

Saint John's University - MN

HLC ID 1401

OPEN PATHWAY: Reaffirmation Review

Visit Date: 3/19/2018

Dr. Michael Hemesath
President

Barbara Johnson
HLC Liaison

Dale Brouger
Review Team Chair

Joaquin Villegas
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Deborah Balogh
Team Member

Jodi Eastberg
Team Member

Dale Simmons
Team Member

Andrew Sund
Team Member

Cynthia Tweedell
Team Member

Linda Wellborn
Team Member

Sarah Westfall
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

3/19/2018

Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Reaffirmation Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit
- Multi-Campus Visit (if applicable)

- Federal Compliance
- Distance Delivery

Institutional Context

Saint John's University was founded in 1857 by Benedictine monks of Saint John's Abbey who had originally emigrated to the United States from Bavaria, Germany. In addition to its undergraduate offerings, SJU includes Saint John's School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem), a graduate school that confers Master of Divinity and master of arts degrees and also prepares seminarians for the priesthood. The University also houses the Hill Museum & Manuscript Library whose mission is to “preserve and share the world’s handwritten past to inspire a deeper understanding of our present and future.” To date, this non-profit division of the University has digitized 140,000 book length manuscripts and over 40,000,000 handwritten pages.

Set amid 2,700 acres of varied terrain, the Saint John's campus is remarkable in its natural beauty, including wetlands, lakes, an oak savanna, a restored prairie, and hiking trails that wind through an extensive pine and hardwood forest. In addition to its recreational value, the landscape inspires spiritual and artistic reflection and fosters the Benedictine traditions of land stewardship, education and environmental respect.

In the past fifty years, Saint John’s University (SJU) has worked collaboratively with the College of Saint Benedict (CSB) to provide a cost-effective higher education experience. The relationship and collaboration has increased over the fifty years and now includes shared curriculum, faculty and many key administrative positions and offices.

Based on the relationship of these two institutions, the visit included both SJU and CSB. A team of eight peer evaluators completed a visit as part of both institutions seeking continued accreditation. In addition, an embedded substantive change request to address the expansion of the SJU School of Theology distance learning offerings.

While a separate team report and recommendation has been made for each institution, significant portions of the reports are duplicates.

Interactions with Constituencies

- Presidents (2)
- Chief Financial Officers CSB/SJU (2)
- HLC Steering Committee (17)
- Criterion #1 Open Forum CSB (20)
- *Criterion #1 Open Forum SJU (10)*
- *Meeting with School of Theology online students*
- Criterion #2 Open Forum CSB (11)
- *Criterion #2 Open Forum SJU (7)*
- Members of the CSB Board of Trustees (7)
- Members of the SJU Board of Trustees (10)
- Meeting with faculty/student Board representatives (8)
- Intercultural Directions Council (14)
- Criterion #3 Open Forum CSB/SJU (*Joint meeting*)(24)
- *Faculty Leadership meeting (2)*
- *Members of APBC, ACC, APSAC (7)*
- Criterion #4 Open Forum CSB/SJU (*Joint meeting*)(22)
- Institutional Research Board (3)
- Criterion #5 Open Forum CSB (16)
- *Criterion #5 Open Forum SJU (26)*
- *Federal Compliance Meeting (8)*
- *School of Theology Librarian and marketing of online courses (3)*
- *Faculty Open Forum (11)*
- *Student Government leadership (4)*
- *Substantive Change Request meeting (7)*
- *Strategic Directions Council (16)*

Additional Documents

In addition to the following list, numerous documents requested by the team were provided and uploaded to the Addendum.

- Learn Which Top-Ranked Colleges Operate Most Efficiently | Morse Code: Inside the College Rankings US News <https://www.usnews.com/education/blogs/college-rankings-blog/articles/2017-1>
- Conflict of Interest Form for CSB/SJU Board of Trustees
- Indemnification Agreement CSB/SJU 11-24-09
- CSB/SJU Presentation Grant Application
- CSB/SJU Production Grant Application

1 - Mission

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

1.A - Core Component 1.A

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

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

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

1.A.1

- Saint John's University (SJU) has a clearly stated mission that articulates its Catholic and Benedictine identity and focus on providing young men a distinctive education in a residential liberal arts oriented environment.
- A revised mission and vision statement was developed by the administration and the Board of Trustees (BOT), and was approved by the BOT on 2015, as part of the University's strategic planning process. Faculty expressed their involvement in the process.
- The SJU of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem) has a separate Board of Regents who approved a mission statement for the School in 2006. Consistent with its discreet mission, and in contrast to the University as a whole, the SOT/Sem is coeducational.

1.A.2

- The programs offered in the College of Arts and Sciences at SJU are consistent with the institutional mission. Outside of the College of Arts and Sciences, professional academic programs (i.e. Accounting and Finance, Elementary Education, Global Business Leadership, and Nursing) are fully grounded in the liberal arts and liberal learning.
- The institution offers the baccalaureate degree to young men in a residential campus setting, but it also offers graduate level, professional education via its SOT/Sem. It is not clear that programs within the School fall within the mission of SJU, which reads "Grounded in Catholic and Benedictine values and tradition, Saint John's University provides young men a distinctive

residential liberal arts education, preparing them to reach their full potential and instilling in them the values and aspiration to lead lives of significance and principled achievement.” Specifically, the SOT/Sem offers graduate, co-educational programs, some of which are not residential, that do not fall within the stated mission of the University.

- No undergraduate fully on-line programs and accelerated programs are offered at SJU with the intention that students will benefit from the liberal arts program and student life experience, but online programming is offered in the SOT/SEM.
- Partnering with the College of Saint Benedict (CSB), SJU offers 35 academic majors and 41 minors with 65% of all degrees conferred being in the arts and science disciplines.
- The residential character of the mission is evident in 86% of the students living on campus while the remaining students live in the nearby neighborhood.

1.A.3.

- The strategic planning documents such as the *Strategic Direction 2020 (SD2020)* focus on the mission and use it as a major source of priorities and decision-making.
- A review of the *Economic Model* reveals a strong mutual commitment to the identity and missions of CSB and SJU. The assumptions that are stated at the beginning of this financial plan confirm the focus of the mission and the use of it in planning for the future.
- Budgeting is tightly aligned with the joint strategic plan. The budget and the financial status of SJU will be covered in more detail in Criterion 5.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team recommends a monitoring report be submitted by November 1, 2018 on the development of a new institutional mission statement with language that is crafted in such a manner as to be inclusive of the institution as a whole and to more accurately identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides, including the SOT/Sem.

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.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

1.B.1

- The mission statements are communicated consistently in SJU documents. The mission documents are available for the public and University community on the joint CSB/SJU website. The institution's handbooks and catalog also convey the nature of the mission. In each place in which the mission is cited, there is intentional explanation of the mission. A review of the advertising and admissions material shows that a consistent message is being provided.
- A review of the handbooks, catalog, and website provided evidence that the institution has provided specific explanations of how it has and intends to implement the mission in the future. In each publication, the Catholic and Benedictine identity is consistently communicated.

1.B.2

- The revised mission and related documents along with the *SD2020* were approved by the BOT in May 2015. The institution reviews and updates the metrics on an annual basis with refinement/adjustment to the 17 outcome metrics of the plan made when necessary. It is clear that faculty, staff, and students played a role in the formation of the strategic plan and are aware of its on-going implementation.
- The SOT/Sem and the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library (HMML) clearly relate to the institution's mission of providing a Catholic, Benedictine education. The visiting team has an understanding that each of these units has its own strategic plan, and these units are not included in the SJU/CSB *SD2020*.

1.B.3

- The vision documents of SJU and the SOT/Sem identify the nature, scope, and intended

constituents of the programs and services the institution provides. However, the relationship of the SOT/Sem's mission to the larger University's mission is not clearly articulated.

- The mission of the University does not include or reflect the important programs, students, delivery modes, collections, and resources of the SOT/Sem or the HMML.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team recommends a monitoring report to be submitted by November 1, 2018 on the development of a new institutional mission statement with language that is crafted in such a manner as to be inclusive of the institution as a whole and to more accurately identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services provided by the institution, including the SOT/Sem.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

1.C.1 and 2

- SJU/CSB have a strong shared commitment to fostering diversity and serving a multi-cultural society as evidenced in:
 - The inclusion of an intercultural learning requirement in the Common Curriculum,
 - The establishment of an Intercultural Directions Council in 2005, which involves faculty, staff and students in the formation of diversity and inclusion objectives, and
 - The hosting of Inclusion Visioning Days in the fall of 2016 and spring of 2017 that together included several hundred faculty, staff and students.
- Diversity is also an aspect for which the institutions are jointly planning. Specifically, the strategic planning document, *SD2020*, includes three diversity-specific goals: (1) developing and implementing a professional development program that strengthens the faculty and staff's ability to meet the needs of the student body that includes enhanced preparation for diversity and intercultural literacy; (2) creation of a comprehensive First Year Experience program to facilitate the transition to college and create a foundation for student success; and (3) elimination of the retention and completion gaps between majority and under-represented students. Work on these goals has been supported by a \$200,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon foundation in 2015 and an additional \$600,000 grant from the same foundation in 2017 that supported the initiatives on inclusive pedagogy and community building. Furthermore, as part of their professional development efforts, the institutions applied for, and were accepted into, the *Council of Independent Colleges, Diversity, Civility, and the Liberal Arts Institute*, to which they will send a team of faculty and administrators in June 2018. The goal of this program is to formulate plans to strengthen diversity and civility on member campuses.
- SJU/CSB are also engaged in activities to improve the retention and success of persons who have disabilities or who are underrepresented. To accomplish these efforts, the Student Accessibility Services group is working with the academic and student development areas to increase access for persons with disabilities. In 2017 the position of "College Navigator" was created and staffed to assist underrepresented students beginning with the admissions process through their first year at SJU. In addition, the University hosts three "coaches" from the national non-profit organization *College Possible*, which is headquartered in the Twin Cities.

These coaches help underrepresented students navigate their academic and co-curricular experience at SJU from admission to graduation.

- SJU/CSB also provide academic and student development programs that are focused on multicultural understanding and inclusion, such as:
 - The *Intercultural Leadership, Education and Development Program* (Intercultural-LEAD) for developing the leadership skills of first-generation students,
 - The annual *Festival of Cultures*, which is an annual event focused on music, entertainment, food and culture, and that draws over a thousand people from the campus and surrounding community, and
 - *Reflection Action Dialogue* (RAD) a student-run organization that hosts interactive theater events on campus as an opportunity to promote inclusivity and shed light on various forms of exclusion that occur on and off campus.

In addition, SJU offers the *SJU FirstGen Scholars* program, which provides recipients with a scholarship and an annual travel allowance for learning or internship opportunities, and faculty and staff mentors.

- Located in Stearns County where 96% of the population is Caucasian, SJU has experienced significant growth in the number of undergraduate students of color. Since 2010 the number of undergraduate students of color has increased by 85%, and their proportion of the entire student body has risen from 8% to nearly 18%.
- SJU continues to be challenged in its effort to attract faculty and staff of color, with only 9% of the faculty being persons of color and 2.9% of the administrative and support staff being persons of color. To address this challenge SJU/CSB developed a *Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee* in 2016. In addition, they are beginning to utilize a program developed by Oregon State University called *Search Advocates*, which is aimed at strengthening the inclusive aspects of the search and hiring processes.
- Students voiced a passionate sensitivity to issues related to racism and prejudices within the institutions, local community, and world. Their voice was evident in the *HLC Student Survey* as well as in the interviews conducted with students. It was clear that the students have a highly developed sensitivity to the need to be inclusive and to provide Benedictine values to all persons.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

1.D.1

- It is evident that SJU/CSB are oriented toward impacting the world through the lives of their students. The mission statement for SJU declares that they will prepare men "to lead lives of significance and principled achievement."
- As an educational institution "grounded in Catholic and Benedictine values and tradition," SJU "approach[es] inquiry and discovery in the context of community and the connections that bind us as people, families, and cultures."
- The University's focus on serving the public good is reflected in an array of high impact learning practices that are largely coordinated through the Office of Experience and Professional Development (XPD), which provides opportunities for the student to engage in experiential learning at the intersection of their liberal education, career aspirations, and community service. Among the many programs offered through the XPD are:
 - The *Bonner Leader Program*, which seeks to improve the lives of individuals and communities by helping meet the basic nutritional and educational needs;
 - The *Marie and Robert Jackson Fellows Program*, which is focused on community service during the summer months; and
 - The *Service-Learning Program*, which incorporates ideas, theories, practices, and methods taught in the classroom with service projects.

The extent of student engagement in such service is underscored in the *2016 Senior Survey*, in which 73% of SJU seniors reported having participated in a community service or volunteer activity while studying at SJU. The institution's creation of the position of Director of Experiential Learning also evidences its commitment to service learning.

The work of the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library also serves an international community, providing essential conservation and preservation services as well as lending leaves of its

internationally recognized St. John's Bible to multiple national and international institutions.

1.D.2

- SJU has developed an extensive partnership with CSB in which the institutions share faculty, curriculum, and several key administrative offices and roles. The relationship has developed over several decades and is based on a mutual relationship that benefits both institutions.
- It was clear to the team that SJU has a singular focus that is stated in its mission and vision documents. In addition, the administration has provided statements indicating that there are no other entities or priorities that would cause SJU to compromise its mission. As stated by the Provost, "The tuition students pay as well as the resources the college generates through its development activities are used exclusively to support those purposes."

1.D.3

- SJU serves the wider Catholic Church through its SOT/Sem, the mission of which is to educate "men and women for ordained and lay ministry in the Church."
- Directly related to its primary educational mission, SJU serves a worldwide constituency through its HMML, which to date has digitally preserved over 50 million manuscripts from numerous religions, languages, and people groups, making its vast catalogue available through online tools for teaching and research.
- SJU engages with external constituencies through its arboretum and campus including 21 miles of trails and its lake.
- The Abbey conducts public masses daily, and the community regularly attends its Sunday services. It also offers the sacraments and rituals of marriage, baptism, and more to the Catholic community.
- The University's art museum, theater programs and concerts are open to the public.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

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

Evidence

Print and digital publications, along with interviews with faculty, staff, and students, evidence that there is a very strong and consistent understanding of SJU's mission. Specifically, SJU's mission and vision documents identify it as a single-gender, residential, Catholic, liberal arts institution, steeped in the Benedictine tradition and values. SJU has partnered with CSB, and the two institutions share administrative, faculty, curricula, and other resources in operationalizing this parallel mission and vision.

The institution is aware of the need to address differences in the diversity of the student body in comparison to the diversity of the staff and faculty. Efforts continue to provide more diversity in both the faculty and staff and in the student experience. SJU has taken steps to enhance the coverage of diversity and inclusive values. With the student body increasingly becoming more diverse in various ways, SJU needs to increase its efforts toward a more diverse faculty and staff.

The team recommends that students be included in the Intercultural Directions Council. As a council established to promote intercultural inclusiveness throughout the campus, this group has broad representation across the institution, but is void of any student representation. Furthermore, this type of involvement may send a positive statement to the students who are very concerned about issues of inclusion and diversity on campus.

The language of the current institutional mission statement is not sufficiently inclusive of SJU's founding academic disciplines, which are housed in the SOT/Sem. As the first Roman Catholic theologate to offer graduate degrees to women, the SOT/Sem has a 60-year coeducational history focused, as their missional documents declare, on "preparing men and women to engage the world." Moreover, the SOT/Sem offers Master's degrees in 6 graduate degrees – Master of Theological Studies; Master of Divinity; Master of Divinity--Priesthood Studies; Master of Arts in Ministry; Master of Arts in Liturgical Music; and Master of Theology. Thus, the current institutional mission statement does not accurately represent the institution as a whole. The specific points of dissonance include: single-gender vs. coeducational; residential vs. combined residential/distance education; and preparing "young men" vs. preparing adult men and women. Additionally, the Assurance Argument, supporting documents, and interviews with faculty, staff and students underscored additional distinctives that are viewed as "missional," but not specifically appearing in the institutional mission statement itself, such as: undergraduate-only education vs. undergraduate *and* graduate education, as well as, face-to-face-only instruction vs. multiple teaching modalities (as evidenced in the SOT/Sem's change request to offer 24 credit hours online).

The team recommends a monitoring report to be submitted by November 1, 2018 on the development of a new institutional mission statement with language that is crafted in such a manner as to be inclusive of the institution as a whole and more accurately identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.A.

- SJU operates with integrity and engages in fair and ethical behavior.
- The institution has a history of clean financial audits, balanced budgets, fidelity to its long-term economic plan, and effective regular communication between the SJU and the College of Saint Benedict (CSB) chief financial officers. The Human Resources office works with a standing Joint Benefits Committee comprised of all employee constituents to monitor and benchmark benefits and perquisites. Detailed descriptions of the Administrative and Support Staff Assemblies, as well as information provided during the team's visit, evidence a well-developed structure for receiving input and enhancing communication across the University. Faculty participate in a well-developed governance process that includes senate and full assembly components as well as committees devoted to curriculum, promotion and tenure, and other matters appropriate to faculty control. Interviews with faculty affirmed the effectiveness of faculty governance and cited examples of changes to committee roles as warranted by institutional circumstances. CSB/SJU's Ethicspoint system for confidential reporting of concerning behavior was widely understood by employees who receive regular reminders about its role and function.
- A great deal of Board and governance documentation is in place for SJU. The University was incorporated as an independent, civil institution with the state of Minnesota separate from St. John's Abbey in 2012, in response to concerns raised in the previous HLC visit. This process entailed thorough review and vetting of revised documents by legal counsel. University Bylaws regarding the presence of faculty and student Trustees were revised in 2017, informed by external review of governance practices. The structure of the Board committee roles and organization, including joint committees with the CSB was revised in 2014 and now is aligned with best practices.
- Board governance for SJU is well documented. Responsibilities of the Board of Regents for the

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem) are clearly outlined in relevant bylaws, and their relationship to the institution's BOT is clear. Communication and continuity between the Board of Regents and SJU's BOT is ensured via joint membership by 3-5 trustees/regents, and ex officio relationships with the SJU president and the abbot of St. John's Abbey.

- SJU maintains independence, but is also integrated with CSB through a special “Coordinate Relationship” governed through a Memorandum of Understanding between the two institutions. This relationship relies on collaboration in governance through the formation of joint and coordinate committees. The Coordinate Relationship is outlined in a 2007 document, and the high-level of integration and functioning between the two organizations demonstrates the success of the relationship.
- A significant and contested change for SJU and CSB was the removal of student and faculty as voting trustees from the Boards of each institution upon the advice of an external consultant, commissioned by both CSB and SJU, who identified the risks related to having faculty and student as voting trustees on the Board. Legal counsel also recommended the change. As a result, those faculty and student voting members were removed from the Board. In interviews with Trustees, staff, faculty, and students, lingering tensions were identified. There were mixed perspectives on whether the faculty and staff members should be removed, but there was consistent concern from students and faculty about the perceived unilateral nature of the decision-making process. In part, as a response to the removal of voting members, students and faculty were given representation with voice rights on the BOT, and voting privileges to some Board committees. This new structure is documented in the *Pathways to Governance* document. In interviews with various constituents it was remarked that student and faculty voices are taken into consideration by the Board. The willingness to include faculty and student representatives on committees and to speak during board meetings has in some ways begun to repair the tension.
- The risk review function of the Board is carried out in large part by the Audit Committee, with other committees playing a role in their areas of focus. Trustees and staff members reported regular attention to issues of enterprise or institutional risk at each Board meeting.
- SJU provided evidence of board development from 2015 that included internally and externally facilitated training on a wide range of topics. New trustee orientation is well documented and supported by strong written materials and a yearlong schedule of topical information, which Trustees reported as effective. Faculty appointees to Board committees are also invited to attend the orientations sessions, something faculty participants reported as valuable. The Board's SharePoint site on the CSB/SJU web portal provides ample resource information for trustees. The Board regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its meetings as well as the effectiveness of members. Feedback from the Board evaluations informs ongoing development and training.
- Faculty and administrative handbooks reinforce the mission and Benedictine tradition of SJU and provide clear policies related to roles and responsibilities for faculty and administrative and supportive operating staff. Policies range from interpersonal behavior to academic freedom. The description of the organizational structure and roles of each institution is effectively laid out in the *Administrative Handbook*.
- Clear processes for preferential treatment of Benedictine candidates/staff are in place and are aligned with the mission of SJU. Specific processes for employment were described by staff during the team's visit. Tenure-track faculty who are monastics participate in the same tenure

and promotion process as lay candidates. It is clear that this preference is consonant with the mission of SJU, and that hiring processes support both mission and competence.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.B.

- SJU has a comprehensive consumer information page on the website shared with the CSB. It includes clear information about tuition and financial aid via the Net Price Calculator. It also provides a clear link for those wishing to file a complaint. The Catholic and Benedictine identities of SJU are clearly communicated on the website and in University documents including the college catalogs. Six professional accreditations in addition to the HLC accreditation are listed on the website: American Chemical Society, Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics, Accreditation of Educator Preparation, Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, National Association of Schools of Music, and the Association of American Theological Schools. Additionally, the nursing and education programs are accredited by the State of Minnesota boards of nursing and education. An accessible, intuitive explanation of the Coordinate relationship between both institutions is also available on the website.
- The HLC team discovered inconsistent information on the SOT/Sem's website. Specifically, a pdf about the Master of Theology degree includes inaccurate information about degree requirements. This may cause understandable confusion to people who access it and then read different, correct information elsewhere on the site. This issue is also addressed in Criterion 3.A.3.
- SJU has a clear focus on the education of men, including the examination of gender, and, in the catalog, defines who "men" are for the purpose of admission. As noted in Criterion 1, the SOT/Sem appears to be absent from the SJU mission statement given its focus on young men and liberal arts.
- Degree, major, and minor offerings are easily accessible on the website, and degree requirements are fully explicated in the college catalog and on department webpages. The *CSB/SJU Factbook* is comprehensive and accessible via the website. Faculty contact information is available through the department pages.
- In conversation with faculty, staff and students, each constituent group was able to reference specific critical information such as policies, handbooks, and reporting features of the website that were significant to the work or learning happening on campus.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.C.1.

- The Coordinate Relationship is supported by jointly appointed Board committees, including the Joint Presidential Advisory Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee. Intentional communication between the Boards of SJU and CSB occurs at two joint meetings each year. Key administrative functions are shared by SJU and CSB (Academic Affairs/Provost, Human Resources, Life Safety, and Dining, as a few examples) and also support the Coordinate Relationship. This Coordinate Relationship is very clearly defined and does not preclude the organization from acting independently.

2.C.2 and 3.

- SJU's Class A and Class B Trustees are members of the Order of Saint Benedict and ensure appropriate and ongoing influence by members of the Abbey on the governance of SJU. This is the only superordinate entity connected to SJU. Board members report clarity about their relatively new independence from the Abbey and other entities. Strong Board governance documents and fidelity to them, effective Board leadership, and ongoing Board professional development activities are evidence that the Board preserves its independence in an appropriate way.
- SJU's 2012 incorporation as a civil and separate entity from the Order of Saint Benedict was a recent institutional change designed to preserve and strengthen the University. Although the new incorporation had important organizational and legal implications, it also affirmed the role of the Trustees as focused on the health and perpetuity of the University in its own right, separate from the Order of Saint Benedict. This process included clarifying the role of St. John's Abbey in the governance of SJU via membership on the BOT. The goals of affirming the "Catholic identity and Benedictine tradition" of SJU were documented and reified by the

changes in governance, an important reflection of the institution's identity and values.

- SJU's Trustees identified prospective students, current students, alumni, families, and donors as important constituencies, as well as the local and broader Benedictine communities. They also identified CSB students, faculty, staff, and alumnae as important constituents given the Coordinate Relationship of the two institutions. Discussions with Board members affirmed their fealty to the needs of their constituents as they plan for the future and conduct their work in Board committees.

2.C.4.

- The role of the president of SJU is clear in Board documents, including primary responsibility for the daily administration of the institution. The faculty is clearly responsible for the curriculum and related academic matters. Trustee interviews indicated their understanding of Board work as high-level direction setting rather than involvement in administrative or academic matters. Board committees and their respective charges are aligned with current practices, and supported by ongoing Board development practices.
- SJU's Policy on Subordinate Bodies clarifies how the Board of Regents for the SOT/Sem and the Board of Overseers for the HMML interact with the BOT. The on-site visit affirmed that the policy is being followed and that it is viewed as effective by the Board and relevant administrators.
- In conversations with members of the BOT, the Trustees clearly understand their roles and have created appropriate committee structures to manage the work of their members in support of the institution. According to the institutional Bylaws, SJU's BOT is autonomous and delegates the management and administration of the institution to SJU's administration including the President and academic matters to the faculty. In interviews with the President, faculty and administration as well as members of the Board, the Board can clearly articulate its role and the role of administrators and faculty at the institution. Trustees and staff members reported regular attention to issues of enterprise or institutional risk at each Board meeting.
- The Board has well-documented expectations of trustees including clarification of conflicts of interest, the Board's structure, and a Committee on Trustees and Governance which is charged, in part, with Board development. An on-site review confirmed that conflict of interest forms had been completed by trustees earlier in the current academic year. SJU's conflict of interest forms included comprehensive definitions of conflicts, including an important, relevant clarification related to "duality of interest" for trustees who are also members of the Order of Saint Benedict. The other Board committees – Audit, Building and Grounds, Executive, Finance, Investment, Resource Development, Student Development, and joint committees (with CSB) for Academic Affairs along with Enrollment and Marketing, are aligned with peer institutions. The Policy on Subordinate Entities, approved in 2012, provides clarity about the role the Board of Regents for the SOT/Sem and the Board of Overseers for the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library (HMML). Governance documentation from those entities confirms the Policy on Subordinate Entities. Members of each entity confirmed that the governance process works effectively.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.D.

- The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.
- SJU and CSB's statement regarding academic freedom of expression are aligned with widely accepted AAUP standards and are expressed in the *Faculty Handbook* (2.10.1) and the *Student Life Policy Statement for Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression* approved in April 2016.
- Faculty and students were able to articulate the strong commitment to academic expression and freedom at the institution including student expression through the award-winning campus newspaper *The Record*, student government, and within the academic setting of the classroom. Onsite conversation during the Faculty Open Session provided unanimous and enthusiastic affirmation of the statement and of the academic freedom enjoyed by faculty members.
- The institution thoughtfully addresses freedom of expression in the Catholic, Benedictine tradition by acknowledging the over thousand-year tradition of indiscriminately understanding and protecting knowledge from multiple perspectives and traditions. Moreover, the institution affirms their policies via reference to Pope John Paul II's *Ex Corde Ecclesia*, which situates the freedom of inquiry in the Catholic tradition that undergirds SJU and CSB.
- Religious pluralism among the University's community is supported and actively encouraged as was affirmed through multiple conversations on campus.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.E.1

- SJU provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students. The institution's IRB process is run in a joint fashion by faculty at both CSB/SJU. The IRB process for reviewing research is properly organized and supported by the institution. In an onsite meeting with the head of the IRB, he confirmed the institution's support of the process and the work of the faculty review committee. The IRB is properly organized for an undergraduate institution focusing mainly on reviews of student research and faculty-student research projects. Online ethical training is provided and applicants are mentored through the process.

2.E.2

- Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources and were able to clearly articulate that they learned about ethical practices from syllabi and through the mentorship of their faculty. Students are trained in their freshman year on academic honesty and other Information Literacy learning outcomes in their First Year Seminar (FYS) course. Onsite interviews identified that the FYS literacy training was effective for grounding students in ethical use of information.

2.E.3

- The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity. The college outlines policies in faculty and student handbooks that clearly articulate expectations for academic integrity. The *Academic Misconduct Policy* is clearly articulated in the *Student Handbook*. Definitions and consequences of academic misconduct are addressed, and the process for reporting is outlined in a transparent manner for both student and instructor. Students from both CSB and SJU articulated their belief that they are held to the same academic standards and ethical behaviors by professors. Faculty members voiced confidence in the implementation of academic honesty policies.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

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

Evidence

SJU strives to act with the highest levels of integrity in conducting its business in an ethical and responsible manner. Every member of the community at every level of the institution articulated commitment to the Benedictine values of the institution as well as SJU's commitment to high-levels of academic integrity and freedom of expression. Policies, procedures, and institutional documentation reflect this as an on-going and regular part of the institution.

The legal incorporation of the University as an entity separate from the Order of Saint Benedict entailed review and revision of central governance issues including the constitution of the BOT and institutional Bylaws. This has been effective and reflects an overall commitment to institutional integrity and fidelity to mission.

Because of the strong commitment to shared governance at the institution and the demonstrated maturity of SJU students, the HLC reviewers recommend (as in Criterion 1) that the institution consider ways that student representatives can formally join the conversation and planning around issues of diversity and inclusion. We also encourage CSB/SJU leadership, at the Board and institutional levels, to continue its attention to rebuilding trust with faculty and students in the wake of the decision to remove them as voting members of the BOT. Doing so will help preserve the strong sense of community so valued by CSB/SJU students, faculty, and staff.

A review of the SOT/Sem's handbook did not turn up a policy related to academic honesty, nor are graduate students addressed in the undergraduate student handbook. SOT leadership may wish to consider developing appropriate expectations and policies related to the conduct of graduate and seminary students. SOT leadership may also wish to review its website for clarity about degree expectations. The team discovered a pdf (on the SOT website) related to the Master of Theology degree that did not reflect degree requirements communicated more fully and accurately elsewhere on the site.

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

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

3.A - Core Component 3.A

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

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

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

3.A.1

- Courses and programs offered by SJU and CSB are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded. The Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness facilitates processes to ensure courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree awarded.
- Content area faculty establish program learning goals, outcomes, and curriculum based upon professional requirements, specialized accreditor standards, peer/aspirant institution requirements, graduate feedback and licensing standards. The *Program Review Schedule* indicates three or four academic programs are reviewed each year, ensuring all academic programs undergo a comprehensive program review every ten years or as required by specialized accreditors. Program reviews include review of learning outcomes, curricular assessment by external content area experts, senior focus groups, and graduate surveys.
- Feedback from graduates regarding curriculum content and rigor, coupled with institutional performance on the *Collegiate Learning Assessment*, indicate that CSB/SJU perform favorably with regard to analysis, problem solving, and writing mechanics compared to a national sample of college graduates.
- The School of Theology and Seminary's (SOT/Sem) Master of Theology post-graduate degree does not meet the 30 credit hour requirement established by the U.S. Department of Education and the HLC Assumed Practices within the Criteria for Accreditation B.1.a. The

SOT/Sem's program only requires 24 credit hours according to information provided on its website here: <https://www.csbsju.edu/Documents/SOT/academic/MasterTHEO.pdf>. The institution must reconcile its credit hours for the Master of Theology degree with the HLC and DOE provisions or degree requirements.

3.A.2.

- The institutions articulate and differentiate learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs. A Common Curriculum Committee, composed of cross-disciplinary academic representatives, along with faculty governance committees, ensures the Common Curriculum provides all undergraduate students with a solid academic foundation and the fundamental tools necessary to develop intellectual inquiry through a broad liberal arts education and through cross-disciplinary and divisional goals. Academic Learning Goals were most recently revised for a new general education curriculum and endorsed by the Joint Faculty Assembly in 2015. The new Common Curriculum has not been approved despite significant deliberation.
- Graduate learning goals are differentiated from undergraduate learning goals in content as well as in cognitive levels. Graduate programs offered through the SOT/Sem at SJU are designed to prepare graduates to minister within the Christian traditions, and thus emphasize theological reflection, spirituality, growth in moral sensibility and character, and the acquisition of skills requisite to the exercise of ministry. A specialized accreditor, the Association of Theological Schools (ATS), affirmed the appropriateness of graduate learning goals in its 2017 report.

3.A.3.

- The institutions' program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations. As primarily residential institutions, alternative delivery formats are limited to study abroad programs and two to three distance-learning courses per semester delivered through the SOT/Sem. The Academic Curriculum Committee and Common Curriculum Committee monitor consistency in program quality and learning goals of study abroad programs through course and curriculum approval processes for the undergraduate curriculum. Qualified faculty of CSB/SJU or a local university teach all study abroad courses.
- Consistency in current and anticipated online courses is monitored through School of Theology faculty using a comprehensive ten-year program review process; faculty alignment and comparison of individual courses and degree outcomes with seated and online students; assessment of ministry students through portfolios and/or mid-degree assessments; and through annual faculty curriculum conferences.
- The HLC team discovered inconsistent information on the SOT/Sem's website. Specifically, a pdf about the Master of Theology degree includes inaccurate information about degree requirements. This may cause understandable confusion to people who access it and then read different, correct information elsewhere on the site. This issue was also addressed in Criterion 2.B.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team recommends a monitoring report on the School of Theology and Seminary Master of Theology degree. It is clear the students have the requisite qualifications that have not been applied to

the degree requirement. The institution must reconcile its credit hours for the Master of Theology degree with the HLC and DOE provisions or degree requirements. The team recommends the reconciliation be carried out immediately, but with the report outlining the steps for reconciliation that have been carried out being submitted no later than November 1, 2018.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.B.1.

- The general education program of SJU/CSB is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution. The program is mission-driven and cross-disciplinary, appropriately supporting the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institutions.
- The three-level Common Curriculum is structured by faculty. The first level includes writing, discussion and research, ethics, and gender, as well as institutional and experiential learning. The second level curriculum introduces “ways of knowing” through courses in the Natural Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Fine Arts. The third level Common Curriculum requirements are fulfilled through departmental courses in Mathematics, Global Language, and a Capstone course in the major. Students must complete all 19 courses in the Common Curriculum to fulfill graduation requirements.

3.B.2.

- The institutions articulate the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of their shared general education requirements.
- In 1988, a shared philosophy of intellectual concepts and skills every college-educated person

should possess led to the development of a common Core Curriculum, by then-separate faculty of the CSB and SJU. During the 2006-2007 AY, a Joint Faculty Assembly revised the Curriculum, which was reaffirmed in separate votes throughout the year, with final adoption in April 2007. The Joint Faculty Senate proposed revisions throughout the years, which academic councils approved. The Joint Faculty Senate approved the current Common Curriculum in 2015. The faculty continue to evaluate and develop the wider General Education curriculum through faculty governance structures.

- The current Common Curriculum is aligned with recommendations by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and supports the six “high-impact practices” for higher education such as the yearlong First-Year Seminar that is writing intensive and provides common intellectual experiences, including ethics, diversity, and global learning, field-based experiential learning, and capstone courses and projects distinct to each major. Findings from the 2016 Senior Survey reveal 86.3 percent of graduates agree that the Common Curriculum imparts “broad knowledge across a number of fields.”
- Intended learning outcomes, purposes, and content of the institutions’ Common Curriculum are clearly articulated in catalogs and on institutional websites.

3.B.3.

- SJU/CSB’s baccalaureate degree programs engage students in collecting, analyzing and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments from the first day of the First-Year Seminar through the culminating capstone presentation as evidenced by multiple components.
- First-Year Seminar students are graded according to a research rubric evaluating presentation of a clear argument, different points of view, and evidence to support the author’s claims. Disciplinary courses engage students in mastering modes of inquiry and creative work by conducting scientific investigation as part of a lab or fieldwork and solving or analyzing challenging problems using qualitative and/or quantitative sources of information.
- Fine Arts requirements help students deepen their understanding of the arts and develop the ability to apply analytic skills to aesthetic judgment.
- Graduate programs engage students through coursework, required research projects, papers and comprehensive oral examinations. Some degree programs require students to participate in field education and clinical experience, which fosters integration of theoretical work with practice.

3.B.4.

- Grounded in the Catholic and liberal arts tradition of respect for all, the institutional *Statement on Diversity* expresses commitment to cultivate inclusiveness and respect for differences. Curricular and co-curricular programs highlight ways in which social, political, economic, and other forces shape culture and emphasize the framework within which student experiences, beliefs, and values inform perspectives. Established as separate colleges for men and women within the Benedictine monastic communities, the institutions are particularly attentive to gender in curriculum and programming. The recent Quality Initiative for the Open Pathway Accreditation focused on gender identities and behaviors.

- The SOT/Sem hosts a contingent of international students, primarily from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, further enhancing diversity among the student body.
- Study abroad programs further emphasize intercultural learning. The *Open Doors Report* of the Institute of International Education ranks SJU/CSB 27th in the nation with 73.7 percent of students participating in international study.

3.B.5.

- With a mission to “provide students with opportunity to engage in intensive scholarship, research, or creative work within the student’s chosen field of study” the institutions support and promote research beginning with a research project during First-Year Seminar, continuing through research embedded in the Common Curriculum, and culminating with a senior Capstone research project. A Celebrating Scholarship and Creativity day is held each spring with approximately 900 students participating. On that day, classes are canceled on both campuses and a full schedule of presentations or poster sessions enable students to present their work. The institutions further support research with opportunity for 10-week, paid summer research fellowships. Additionally, science and social science majors are encouraged to apply for the National Science Foundation sponsored programs.
- Clear expectations for faculty scholarship and creative work are set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, which states, “Demonstration of scholarly excellence may include, but is not necessarily limited to, the following evidence: a. publications subject to peer review; b. slides, recordings, or portfolios of artistic works or performance; c. other relevant publications; d. presentations of scholarly and/or creative work at professional meetings; e. on-campus presentations of scholarship and/or creative work; f. evaluation by department chair, program director [and/or the dean of the School of Theology]; g. evaluative statements by professional peers; and h. award of grants, patents, prizes, or commendations.” Additionally, School of Theology faculty must also publish periodically in scholarly or professional journals and be active in at least one professional society.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.C.1.

- The institutions have sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty to carry out both teaching and non-teaching faculty responsibilities. Eighty percent of faculty are full-time and tenured or on tenure track. The student-to-faculty ratio has remained around 12:1 for the past five years; the median class size is 19 and the largest class has 35 students. During the Open Faculty Session faculty reported being satisfied with the 3:3 load. The report of the 2017 comprehensive evaluation visit by the Association of Theological Schools affirms faculty sufficiency and qualifications.

3.C.2.

- A selective hiring process ensures faculty are qualified within their respective disciplines. Department chairs and search committees review transcripts and vita of candidates to ensure they meet credential requirements, as set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*. Faculty credential documents are held in the office of Academic Affairs and are updated regularly as part of the academic program review process. A random sampling of faculty vita and course assignments indicates all faculty that were reviewed are academically and experientially qualified; 90 percent of faculty hold the terminal degree within their field.

3.C.3.

- Clear guidelines and processes for faculty evaluation are set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*. Comprehensive evaluation for term faculty includes annual direct observation, review of syllabi and review of student course survey results. The Rank and Tenure Committee evaluates tenured and tenure-track faculty during the third and sixth years of full-time appointment and before promotion in rank. Criteria for evaluation include teaching effectiveness; scholarship and creative work; advising; service to the community, college, profession, and students; professional qualities and identity; professional development; and support of mission. Faculty described extensive peer mentoring to support teaching excellence.
- Department chairs and the Dean of the SOT/Sem periodically consult with faculty within their areas regarding professional development and arrange annual evaluations of probationary members.

3.C.4.

- The institutions ensure instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in teaching through the required *Program for Professional Development* plan. The Plan requires faculty to maintain a professional portfolio and professional development plan. Department chairs or the College dean reviews Professional Development plans with faculty during regularly scheduled faculty evaluations and at various times as may be desired.
- SJU/CSB place an emphasis on professional development, budgeting a minimum of \$750 annually to support each full-time faculty member. Faculty may apply to the Faculty Development and Research Committee for supplemental professional development funding. The Provost, Academic Dean, and Dean of Faculty also have authority to grant supplemental funding as needs arise.
- In addition, tenured faculty become eligible for a semester-long sabbatical at full salary or a full-year sabbatical at half pay every seven years. The first eligible year for tenure is the year after tenure is awarded. The institution reports that over the past ten years, every qualified faculty member who applied for funds received approval.
- The institution is aggressive in seeking external funding for professional development. CSB was awarded a \$100,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for teaching and advising a diverse student body. The institutional commitment to professional development is further evidenced by the significant investment it makes annually. During fiscal year 2016, over \$1 million was allocated to sabbaticals; \$182,418 for faculty travel; \$83,130 for faculty development; and \$67,488 for supplemental travel.
- Ongoing faculty support is provided by the Learning Enhancement Service which provides a range of support services including teaching seminars, celebrated teacher sessions, reading groups, faculty interest groups, and individualized personal sessions. The Learning Enhancement Service offers ongoing professional development opportunities including the Annual Technology Day during which a full range of technology-related teaching workshops are provided.

3.C.5.

- As set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, faculty are required to hold office hours for consultation on course work and advising students. In addition to formal office hours, faculty and students

communicate on a frequent basis via email or through the Canvas learning management system. Over 90 percent of senior respondents to the *2016 Senior Survey* described their relationships with faculty as “excellent” or 'good.' Over 92 percent reportedly discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class. Additionally, aggregate results from Forms A and B of the IA Systems student course surveys indicate that students are satisfied with faculty availability outside of class.

3.C.6.

- A detailed, comprehensive *Employment/Recruiting Toolkit for Supervisors and Search Committees* establishes a strong framework for identifying qualified support services personnel. The Toolkit is divided into three sections: Prior to a Recruitment, During a Recruitment, and After Recruitment. Detailed job descriptions specify required skills and qualifications for all positions; those requirements are contained within employment ads. Guidelines and checklists are provided to help administrators screen applications, evaluate credentials, and interview candidates.
- New employee orientation provides training in areas such as Title IX, conflict resolution, and campus safety. An annual performance appraisal provides opportunity for employees and supervisors to discuss professional and career goals, professional development, and need for job specific training. Staff may apply for professional development funds through one of four committees: College of Saint Benedict Administrative Staff, Saint John’s University Administrative Staff, College of Saint Benedict Staff Support and Saint John’s University Staff Support. Typically there are 22-28 applicants and funding for 16-20 applicants. Funding is awarded depending upon the locus of appointment and job classification of the applicant. Additionally, the endowed Paul Lawson Professional Development fund provides support for SJU administrative employees to participate in ongoing professional development.
- There is a new managerial training session being developed by the institution to further support campus leadership.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.D.1.

All students at the SJU/CSB have access to a wide range of support services including:

- Academic Advising, which supports students in understanding academic policies/procedures, scheduling, fulfilling graduation requirements in a timely manner, and in identifying and using campus resources;
- Library services that provide study rooms, research guides, access to databases, and individualized research assistance;
- Information Technology Services that provides innovative and reliable technology service to enable teaching and learning for students, faculty, and staff including learning space design, tools for teaching and learning and support services;
- English as a Second Language, which provides classes that fulfill the global language proficiency requirement and assistance to strengthen the academic language and research skills for students in need of English support;
- Student Accessibility Services, which coordinates appropriate accommodations for individuals with documented disabilities to ensure they have equal opportunity to participate in both academic and non-academic campus activities;
- Health Promotion and Services, which addresses health related issues and provides quality, cost effective primary care and preventive health services to the campus community;
- Counseling and Psychological Services, which is available to enhance the mental health of students by providing prevention, intervention, consultation, and referral services along with consulting and training to the campus community;
- Academic Support, including peer tutors, writing and math support, and experiential learning;

- Experiential and Professional Development, which provides opportunities empower students to explore, do, reflect and connect through self-exploration, research, and experience-based programs; and Center for Global Education, which coordinate 10-week and semester-long study abroad programs and yearlong international exchange programs.

3.D.2.

- Learning support begins prior to matriculation through an interactive survey, which enables academic advisors and student accessibility staff to review profiles of incoming students including aspirations, experience with college-level course work, and responses to a series of questions that provide a holistic picture of each student.
- Online placement exams for math and writing, coupled with ACT and SAT scores, ensure students are enrolled in appropriate courses and provided readiness courses where indicated.
- Students at SJU/CSB perceive the quality of interactions and level of support significantly higher than peer institutions according to the *2016 National Survey of Student Engagement*.

3.D.3.

- The institutions see advising as a strength. As indicated by *2016 Senior Survey* responses, 80.5 percent of graduating seniors perceive the quality of academic advising as “excellent” or “good.” New students are placed into appropriate courses and sequences based upon online placement exams, ACT and SAT scores, and responses to interactive questionnaires; the professor of a student’s First-Year Seminar becomes the faculty advisor for that student and sees the student at least twice a week during the entire first year. Students are assigned to an advisor within their major at the end of the first year. The academic advisor monitors student progress and recommends support services as appropriate.

3.D.4.

Identified as a priority in *Strategic Direction 2020 (SD2020)*, the institutions provide the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning.

- The many strengths of the technology infrastructure and support services are highlighted in the May 2017 Kaludis Consulting Report. Technology infrastructure includes 95 percent smart classrooms, 941 computers for student use in residence halls common areas, and labs. Information Technology Services (ITS) provides tech training and support for students, faculty, and staff.
- Modern scientific laboratories on both campus (Nursing Simulation Lab, Ardoff Science Center, Peter Engel/New Science Center, Bailey Herbarium and the Arboretum) ensure students of both institutions have access to laboratory facilities and equipment to support learning in the natural and applied sciences.
- Usage data confirm high usage of the combined Clemens and Alculn Libraries comprised of 165,000 square feet of library space, with seating for 972, within study rooms and open areas, research space, collaborative rooms and classrooms. The Learning Commons within the Library houses ITS, which provides training and assistance, the Writing Center, World Languages Center, Media Services, and Archives.
- Multiple venues (Escher Auditorium, Stephen B. Humphrey Theater, Gorecki Family Theater,

Colman Black Box Theater, Darnall Amphitheater, Helgeson Dance Studio, Pellegrine Auditorium) provide rehearsal and performance space for students and community events.

- SJU houses the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library (HMML), which holds distinction as the world's largest archive of manuscript photographs in both microfilm and digital format. The Museum serves scholars worldwide by identifying manuscript collections in need of photographic preservation.
- The institutions hold clinical contracts with over 300 clinical practice sites including hospitals, schools, community health sites, public health agencies, clinics, and nursing homes, all of which provide facilities to meet clinical hour requirements of nursing students.

3.D.5.

- SJU/CSB Library faculty and staff provide guidance to students in research and the effective use of information resources. Library staff are well qualified, and all hold an ALA-accredited degree in Library and Information Studies.
- Student guidance in information literacy begins with First-Year Seminar research projects. Reference librarians conduct classes at all continuing levels. An online form enables students to schedule individual help sessions; online chat, text and email support is also provided.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.E - Core Component 3.E

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.E.1.

- The institutions share ten clearly articulated goals for co-curricular programs, which are directly connected to institutional missions. The emphases for co-curricular programs are leadership and service, living in community, and holistic development.
- Co-curricular activities are coordinated through Student Development and focus on distinctive needs of students on each campus. Each campus hosts 90-plus clubs and organizations as well as programming related to residential life, athletics, ministry, career development, health, international and intercultural relations, recreation, and leadership development.
- Eighty-six percent of seniors completing the *2016 Senior Survey* responded that campus community is 'excellent' or "good;" 77 percent were satisfied with co-curricular opportunities; 80 percent were satisfied with social experiences, and 84 percent spent at least one hour per week engaged in co-curricular activities with over one in five participating 6-10 hours per week.

3.E.2.

- Senior and alumni surveys provide evidence that the institutions fulfill claims for excellent residential life, liberal arts and educational experience in the Benedictine traditions with an emphasis on serving others. Leadership development and global engagement are evidenced in senior and alumni surveys and in student participation and satisfaction ratings within various activities.
- Ninety percent of alumni describe academic content and rigor as "excellent" or "good." Ratings related to general knowledge, oral and written communication, critical thinking and quantitative reasoning average percentages in the upper 80s, further indicating fulfillment of the commitment to a quality liberal arts education.
- Ninety percent of survey respondents indicated their College or University experience helped

them develop practices of ethics and integrity; 80 percent credited the institutions with contributing to their understanding of themselves, their spirituality, and meaningful purpose of life. The majority reported that they integrate Catholic and Benedictine values into their lives.

- Additional results indicate they attribute their educational experience to helping them understand and be engaged in social, civic, and political issues. *Washington Monthly* listed both institutions among the top 50 liberal arts colleges in the nation in 2017.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

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

Evidence

SJU and CSB ensure all students receive a high quality liberal arts education in the Benedictine tradition. Students are provided with an enriching educational experience via a cross-disciplinary Common Curriculum rooted in the institutional missions.

Grounded in the Catholic and liberal arts tradition of respect for all, the institutions emphasize diversity and intercultural and international learning experiences. With a mission to “provide students with opportunity to engage in intensive scholarship, research, or creative work within the student’s chosen field of study,” the institutions support and promote research through all phases of matriculation beginning with the First-Year Seminar and culminating with a senior research project.

Qualified faculty and staff provide numerous academic programs, support services, and co-curricular activities designed to enhance students’ college experience. A strong infrastructure ensures support in the areas of technology, research, the arts, and sciences.

In summary, SJU/CSB provide high quality education, as evidenced by Senior and Alumni Surveys, external evaluators, specialized accreditors, and public media reports.

The team recommends a monitoring report on the SOT/Sem Master of Theology degree. It is clear the students have the requisite qualifications that have not been applied to the degree requirement. The institution must reconcile its credit hours for the Master of Theology degree with the HLC and DOE provisions or degree requirements. The team recommends the reconciliation be carried out immediately, but with the report outlining the steps for reconciliation that have been carried out being submitted no later than November 1, 2018.

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).

Rating

Met

Evidence

4.A.1.

- Saint John's University (SJU) and the College of Saint Benedict (CSB) conduct regular academic program reviews. The team saw a *Schedule of Program Reviews* indicating four reviews were conducted each year since 2013. Each program is reviewed every 8-10 years. Forty-two program reviews were in the evidence files and the team noted these review included an external reviewer and two-day site visit. Interviews with the Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee indicated faculty are motivated to do program review because there is a connection between program review and resource allocation.

4.A.2. and 4.A.3.

- SJU/CSB exercise authority over all credit transcripts. Three committees, Academic Curriculum Committee (ACC), and Common Curriculum Committee (CCC), and Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee (APSAC) oversee transfer credit policies while Registrar's office enforces policies. Transfer coursework is individually evaluated, and credit policies are also enforced. CLEP and AP minimum scores are clearly published in catalog. There are policies regarding internships and independent projects.

4.A.4.

- The SJU/CSB Joint Faculty Senate and Joint Faculty Assembly exercise authority over curriculum. The team interviewed representatives from the four faculty committees (ACC, CCC, APSAC and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee (APBC)) and verified there is a rigorous process through which curriculum is reviewed, revised, and planned. Evidence included a document defining rigor. SJU/CSB does not offer dual credit for high school students. The School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem) has separate but parallel faculty committees to review and revise curriculum.
- Departments monitor qualifications of the faculty and course teaching assignments. The *Faculty Handbook* clearly defines faculty rank and tenure and promotion processes are clear. Interviews with the Academic Dean indicated candidate vitae are reviewed to match them to courses offered. Credential review and verification of compliance with HLC faculty qualifications policy occurs at hire. SJU/CSB has recently adopted Taskstream to verify ongoing qualification over time. Although there is no systematic process of credential review to verify compliance with HLC faculty qualification guidelines, a spot check of the qualifications of faculty in a random sampling of courses found no faculty who were not qualified for their teaching field.
- Students have access to learning resources through multiple locations on both campuses. All students have access to two well-equipped libraries containing many print volumes and online resources. Library instruction is part of the First Year Experience program and the All Campus Thesis program. Student academic services such as a writing center, tutoring, accessibility services, and international student services are located on both campuses. There is ESL coursework bilingual and international students. Student services personnel are diverse.

4.A.5.

- Specialized academic accreditations include CCNE (nursing), ACEND (dietetics), ACS (chemistry), MNBOT and NCATE (education), NASM (Music), and ATS (School of Theology).

4.A.6.

- Success of graduates is followed through the *First Destination Survey* given at graduation and *Alumni Surveys* given three years after graduation. The *First Destination Survey* focuses on employment and continuing education. As students are further from graduation, the survey questions change so that the Institutions can assess the lifelong impact of the Benedictine values. Results were shared with the team. The *First Destination Survey* had a high completion rate (over 80%). The *Alumni Survey* (3 years out) had a 30%+ response rate.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

4.B.1.

- SJU and CSB have curricular and co-curricular learning goals. The Assurance Argument and accompanying documents provided evidence of a recent self-study process with the John Gardner First Year Experience to develop first-year learning goals. Common Core Learning Goals are regularly revised. The Student Development Departments of both schools have written unified learning goals with the help of a consultant. The School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem) has learning goals that were noted in the evidence file.

4.B.2.

- Evidence indicates assessment of learning outcomes is ongoing. The CSB and SJU websites include learning goals, curriculum maps and assessment timelines for all academic departments. Regular program reviews result in action plans with annual reports on the progress of those plans. The APSAC works with the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness to assure all programs are assessing learning outcomes. Results are tied to the budget process, which motivates faculty to produce data. The schools are beginning to use TaskStream to organize assessment processes. The SOT/Sem provided evidence of a robust system of assessment that was commended in their recent American Theological Society accreditation visit.

4.B.3.

- There is evidence that strategic goals and curriculum changes are driven by assessment data. Faculty reported changes such as revised objectives, department reorganization, and revised senior thesis that are the product of assessment. The Assurance Argument contains several other examples of data-driven decisions. The Student Development Office has been through one cycle of program review resulting in program improvements. The SOT/Sem discusses

assessment results and improvements during its annual Curriculum Conference, which promotes a "common mind" among the School's faculty.

4.B.4,

- CSB and SJU employ best practices for assessment. For example, the APSAC in collaboration with Academic Affairs and the Office for Academic Assessment and Effectiveness developed the *Procedure for Programmatic Assessment of Student Success*, which includes an Action Plan, Curriculum Map and Report on the Action Plan. Evidence suggests the processes have improved over time and includes a wide range of stakeholders. Recently a Teagle grant supported faculty and staff training on assessment. In sum, SJU/CSB show evidence of a strong culture of assessment at all levels.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

4.C.1.

- *SD2020* identifies clear retention and completion goals. SJU/CSB have a first-to-second year retention goal of 90 percent and four-year completion goal of 75 percent. Currently the rates are 87 and 68 percent, respectively. The institutions are to be commended on clearly defining retention and completion goals. They consistently work toward those goals through the strategic plan. The SOT/Sem also has a retention plan. It has an 81 percent retention rate and 54 percent graduation rate. These goals seem realistic.

4.C.2 and 4

- Both institutions, as well as the SOT/Sem, provided evidence they have collected and analyzed retention. The IPEDS collection method is used for report retention. They have also collected demographic data on the characteristics of students who persist and those who leave. The institution analyzed the data and found that students of color were succeeding in lower rates than majority students.

4.C.3

- As a result of their data analysis the institutions have developed retention initiatives. They are addressing retention goals through an improved First Year Experience and better communication with students. They have developed inclusivity training for faculty and staff. They applied for and were selected to participate in the CIC Diversity, Civility and Liberal Arts

Institute. Moreover, upon seeing a dip in retention among part-time students, they have begun to address this issue. They have created a position to assist first generation students in navigating college.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

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.

Evidence

SJU/CSB share a strong faculty that has many processes to exercise responsibility for the quality of their educational programs, learning environments, and support services. Regular program reviews and annual reports on improvement plans contribute to a culture of continuous improvement. Individuals across the institution are involved in setting goals, gathering data, and making improvements.

Both institutions, as well as the SOT/Sem provided evidence they have collected and analyzed retention data. They effectively use evidence to develop retention initiatives.

The team is confident the existing processes help to assure the continued quality of students' educational experiences.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

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

5.A - Core Component 5.A

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

Evidence available in Saint John's University's (SJU) Assurance Argument and financial reports; in *Strategic Directions 2020 (SD2020)*; and as verified in meetings with its board members, administrators, faculty, and staff, demonstrates that the institution has the resource base to support its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future. The institution derives significant budget flexibility and efficiencies through its partnership with the College of Saint Benedict (CSB), which involves sharing 60 percent of its total administrative and support staff and several of its administrative areas. The two institutions do not share revenue; however they have student FTE-based formulas that drive cost sharing in some areas. In addition, collaboration takes place when one of the institutions experiences a budget deficit and the other has realized a surplus. In these cases resources are deployed to address specific needs.

5.A.1.

- SJU has efficiently structured its operations by creating four self-sustaining divisions. These are the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem), the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library (HMML), and the Artist in Residence. Each unit has

separate financial statements that are consolidated into the university statements within the annual audited financial report.

- As documented in its audited financial statements, which have received unqualified opinions, SJU has had a history of effective fiscal management producing consistent budget surpluses. Over the past ten years its assets have increased by 39%, from \$247 million to \$344 million. The institution currently has a Moody's rating of A2 with a stable outlook as a result of its operating surpluses and cash flow management, reserves, and moderate debt service.
- The first-year discount rate has increased from 57.6% to 60.3% between FY14 and FY 18. The total discount rate has risen from 50.8% to 56.7% in the same period. This causes concern to the institution but careful planning has allowed this increase not to impact financial statements in a negative way, and institutional planning leads to the conclusion that the rate will stabilize in the future.
- Key to SJU's successful fiscal management and ability to support its operation is its partnership with CSB. In addition to wholly sharing the faculty, 60% of administrative and support staff are shared by both institutions. These include Admissions, Information Technology Services (ITS), Libraries, Registrar, Human Resources, and many other administrative units.
- SJU's endowment of \$180 million is considered moderate in higher education environments. However, between FY08 and FY17 it has risen by 24%. Additionally, in June 30, 2017 the University successfully completed its capital campaign, raising \$158 million, which is \$18 million above its \$140 million goal.
- SJU has sufficient facilities to support its operations and mission. These are valued at approximately \$152 million. The University manages its facilities through the *Master Plan* developed in 2009. This plan is the key planning document in the management, maintenance, and expansion of campus facilities.
- A campus tour corroborated that SJU has sufficient facilities to support its operations. The campus includes historic buildings as well as modern structures from various construction periods. Classrooms are adequate, and the newly remodeled library offers excellent study spaces. Students may also use the library, athletic facilities, and other spaces at CSB. A shuttle bus that operates every few minutes permits students to travel the six-mile distance between the two campuses.
- ITS provides a range of services to the university community. These include computer and network support, enterprise applications, web service, technical support and telephone support. ITS underwent an external review process in 2016-17. The resulting report indicated many strengths such as talented staff and the existence of a plan that aligns well with institutional planning. The report also indicated areas that required attention, but conversations with staff showed that SJU has already taken action to improve these areas, including the hiring of additional support staff.
- SJU has a strong human resource base to support its operations. As part of its strategic plan, *SD2020*, the University developed an ideal staff and faculty composition design in order to manage student-to-faculty and student-to-staff ratios. The plan is reviewed annually. Currently, SJU employs 149 faculty FTE and 328 staff FTE for a total of 477 FTE. It should be noted that instructional and other services are shared with the CSB, which can influence how these data are interpreted.

5.A.2.

- SJU does not have a superordinate body in terms of disbursing revenues.

5.A.3.

- SJU has articulated realistic strategic goals that are aligned with its mission. Its strategic plan includes goals and objectives for a multi-pronged economic model that aims to "meet and sustain high standards of excellence, value, affordability, efficiency." The model includes goals and objectives related to balancing long-run revenues and expenses; creating a faculty and resource base that is responsive to market demands and that maintains academic quality; and developing a comprehensive brand identity. The institution has a four-year forward projection process to update the plan and annual indicators of progress inform these updates.

5.A.4.

- The SJU Assurance Argument demonstrated that its staff is qualified; the annual performance review processes is designed to promote dialogue between employees and supervisors and to reflect on the employees' goals and professional aspirations. The university supports staff development through departmental funds and institutional grants managed by the Administrative Professional Development and Support Staff Development committees. The Human Resources office also provides a professional development series of trainings ranging from supervisory training to wellness.

5.A.5.

- The University aligns its budget for the College of Arts and Sciences with its long-term economic model. An annual environmental scan informs the model. All budget requests must align with the goals articulated in *SD2020*. The Board of Trustees (BOT) and the President's Cabinet monitor the budget through a series of dashboard reports throughout the year. The Business office monitors and reviews all expenditures and sends monthly reports to all budget managers and vice presidents. The University undergoes an annual audit and has consistently received unqualified opinions.
- The other divisions of the University have separate budgets based on their own planning processes.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.B - Core Component 5.B

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

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

5.B.1.

- Assurance documents and conversations with a group of board members, verified that SJU's BOT is knowledgeable about the institution and provides oversight to the institution's academic and financial policies and practices by having quarterly meetings, periodically revising the university's mission, appointing and supporting the president of the university, assessing board performance, monitoring the university's educational and public service programs, ensuring the adequate and appropriate allocation of resources, and preserving institutional independence. The Board has taken appropriate measures to avoid conflicts of interest for the two priests from the Abbey employed by the University.
- Although CSB has operated in partnership with SJU, each institution has a separate BOT, each with a committee structure that mirrors Board functions. The effectiveness of the partnership has been facilitated through some joint committees such as Academic Affairs, Enrollment and Marketing, and President's Advisory.
- Two major developments in board governance have taken place since the last accrediting cycle. The first was in 2012, when the institution incorporated itself as an independent, civil institution within the state of Minnesota and separate from St. John's Abbey. Second, in 2017 the Board revised its Bylaws and discontinued the practice of including faculty and student representation with voting rights on the Board. The latter development has led to some tensions on campus, but the majority of faculty and students agree that the resulting compromise, in which there is faculty and student representation with voting rights on board committees, and representation with voice in board meetings, has resulted in an acceptable shared governance system.
- SOT/Sem must follow additional governance standards specified in Standard 7 of the American Theological Society. To accomplish this, the Board approved in 1997 the formation of a Board

of Regents for the SOT/Sem as a subordinate to the SJU BOT, investing it with the Trustees' authority for the primary governance of the School.

5.B.2.

- Assurance arguments and evidence files showed that SJU employs policies and procedures that ensure that all stakeholders participate in the institution's governance. Given its unique relation with the CSB, SJU personnel frequently meet with their counterparts at CSB to assure consistency in shared operations and services.
- The BOT of SJU meets four times a year. The meetings focus on governance, strategy, and operational performance. Administrators, faculty leadership, and student representatives attend these meetings, make presentations, and participate in discussions.
- The administration of the institution is led by the President and his cabinet. The Cabinet is composed of the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Dean of the School of Theology, the Vice President for Advancement, the Executive Director for Public Relations, the Provost, the Vice President for Planning and Strategy, the Vice President for Admissions and Financial Aid, the Vice President for Student Development, and the Executive Director of the Museum. The Cabinet meets often throughout the year to discuss internal priorities and challenges. Additionally, the Cabinets of both institutions meet several times a year to discuss joint matters and strategic priorities. The following individuals are members of the cabinets of both institutions: the Provost, the Vice President for Admissions and Financial Aid, and the Vice President for Planning and Strategy.
- The document, *Shared Governance Pathways* confirmed participation of students and faculty in SJU governance and summarizes the faculty and student roles in the University's decision-making. The document also articulates the expectations that the President and Provost will regularly find ways to engage these groups in shared governance.
- Despite positive outcomes associated with the Bylaws change, conversations with student and faculty representatives suggest that even more opportunities for their input are needed. The team heard concerns that the student and faculty voices may not be reflected in BOT meeting agendas regularly because there is no mechanism for them to introduce agenda items or there is insufficient time to cover these issues in already packed meeting agendas. It appears that an opportunity exists to modify existing formal communication channels so that faculty and student representatives can share emerging concerns for consideration and/or placement on future BOT agendas.

5.B.3.

- Section 5.0.1 of the *Faculty Handbook* outline the role of the faculty in institutional governance: *The primary role of the faculty in governance is the implementation of the educational goals held separately and in common by the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. In this capacity the faculty is primarily responsible for curriculum planning, policy, and review, and curricular requirements including but not limited to: admissions and graduation requirements; the core curriculum; additions and deletions of majors, minors, or programs.*

- Section 5.3 of the *Faculty Handbook* describes the composition and responsibilities of the Faculty Senate, the Joint Faculty Assembly, and the Standing Committees of the Joint Faculty Assembly. These documents confirm that the faculty has had responsibility for the academic curriculum through the work of the following committees: Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee (APSAC); Academic Curriculum Committee (ACC); and Common Curriculum Committee (CCC).
- CSB/SJU faculty senate committees have worked collaboratively on academic matters with various administrative units such as the Registrar's Office, Business Office, Academic Advising, and Admissions and with the Academic Planning and Budget Committee, depending on the nature of the issues under consideration. For example the Handbook Committee makes document revisions, and input from various offices on campus is sought in making these revisions. It was also noted that the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee works collaboratively with the CFO and his staff.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

5.C.1.

- Resource allocation at SJU is guided by *SD2020*, the strategic plan of the institution. Developed in 2015, this plan consciously included links to an institutional planning process. This process is guided by an economic model, shared with CSB, designed to balance long-run revenues and expenses.
- The institution prepares an annual report describing progress towards the goals and objectives of *SD2020*. The May 2017 report illustrates how the institution resource allocation decisions have been made in support of *SD2020*.

5.C.2.

- *SD2020* is the key document linking the university's processes for assessing student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. The annual report on progress towards goals and objectives in *SD2020* provides the opportunity to tie resource allocation to assessment issues. An example is the First Year Experience (FYX), an important objective in *SD2020*. A report by the Gardner Institute led to allocating \$50,000 to the development of FYX.
- Evidence provided in Criterion 4.A.1. elaborates how departmental reviews are part of assessment processes. This process informs resource allocation and is an important informational source for the Provost to make hiring decisions.

5.C.3.

- The main evidentiary source explaining SJU planning process is *SD2020*. This process

involved all the university's stakeholders and it was the result of numerous meetings including, an all campus forum, and nine campus conversations. The plan was presented and approved by the BOT in May of 2015. The Strategic Directions Committee, which includes the senior leadership of the institution and has faculty representation, is the advisory body to the Presidents of both SJU and CSB in the execution of *SD2020*.

5.C.4.

- SJU, in partnership with CSB, utilizes an economic model that clearly indicates shifts in revenue streams and allows key decision makers, including the BOT, to make expense adjustments. Clear evidence of anticipating economic shifts is that SJU has managed to maintain budget surpluses despite some enrollment decreases and an increasing tuition discount rate.

5.C.5.

- SJU's major process for anticipating changes in technology, demographic shifts and globalization is through its annual environmental scan. Prepared by the Strategic Directions Council, this detailed report carefully analyzes how external factors can influence the university's operation. Environmental scanning reports significantly influenced the development of *SD2020*.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

5D.1

- A review of the Assurance Argument, associated documents and artifacts, and conversations with various stakeholder groups produced evidence that SJU works systematically to improve its performance. The institution has calculated financial ratios and compares these indicators to those of peer institutions. These benchmarks have driven ongoing evaluation of and responses to institutional strengths and weaknesses. SJU's net assets have been steadily increasing since 2014. Its net income ratio for the past three years has been above the minimum standard and indicates a net surplus. Its viability ratio, which measures its ability to strategically manage debt, dropped below standard in 2016 and 2017 as compared to the previous two years. However, its unfunded tuition discount has been consistently above that of its peers and currently stands above 50%.
- SJU has conducted annual financial audits, the results of which are posted along with annual financial statements on the Business Office website after approval by the BOT. The previous two audits noted no material or non-material deficiencies.
- SJU has tracked enrollment progress and financial aid disbursement in relation to Fall Semester goals using weekly reports, and has used the Fall 10th day lock-in enrollment data to assess goal attainment. SJU has used these data to determine enrollment and financial aid strategy modifications for the future.
- As part of its evaluation of *SD2020*, SJU has measured student learning, professional development, and personal development with standard metrics. The Assurance Argument included metrics and outcomes for learning new information, synthesizing information, integrating information, communication, study abroad, experiential learning, and engagement in research and/or creative projects. These learning indicators have informed program additions and modifications as described in Criterion 4B. For example, the institution is undertaking a revision of the Common Curriculum, and new learning goals were adopted in September 2017.
- The annual *CSB/SJU Institutional Profile* has summarized 45 key performance indicators related to admissions; entering and overall student demographics; retention and graduation

rates; characteristics of the curricular and co-curricular experience for students; alumni/alumnae measures of satisfaction and success; and financial performance. These performance indicators, when possible, have been benchmarked against data from other Minnesota private colleges. SJU outperforms the average among Minnesota private colleges in the following areas: application yield rate, 1st year retention rate, and 4- and 6-year completion rates.

5.D.2.

- SJU has used its documented evidence of performance available through its administrative program review to make changes in operations such as modifying its enrollment targets; revising its ITS deployment of resources to increase efficiencies and consideration of a new LMS; identifying ways to improve the Library's student communication, student usage of resources, and its website; and enhancing experiential learning, student engagement, and career services opportunities, which resulted in combining these student support areas.
- SJU has analyzed the disparity between the percentage of underrepresented groups in the student population as compared to the percentages for faculty and staff. To increase the percentage of diverse faculty and staff, the institution has added an equity advisor to all search committees and has plans to engage campus representatives in a CIC workshop on diversity.
- In meetings with various constituent groups, several examples of collecting and analyzing operational effectiveness to drive change and improvement were provided, including the Library's collection of usage patterns and perceptions of access to its website; the annual environmental scan that is used to update the strategic plan annually; the new position review process; and the use of a long-term economic model to forecast and evaluate enrollment and net revenue.
- Members of the faculty point to the annual review process and the tenure review process as indicators that SJU cultivates a culture of quality and currency in one's discipline. Staff members noted that the inclusion of professional goals in their annual review process also demonstrates that continuous improvement is embedded in the SJU culture.
- The SJU academic program review process, as documented in the evidence for Criterion 4A, has engaged the faculty in a multidimensional evaluation of the effectiveness of the curriculum in promoting student learning.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

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

Evidence

SJU, as a primarily tuition driven institution, has a history of strong fiscal management, debt management; consistent surpluses and cash flow; and success in fund raising. Its strategic plan includes goals and objectives for a multi-pronged economic model that aims to meet and sustain high standards of excellence, value, affordability, and efficiency.

SJU has the financial, human, physical, and technology resources to fulfill its mission. Its processes for hiring and providing professional development opportunities to faculty and staff members ensure that they are qualified and current in their respective fields.

SJU's bylaws, policies, and processes for planning, governance, and decision-making are robust, inclusive, and data driven. Planning processes, which are informed by an annual environmental scan, are structured so that the institution has goals that are realistic given SJU's organization, resources, and opportunities. The BOT includes input from faculty and students in its deliberations. Faculty governance committees work collaboratively with other areas on campus to ensure the quality of curricular and co-curricular experiences. Institutional processes for developing the annual budget consistently include opportunities for input from the major areas on campus.

A culture of improvement exists at SJU. The institution systematically collects and analyzes data to evaluate and document unit and overall effectiveness. These efforts are future-focused and help to prepare the institution for unforeseen challenges and emerging opportunities.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met With Concerns
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met With Concerns
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met With Concerns
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	

Review Summary

Interim Report(s) Required

Due Date

11/1/2018

Report Focus

The team recommends a monitoring report to be submitted by November 1, 2018 on the development of a new institutional mission statement with language that is crafted in such a manner as to be inclusive of the institution as a whole and to more accurately identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides. (Criterion 1.A and B)

Due Date

11/1/2018

Report Focus

The team recommends a monitoring report on the School of Theology and Seminary Master of Theology degree. It is clear the students have the requisite qualifications that have not been applied to the degree requirement. The institution must reconcile its credit hours for the Master of Theology degree with the HLC and DOE provisions or degree requirements. The team recommends the reconciliation be carried out immediately, but with the report outlining the steps for reconciliation that have been carried out being submitted no later than November 1, 2018. (HLC Assumed Practice B.1.a., Criterion 3, and Federal Compliance: Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition, Question 2).

Conclusion

With the exception of the issues that require monitoring reports, the team found Saint John's University to be a mission-driven, residential institution that strives to authentically practice the Benedictine values. Grounded in the Catholic and liberal arts tradition of respect for all, the institution emphasize diversity and intercultural and international learning experiences. Qualified faculty and staff provide numerous academic programs, support services and co-curricular activities designed to enhance students' college experience.

A strong infrastructure ensures support in the areas of technology, research, the arts, and sciences. Saint John's University operates in a way that ensures the institution's resource base supports the educational program and mission. There are structures in place that promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes. Not only does the institution operate effectively in the here and now, there is always an eye toward the future. There is a culture of systematic and integrated planning that ensures emerging factors in the world generally and higher education specifically is considered as the University charts its course into the future. Throughout all of this planning, the institution is systematically working to improve its performance.

The team is confident that the existing processes and plans help to assure the continued quality of students' educational experiences.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Met With Concerns

Sanctions Recommendation

No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation

Eligible to choose



Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

This worksheet is to be completed by a Federal Compliance reviewer or by the peer review team that conduct the on-site visit. If a Federal Compliance reviewer completes the form, the reviewer will evaluate the materials in advance of the visit and refer any issues to the team for further exploration and confirmation. The team chair will confirm that the team has reviewed the Federal Compliance reviewer's findings, make any necessary adjustments to the worksheet following the on-site visit, and submit the worksheet as part of the team's final report.

The Federal Compliance reviewer or the team should review each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and document their findings in the appropriate spaces below. Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation. Refer to the [Federal Compliance Overview](#) for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in the appropriate parts of the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the team report.

Submission Instructions

Federal Compliance reviewer: Upload this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* to the related review page in the HLC Portal.

Team chair: Send the draft of this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* to the institution's HLC staff liaison at the same time the draft team report is submitted for liaison review. Submit the final worksheet to HLC at finalreport@hlcommission.org.

Institution under review: Saint John's University

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

- Evaluation team
- Federal Compliance reviewer

To be completed by the evaluation team chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:

Name: Dale Brougher

I confirm that the evaluation team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition

(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the [Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours](#). Submit the completed worksheet with this form.
 - Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution's Appendix A if necessary). The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
 - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
 - Master's or other degrees beyond the bachelor's = At least 30 hours beyond the bachelor's degree
 - Note that 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.
 - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
 - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.
2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion Core Component 3.A and Assumed Practice A.3,A.4).

Rationale:

Saint John's University (SJU) offers four-year programs in liberal arts and sciences leading to a baccalaureate degree. The Bachelor of Science degree is awarded in nursing. All other four-year programs lead to the Bachelor of Arts degree with a range of 38 to 74 credit hours of undergraduate major study fields.

The School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem) offers the following master degree programs:

Master of Theological Studies- 48 credit hours

Master of Divinity- 78 credit hours

Master of Divinity-Priesthood Studies- 109 credit hours

Master of Arts in Ministry- 36 credit hours

Master of Arts in Liturgical Music- 42 credit hours

Master of Theology – 24-credit hours with/premised on prerequisite of completed Master of Arts in Theology or Master of Divinity. Note the monitoring paragraph below.

The SJU credit hour policy is general and reads, “Credits indicate the quantity of work. The unit of credit is termed an hour. The number of credits carried in each course is indicated after each course title in the curriculum section. One credit ordinarily represents three hours of work each week, including private study and research as well as scheduled class meetings.”

The visiting team explained United States Department of Education Regulation 34 CFR §600.2, effective July 1, 2010, and provided the institution with a sample, comprehensive Credit Hour Policy. Prior to the team’s departure, the institution provided a draft comprehensive Credit Hour Policy with a commitment to move the policy through internal approval processes for immediate implementation. The draft clearly articulates that the policies related to credit hours were in existence across the institution, but had not been previously collected into a single document.

Additional monitoring, if any:

This component is not met, and additional monitoring is required for the following reason:

SJU’s SOT/Sem offers a 24-credit hour master’s degree (Master of Theology) that is premised on students having completed a master’s degree in theology or divinity prior to admission. This degree is described variously as a post-grad or pre-doctoral degree. Although this a somewhat common practice among Schools of Theology, a 24-credit hour master’s degree is out of alignment with US Department of Education and HLC requirements for master’s degrees (minimum 30 credit hours). The SOT/Sem’s Master of Theology degree does not require 30 credit hours for completion.

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to by systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

- Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.
 - Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
 - Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning.
 - Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
 - Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion _____.

Rationale:

Academic Affairs and Student Development handle all students' complaints, separately and in concert. The Academic Dean, Assistant Dean and Dean of Students meet once per semester to review complaints that went through the formal process to identify any changes that are needed. As complaints are evaluated and resolved, this becomes an opportunity to address any unforeseen issues with policies and procedures. As an example, in AY2017 the Academic Honesty and Misconduct Policy was changed after the institution recognized issues with the policy while working through informal and formal complaint processes.

Students attending the college via distance education, regardless of their state of residence, should contact the State Portal Agent at the Minnesota Office of Higher Education if their complaint is not resolved informally with their professor or through the CSB/SJU compliant process.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies

(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.
 - Review the institution’s transfer policies.
 - Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs and how the institution publicly discloses information about those articulation agreements.
 - Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.
 - Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides to students should explain any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.). Note that the institution need not make public the entire articulation agreement, but it needs to make public to students relevant information about these agreements so that they can better plan their education.
 - Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

Two faculty committees authorize policies governing the transcription of credit for prior learning and transfer courses: Academic Curriculum Committee and Common Curriculum Committee. The transfer course evaluation policies and guidelines, as approved by the committees, are strictly adhered to in the transcript evaluation process. These policies apply

to transfer students and new first year students who earned PSEO credits while in high school. These policies also apply to reinstated students who have left CSB or SJU for a period of time and readmit with transfer credits. These policies are also applicable to students who want to take summer courses and/or transfer credits back to complete their degree requirements.

Transfer course work is evaluated for its applicability of elective credits, common curriculum requirements and, if approved, the respective department chair toward major or minor degree requirements. Grades earned for transferred coursework are not calculated into the student's cumulative GPA. For final transcript evaluation to be completed and credit applied to the student record, an official transcript must be received by the Registrar's Office directly from the college at which the courses were completed.

The Registrar's Office has been given authority by the Academic Curriculum Committee and the Common Curriculum Committee, as well as the Academic Dean, to review course descriptions of the transfer credits to be applied as elective credits or toward common curriculum requirements. The Registrar's Office follows guidelines as authorized by these committees. If the course does not meet the normal guidelines, then the student will be directed to the Academic Advising Office for further evaluation of elective credits or common curriculum requirements.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

(See FCFI Questions 11–16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students' privacy.
 - Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.
 - Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

The SJU undergraduate program has very few distance courses which include ACFN 330A: Governmental and Not-for-Profit Accounting, 339A: Financial Reporting Standards, and COLG 121: Medical Terminology.

The SOT/Sem also has several online courses that include LTGY 424: Sacrament and Worship and SPIR 414: Theology and Spirituality of Vision. After students' enrollment, the Registrar's Office assigns students a CSB/SJU email account and Banner ID. No one can participate in the course without the CSB/SJU email account and Banner ID with related password.

The institution uses an online learning management system, Canvas, to conduct exams and quizzes. Students are not able to log onto Canvas and take the quizzes and exams without using their CSB/SJU email account and password.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.
 - The team should verify that the following requirements are met:
 - **General Program Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities.
 - **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)
 - **Default Rates.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its three-year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note that for 2012 and thereafter, institutions and teams should be using the three-year

default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact the HLC staff.

- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.
 - **Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)
 - **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by state or federal regulations but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.
 - **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)
 - **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)
- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.

- Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution's compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
 - If the institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the Federal Compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
 - If issues have been raised concerning the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Components 2.A and 2.B*).
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

General Program Requirements.

SJU does not show records of Title IV Program review in the past 10 years. The US Department of Education recertified the institution on 6/10/2015. There are no limitations, suspensions, or termination actions taken by the US Department of Education related to the most recent financial audits 2016, 2015, and 2014.

- ***Financial Responsibility**

SJU has maintained a composite score within the range of 2.6 to 3.0 for the last three years: 2011-12 (2.6), 2012-13 (3.00), and 2013-14 (3.00).

- **Default Rates**

SJU's default rates have consistently fallen within the Department of Education range of acceptable standards from 0.2 (2012); 0.9 (2013); and 1.1 (2014). SJU closely monitors the default rate, which has been lower than most of its peer institutions. The average default rate for Minnesota colleges is 8.8% and the average for private colleges nationally is 7.0%.

SJU participates with private lending institutions and has a lender list, administered by a student loan processor named Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation

and Affiliates, which is responsible for updating any changes to loan programs and interests. SJU does not have loan agreements or disclosure information.

- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures**

The Office of Institutional Planning and Research is responsible for ensuring the disclosures of information are regularly compiled and published. The report is provided to all students and employees under the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy.

- **Student Right to Know**

The Office of Institutional Planning and Research is responsible for ensuring that the disclosure of information is regularly compiled and published. Information was provided and is appropriate.

- **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance**

SJU operates on a semester system, and a typical full-time undergraduate course load includes 16 credits comprised of four-credit courses. Minnesota students receiving Minnesota Grant Funds must enroll in at least 15 credits to receive the full-awarded grant amount. SJU's four-year completion rate average for the past three years is 74%.

Data reviewed on completion rates from new entering students who completed in four years is as follows:

Year	Percent Four-Year Completion
2010	72
2011	67
2012	68

- **Contractual Relationships**

SJU has no formal articulation agreements or contracts with third party, non-accredited providers of academic instruction for any degree program.

- **Consortial Relationships**

SJU does not have any consortium agreements.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Required Information for Students and the Public

(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

Information was provided and is appropriate. Required information for consumer information is available on the University home page.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

(See FCFI Questions 28–31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that the institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.
 - Review the institution’s disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC’s web address.
 - Review the institution’s disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.
 - Review the institution’s catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution’s advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.

- Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

The information was provided and is appropriate. Information is accessible on the Admissions web page at www.csbsju.edu/admission.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 32–35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.
 - Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.
 - Review the institution’s explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including student retention and completion and the loan repayment rate.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

SJU utilizes various methods of collecting data across the institution and academic programs. Those departments with state licensure requirements document and publicize success rates on licensure exams. The Nursing, Education, and Dietetics licensure programs highlight their passing rates on their appropriate webpages.

Through the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, SJU tracks retention, persistence, and graduation rates using the IPEDS methodology. This tracks entering cohorts of full-time, first-time degree seeking students, which aligns with the majority of the population, and therefore is deemed an appropriate measurement technique.

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning also tracks post-graduate achievement with an alumnae/alumni database and alumnae/alumni surveys.

SJU's *Strategic Plan 2020* has very specific goals regarding retention and completion. Specifically, SJU aims to achieve and sustain a first-second year retention rate of 90% and a four-year completion rate of 78%. The Retention Committee reviews persistence data to make improvements in registration and student outreach processes. Significant changes have been made in recent years on earlier outreach to students and parents to prepare for class registration.

For many years, SJU has conducted research on student outcomes, long before the College Scorecard appeared in fall 2015. The institution surveys seniors (CSB/SJU Senior Survey) as well as alumnae and alumni classes three years from the point of graduation.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.
 - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution's website—for instance, linked to from the institution's home page, included within the top three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.
 - Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

The Office of Institutional Planning and Research tracks retention, persistence, and graduation rates using the IPEDS methodology. This tracks entering cohorts of full-time, first-time degree-seeking students, which aligns with the majority of the student population. The public can review graduate data through a searchable database. This database can be searched institutionally or by individual program to identify progress of the graduates.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies

(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

Note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the assurance section of the team report and provide its rationale for recommending HLC status in light of this action.

- Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.
 - Verify that the institution’s standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.
 - Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution’s capacity to meet HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the HLC staff liaison immediately.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion _____.

Rationale:

SJU is registered with the Minnesota Office of Higher Education pursuant to Minnesota Statutes sections 136A.61 to 136A.71. The National Council also approves SJU for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement.

The following is a list of disciplines professionally accredited and their respective accrediting bodies:

- Chemistry, American Chemical Society;
- Dietetics, Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics
- Education, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation and Licensed by the State of Minnesota Board of Teaching;
- Music, National Association of Schools of Music
- Nursing, Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education and Licensed by the State of Minnesota Board of Nursing; and
- School of Theology and Seminary, Association of Theological Schools.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment (FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

Note: If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the appropriate section of its report in the Assurance System.

- Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution's notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.

- Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion _____.

Rationale:

Information was provided and is appropriate. An advertisement with invitation to comment was placed to SJU donors, alums, friends, current parents, students, faculty, staff, monastics, community members, community groups and the public.

The following media was also solicited for comments: alum magazine, *St. Cloud Visitor*, *St. Cloud Times*, *St. Joseph News Leader*.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement

(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution have regular and substantive interactions: the faculty and students communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc. (Also, confirm that the institution has explained the credit hour equivalencies for these programs in the credit hour sections of the Federal Compliance Filing.)
 - Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.
 - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students about the subject matter of the course.

- Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students' mastery of tasks to assure competency.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Not Applicable

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

- **Documents**

SJU Banner Student Information System-Current Catalog Inventory

SJU Crime StatsGrid-2017

SJU School of Theology and Seminary –Information Sheet

SJU Sampling Spring 2018 Syllabi

SJU Spring 2018-Class Schedule

- **Tables**

Table 18: Completion Rates New Entering Cohorts 2003-2012- Appendix N

- **Links/Websites**

Consumer Information: CSB/SJU Fact Book

Student Complaint Policy:

<http://www.csbsju-student-development>

<http://www.csbsju.edu/academic-affairs>



Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institution Under Review: Saint John's University

Review the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including all supplemental materials. Applicable sections and supplements are referenced in the corresponding sections and questions below.

Part 1. Institutional Calendar, Term Length and Type of Credit

Instructions

Review Section 1 of Appendix A. Verify that the institution has calendar and term lengths within the range of good practice in higher education.

Responses

A. Answer the Following Question

1. Are the institution's calendar and term lengths, including non-standard terms, within the range of good practice in higher education? Do they contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes No

Comments:

Saint John's University (SJU) offers four-year programs in liberal arts and sciences leading to a baccalaureate degree. The Bachelor of Science degree is awarded in nursing. All other four-year programs lead to the Bachelor of Arts degree.

The School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem) offers the following degrees: Master of Theological Studies; Master of Arts in Liturgical Music; Master of Arts in Ministry; Master of Theology; and Master of Divinity.

This noted in the 2017-2018 Academic Catalog.

B. Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's calendar and term length practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

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

Part 2. Policy and Practices on Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

Review Sections 2–4 of the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including supplemental materials as noted below. In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps. The outcomes of the team's review should be reflected in its responses below.

1. **Format of Courses and Number of Credits Awarded.** Review the *Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time for Courses* (Supplement A1 to the *Worksheet for Institutions*) completed by the institution, which provides an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats.
2. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution (see Supplements B1 and B2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, as applicable).
 - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14–16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The descriptions in the catalog should reflect courses that are appropriately rigorous and have collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
 - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
 - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode and types of academic activities.

- Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. HLC procedure also permits this approach.
3. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course (see Supplement B3 to *Worksheet for Institutions*). Pay particular attention to alternatively structured or other courses completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor that have particularly high credit hour assignments.
 4. Sampling. Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
 - For the programs sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several courses, identify the contact hours for each course, and review expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
 - At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
 - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
 - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
 5. **Direct Assessment or Competency-Based Programs.** Review the information provided by the institution regarding any direct assessment or competency-based programs that it offers, with regard to the learning objectives, policies and procedures for credit allocation, and processes for review and improvement in these programs.
 6. **Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation.** With reference to the institutional policies on the assignment of credit provided in Supplement A2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, consider the following questions:
 - Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?
 - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
 - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended

learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame allotted for the course?

- Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)
 - If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?
 - Do the number of credits taken by typical undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the number of students earning more than the typical number of credits, fall within the range of good practice in higher education?
7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:
- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and provides evidence of implementation.
 - If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or a single department, division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (a monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.
 - If the team identifies systematic noncompliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify the HLC staff immediately and work with staff members to design appropriate follow-up activities. HLC shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team

Course Program, Course Title, Credit Hours, Delivery Mode, Course Instructor

DOCT 414: Eschatology, 3 credit, Onground mode, Jacob K. Rinderknecht

DOCT 406: Christology, 3 credit, Onground mode, William J. Cahoy

DOCT 408: Ecclesiology, 3 credit, Onground mode, Kristin Colberg

DOCT 468: Hindu/Christian Devotional Traditions, 3 credit, Onground mode, Chris Conway

DOCT 406: Christology, 3 credit, Hybrid mode, William J. Cahoy

LMUS 409: Applied Composition, 3 credit, Onground mode, Brian Campbell

PTHM 414: Theology and Spirituality of Vocation, 3 credit, Online mode, Kathleen A. Calahan

PTHM/SPIR 468: Theology and Spirituality of Vocation, 3 credit, Onground mode,

Kathleen A. Calahan

SPIR 437: The Practice of Discernment in Prayer, 3 credit, Onground mode, Becky VanNess

LTGY/DOCT 424: Theology of Sacraments and Workship, 3 credit, Onground mode, Anne McGowan

LTGY/DOCT 424: Theology of Sacraments and Workship, 3 credit, Online mode, Benjamin Durham

PSYC 309: Cross Cultural Psychology, 4 credit, Onground mode, ,Amanda Macht Jantzer

SOCI 341: Urban Studies, 3 credit, Onground mode, Sheila Nelson

THEO 312: Christianity in Relation to Judaism, 4 credit, Onground mode, John Merkle

CHEM 205: Chemical Measurement Laboratory, 1 credit, Winikoff

COMM 305: Women's Voices, 3 credit, Onground mode, Emily Berg Paup

CSCI 332: Data Driven Intelligence, 3 credit, Onground mode, Imad Rahal

ECON 334: Quantitative Methods in Economics, 4 credit, Onground mode, Margaret Lewis

ECON 384: Advanced Research in Economics, 3 credit, Onground mode, Margaret Lewis

EDUC 318: Social Studies Pedagogy: K-6, 4 credit, Onground mode, Lynn Schnetter

EDUC 363: Secondary Student Teaching K-12, 16 credit, Onground mode, Del Brobst, Director

B. Answer the Following Questions

1. Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

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

Yes

No

Comments:

Credit earned for courses are independent of delivery format and centrally monitored.

b. Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

Yes No

Comments:

The policy is very explicit and delineated for each class session of the time for class instruction and homework. All reviewed syllabi specified clearly the time allocated for instruction and homework.

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

Yes No

Comments:

All require substantial clock hours to be committed, and the credit hours assigned are appropriate to the learning outcomes.

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

Yes No

Comments:

The policy equates the credit hour to the federal definition.

2. Application of Policies

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

Yes No

Comments:

In review of the syllabi for the Bachelor of Arts and the Master's programs, it was apparent that they were reflective of the policy on the awarding of academic credit.

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

Yes No

Comments:

Learning outcomes are within the norms expected in higher education for the credit hours associated with each course and program.

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

Yes No

Comments:

Courses offered via onground, hybrid and online (SOT/Sem) modes follow similar syllabi format; very detailed and comprehensive.

d. If the institution offers alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allocated, such that the allocation of credit is justified?

Yes No

Comments:

Courses offered in any mode of delivery or format follow similar syllabi and adhere to classroom and out-of-class clock hour expectations.

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

Yes No

Comments:

Assignment of credit is consistent with the credit hours established within the curriculum and published in the student bulletin and on institution's website.

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this worksheet. If the team has responded "no" to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign HLC follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

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

Yes No

Rationale:

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

D. Systematic Noncompliance in One or More Educational Programs With HLC Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

Did the team find systematic noncompliance in one or more education programs with HLC policies regarding the credit hour?

Yes No

Identify the findings:

Rationale:

Part 3. Clock Hours

Instructions

Review Section 5 of *Worksheet for Institutions*, including Supplements A3–A6. Before completing the worksheet below, answer the following question:

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours or programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

Yes No

If the answer is “Yes,” complete the “Worksheet on Clock Hours.”

Note: This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (for which an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or

quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock hour programs might include teacher education, nursing or other programs in licensed fields.

Federal regulations require that these programs follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution's overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, the accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction so long as the student's work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

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

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

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

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

Worksheet on Clock Hours

A. Answer the Following Questions

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

Yes No

Comments:

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

3. Did the team determine that the institution's credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers "No" to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

Yes No

Comments:

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

Yes No

Comments:

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

Yes No

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

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

Yes No

Rationale:

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

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE:	Saint John's University, MN
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Open Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:	Visit to Saint John's in conjunction with visit to College of Saint Benedict. Visit extended to three days. Embedded in visit is request to initiate distance delivery. Evaluation includes a Federal Compliance reviewer.
DATES OF REVIEW:	3/19/2018 - 3/21/2018

No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Private NFP

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Degrees Awarded: Bachelors, Masters, Specialist

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2008 - 2009

Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2017 - 2018

Recommended Change: 2027-2028

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

Prior Commission approval is required for substantive change as stated in Commission policy.

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Additional Location:

Prior HLC approval required.

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:

Approval for distance education is limited to courses. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Accreditation Events

Accreditation Pathway

Open Pathway

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Upcoming Events

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change:

Interim Report due 11/1/2018 on Master of Theology Credit Hour Reconciliation

Interim Report due 11/1/2018 on Mission Statement

Institutional Data

Educational Programs

Undergraduate

		Recommended Change: NO CHANGE
Certificate	0	_____
Associate Degrees	0	_____
Baccalaureate Degrees	37	_____

Graduate

Master's Degrees	4	_____
Specialist Degrees	1	_____
Doctoral Degrees	0	_____

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

None

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Additional Locations

None

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Correspondence Education

None

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Distance Delivery

None

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Contractual Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Consortial Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE
