College of Saint Benedict - MN

HLC ID 1383

OPEN PATHWAY: Reaffirmation Review   Visit Date: 3/19/2018

Dr. Mary Dana Hinton
President

Barbara Johnson
HLC Liaison

Dale Brougher
Review Team Chair

Cheryl Jacobsen
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

Institutional Context

The College of Saint Benedict (CSB) was founded by the Sisters of the Order of Saint Benedict in 1913, and provides a residential, liberal arts education preparing women to think critically, lead courageously, and advocate passionately.

In the past fifty years, CSB has worked collaboratively with Saint John's University (SJU) 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 CSB and SJU. A team of eight peer evaluators completed a visit as part of both institutions seeking continued accreditation. In addition, the team evaluated an embedded substantive change request to address the expansion of the SJU School of Theology distance learning offerings.

Although 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 CS*B/SJU* (2)
- HLC Steering Committee (17)
- Criterion #1 Open Forum CS*B (20)*
- *Criterion #1 Open Forum SJU (10)*
- *Meeting with School of Theology online students*
- Criterion #2 Open Forum CS*B (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 CS*B/SJU (Joint meeting)(24)*
- *Faculty Leadership meeting (2)*
- *Members of APBC, ACC, APSAC (7)*
- Criterion #4 Open Forum CS*B/SJU (Joint meeting)(22)*
- Institutional Research Board (3)
- Criterion #5 Open Forum CS*B (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

Evidence

1.A.1.

- The College of Saint Benedict (CSB) has a clearly stated mission that articulates its Catholic and Benedictine identity and focus on serving women. Furthermore, it defines the institution as a residential, liberal arts oriented provider of higher education.

- The mission statement was approved by the Board of Trustees (BOT) on 2015 with the involvement of faculty, staff, and administration. Members of the BOT confirmed that they had approved the mission statement and use it to guide their work. Several members of the Board also commented that the mission statement is part of their nameplate for all Board meetings.

1.A.2

- The programs offered by CSB are consistent extensions of the mission and vision statement. The institution offers the baccalaureate degree to women in a residential campus setting influenced by Benedictine values. No online programs or accelerated program are offered with the intention that students will benefit from the liberal arts program and student life experience. Although the majority of the programs are within the arts and sciences, all other programs share a liberal arts and liberal learning basis.

- Partnering with Saint John's University (SJU), CSB offers 35 academic majors and 41 minors with 69% of all degrees conferred being in the arts and science disciplines.

- The residential character of the mission is evident in 91% of the students living on campus

while the remaining students live in the nearby neighborhood. Furthermore, based on Fall 2017 enrollment statistics, 99% of the students were under the age of 23.

- The academic program is undergirded by extensive student support services that include Counseling and Health Services, Career Services, Intercultural and International Student Services, Campus Ministry, Intercollegiate Athletics and Student Activities. Many interviews with students, staff, and faculty included comments on the passionate effort to ensure that the Benedictine values are integrated and experienced by the entire student body and campus community.

1.A.3.

- The BOT is highly engaged in carrying out the mission of the institution and self-evaluates their commitment to the mission. The 2017 board assessment results indicate that 92% of the Trustees rate the mission as a good or excellent driving force in their decision-making. Trustees within a meeting of the CSB BOT, spoke often of the Board's commitment to the mission and the vision statements.

- The strategic planning documents, such as the *Strategic Directions 2020 (SD2020),* focus on the mission and use it as a major source of decisions. Statements such as, "Since their founding, the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University have framed our residential, liberal arts education with powerful values rooted in a centuries-old Catholic and Benedictine tradition" (*SD 2020*), indicate a strong commitment to the mission and decision documents. Furthermore, faculty, staff, monastic leadership, and administration all continually referred to the strategic plan and often-referenced key components of the plan that they were involved in implementing.

- A review of the *Economic Model* reveals a strong commitment to the identity and mission of the College. The assumptions that are stated at the beginning of this financial plan confirm the focus on the mission and the use of it in planning for the future.

- The budget and the financial status of CSB will be covered in more detail in Criterion V.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

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

Evidence

1.B.1.

- The mission is communicated consistently in CSB print and digital materials. The mission documents are available for the public and College community on the CSB website. The institution's handbooks and catalog also convey the nature of the mission. In each place in which the mission was cited, there was intentional explanation of the mission. A review of the advertising and admissions material shows that a consistent message is being provided. During the visit to campus, the team found the mission statement and the key values of the institution displayed in most buildings.

- A review of the handbooks, catalog, and website provided evidence that the College has developed specific explanations of how it has and intends to implement the mission in the future. In each publication, the Benedictine and Catholic women's college identity is consistently communicated.

1.B.2.

- The revised mission and related documents, along with the strategic plan, *SD 2020*, were approved by the BOT in May 2015. The institution reviews and updates its planning documents on an annual basis with refinement of the 17 outcome metrics of the plan when necessary.

- Interviews of faculty and staff provided strong evidence that all components of the campus have been involved in the formation of *SD 2020*. A large wall display signed by faculty, staff and students revealed that many persons from across the campus community participated in the strategic planning process.

1.B.3.

- CSB was clear and intentional regarding the type of education it provides and to whom. CSB provides well-documented descriptions of its identity as a residential Benedictine and Catholic college of higher education. Furthermore, a review of the admissions publications revealed a consistent vision. Interviews with faculty, staff and students confirmed this intentional focus on a residential, Catholic, liberal arts based, Benedictine education. CSB has no intent to offer any other programs than those that fit this model.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

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.

- CSB is engaged in providing a multicultural campus. The President has provided leadership in focusing the College on multicultural and human diversity. The formation of the *Inclusion Eco-System* along with the statements in the plan provides evidence of the commitment to diversity. The faculty at CSB is much more diverse than it was ten years ago; however, the hiring of diverse staff and faculty has not kept pace with the diversity of the student body.

- The academic and student life experience at CSB includes diversity training and programming. The Common Curriculum has an intercultural learning requirement of a course focused on developing the understanding of and appreciation for diversity. Beyond the classroom, the College has hosted *Inclusion Vision Days* in the past two years. These experiences have been led by the Intercultural Direction Council (IDC) and continue to be held each semester. Members of the IDC indicated that this was a part of the campus-planned activities to increase inclusion on campus.

- Both CSB and SJU are working together on the issue of diversity and inclusion. An IDC, developed in 2005, involves faculty and staff in the formation of diversity and inclusion objectives. The purpose of this group is to help the institutions move toward more just and inclusive communities. Currently, the council does not include student representation.

- Students indicated that diversity and inclusion were important issues for them during interviews and in the student survey.

- Increased diversity is a strategic goal held by both institutions. The strategic planning document, *SD2020*, includes two imperatives that include diversity related goals and benchmarks. Three of the embedded goals are: (1) development and implementation of a professional development program that will enhance diversity and intercultural literacy; (2) formation of a first year experience that will address the needs of underrepresented students; 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, which support the initiatives on inclusive pedagogy and community

building. Furthermore, as part of the professional development, the institutions will send a team of faculty and administrators to the *Council of Independent Colleges, Diversity, Civility, and the Liberal Arts Institute* in summer 2018. The goal of this program is to formulate plans to strengthen inclusion, diversity, and civility on campus.

- CSB and SJU 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 from the admissions process through their first year at CSB. In addition, CSB and SJU hosts 3 "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 from admission to graduation.

- The College provides academic and student development programs that are focused on multicultural understanding and inclusion. Evidence of these programs includes the Intercultural Leadership, Education and Development Program, the annual Festival of Cultures, Advocates for Inclusive Mentoring, and Reflection Action Dialogue.

- CSB has experienced significant growth in the number of undergraduate students of color. Since 2010 the number of students of color has doubled with the percent of the student body increasing from 8 to 17%. However, CSB continues to be challenged in its effort to attract faculty and staff of color. Although the student population represents 17% persons of color, as of 2016, only 9.4% of the faculty and 3.2% of the staff were non-white. To address this challenge CSB and SJU 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 institution, local community, and world. Their voice was evident in the *HLC Student Survey* as well as 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 CSB and SJU are oriented toward impacting the world through the lives of their students. The CSB vision statement declares that they "provide a liberal arts education preparing women to think critically, lead courageously and advocate passionately."

- As an educational institution within Benedictine monasticism and Catholic Social Teaching, the institutional policies, academic and student development experience, all provide strong examples of the strong focus on making a difference in the world.

- The Office of Experience Professional Development (XPD) provides options for student engagement in experiential learning opportunities at an intersection of their liberal education, career aspirations, and service opportunities. Several of the programs offered through the XPD serve as examples of the programs offered, such as the Bonner Leader Program, the Marie and Robert Jackson Fellows Program, the CSB Community Kitchen Program, and the Service-Learning Program. These programs provide opportunities to provide basic needs of nutrition and education, community engagement, and service-learning that tie what is taught in a classroom to service experiences. In the CSB/SJU *2016 Senior Survey*, approximately 81% of CSB seniors reported having participated in a community service or volunteer activity as a part of the campus community.

1.D.2.

- CSB has developed an extensive partnership with SJU 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 relationship that is mutually beneficial.

- It was clear to the team that CSB 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 CSB 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

- The involvement of the Sisters of the Order of Saint Benedict and more generally, the Catholic Church, is evident on campus. Evidence of this influence is found in almost every aspect of the campus. Although the Sisters of the Order of Saint Benedict have representation on the Board of Trustees and reserve some decision making authority, they do not dominate the institutional decision making process.

- As stated in the Assurance Argument, "The College actively engages the local community, regularly meeting with St. Joseph community leaders and serving as members of the St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce, the Greater St. Cloud Development Corporation, and the Central Minnesota Community Foundation."

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

CSB has a very clear understanding of its identity. Its mission and vision documents identify it as a residential, Catholic, liberal arts institution, steeped in the Benedictine tradition and values. This identity was espoused by everyone on the campus with passion for the institution. CSB has partnered with Saint John's University (SJU), and the two entities share administrative, faculty, curriculum, and other resources in support of its mission.

The institution understands its challenges with the area of diversity. Although it 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 as well as the student experience. CSB has taken steps to enhance the coverage of diversity and inclusive values. With the student body increasingly becoming more diversity in various ways, CSB needs to increase its steps toward a more diverse faculty and staff.

The team recommends that students be included in the IDC. 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.

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

- The College of Saint Benedict (CSB) has a history of clean financial audits, balanced budgets, fidelity to their long-term economic plan, and effective regular communication between the CSB and SJU 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 College.

- Faculty members 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.

- Conversations with members of the Board of Trustees (BOT) confirmed that 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, CSB's BOT is autonomous and delegates the management and administration of the institution to CSB's administration, including the President as Chief Executive Officer, and academic matters to the faculty. In interviews with the President, faculty, and administration as well as members of the BOT, 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 BOT meeting.

- CSB maintains independence, but is also integrated with Saint John's University (SJU) 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 representatives as voting trustees from the BOTs of each institution, and upon the advice of an external consultant, commissioned by both CSB and SJU, who identified the risks related to having faculty and student 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, and as a response to, the removal of voting members, students and faculty were given representation with voice rights on the BOT, and voting privileges on some board committees. 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.

- Faculty and administrative handbooks reinforce the mission and Benedictine tradition of CSB 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 CSB. 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 CSB, and that hiring processes support both mission and competence.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

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

- CSB presents a comprehensive communication strategy for sharing critical information with its constituents. The shared website with SJU includes clear information about tuition and financial aid via the Net Price Calculator. The Catholic and Benedictine identities of CSB and SJU are clearly communicated on the website and the college documents including the college catalog. An accessible, intuitive explanation of the Coordinate Relationship between both institutions is also available on the website.

- Six professional accreditations in addition to 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. 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. Faculty contact information is available through the department pages.

- The CSB website articulates its clear mission, which is to provide women a liberal arts education in the Catholic and Benedictine traditions with a focus on fostering leadership and wisdom for a lifetime.

- 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 BOT's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution. Committee structures provide appropriate mechanisms to address the critical areas for evaluating and planning at the institution. The committee structure is sufficient to manage the business of the College, including holding regular meetings, setting agendas, and aligning meeting times with coordinate committee meetings.

2.C.2.

- The BOT reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations. The BOT includes student and faculty trustee representatives who may voice their views on critical issues at board meetings. Students and faculty are given voting privileges at selected committee meetings. The CSB Board's deliberations and standing committee work reflect the strategic priorities of the institution and respond to appropriate concerns.

2.C.3.

- The BOT 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.

- CSB is organized as a corporation and is sponsored by the Sisters of the Order of Saint Benedict. The Order of Saint Benedict officers serve as Corporate Members of the Board as outlined by the Bylaws and are responsible for appointing voting members of the BOT; approving any merger, acquisition, or dissolution of the Corporation; approving the sale or

encumbrance of all or substantially all of the assets of the Corporation; amending the *Articles of Incorporation*; or making and amending the *Bylaws of the Corporation*. In conversation with Trustees, it is apparent that the Sisters of the Order of Saint Benedict are active members of the institution and that the BOT understands its role in approving and appointing all voting members of the board.

- The Board carries out its responsibilities with a clear understanding of the institution's mission and uses the mission as a compass by which to guide decision-making. Onsite review confirmed that all CSB trustees had completed Conflict of Interest forms earlier in the current academic year. The forms are adequate, though short.

2.C.4.

- The BOT delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.
- The Bylaws clearly outline that the president serves as the college's chief executive officer. The president and her cabinet are responsible for the administration and well being of the College. The structures organized within CSB and onsite interviews clearly document the leadership and management of the president of the institution and her cabinet.

- Moreover, robust faculty governance and oversight of the curriculum clearly demonstrate responsibility for the curriculum and related academic matters. Significant faculty participation in these structures is further evidence of the shared nature of their responsibility for academic programs.

- CSB is organized as a corporation and is sponsored by the Sisters of the Order of Saint Benedict. The Order of Saint Benedict officers serve as Corporate Members of the BOT as outlined by the Bylaws and are responsible for appointing voting members to the BOT; approving any merger, acquisition, or dissolution of the Corporation; approving the sale or encumbrance of all or substantially all of the assets of the Corporation; amending the *Articles of Incorporation*; or making and amending the *Bylaws of the Corporation*. From conversation with Trustees, it is apparent that the Sisters of the Order of Saint Benedict are active members of the institution and that the Trustees understand their role in approving and appointing all voting members of the BOT.

- The BOT of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.
- The Coordinate Relationship with SJU 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, and Informational Technology Services 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.

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

- CSB/SJU's statements 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* that was 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 Forum provided unanimous and enthusiastic support of the statement that the institution supported academic freedom.

- 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 its 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 within the CSB community is supported and actively encouraged as was affirmed through multiple conversations on campus with faculty and students who hold non-Catholic beliefs. And, a deep care is held by CSB to attend to issues of race, class, and gender through curricular and current diversity and inclusion initiatives.

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.

- CSB 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 they were able to clearly articulate that they learned about ethical practices from syllabi and through the mentorship of their faculty. Students could also point directly to the appropriate policies within the *Bennie Book* student handbook. 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 *Academic Catalog* and on the web. 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 can easily access the misconduct form on the web to report instances of academic misconduct. Faculty and students were aware that

this process has been used, and felt it is used effectively by the institution with real consequences as a result of enforcing the policy.

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

CSB acts 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, the 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.

Because of the strong commitment to shared governance at the institution and the demonstrated maturity of CSB's students, we 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 Boards of Trustees. Doing so will help preserve the strong sense of community so valued by CSB/SJU students, faculty, and staff.

We also recommend that CSB consider updating their Conflict of Interest form to resemble that of SJU to better document any potential conflicts of interest. This is not because of any concern on the team's part that there are unknown or unreported conflicts, but instead to revise their practices to be consistent with best practices.

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

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 that 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 the College of Saint Benedict (CSB) and Saint John's University (SJU) perform favorably with regard to analysis, problem solving, and writing mechanics compared to a national sample of college graduates.

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 via 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.

3.A.3.

- The institutions' program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations. As primarily residential institutions, CSB/SJU limit undergraduate alternative delivery formats to study abroad programs. 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.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

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 CSB/SJU 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 academic year, 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 approved revisions throughout the years, approved with the most recent revisions approved in 2015. The faculty continue to evaluate and develop the broader 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 including a yearlong first-year seminar that is writing intensive; includes common intellectual experiences, such a first-year seminar, ethics, diversity, and global learning, and field-based experiential learning. The Common Curriculum also includes Capstone courses and projects distinct to each major. Findings from the *2016 Senior Survey* reveal that 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.

- CSB/SJU'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.

- Study abroad programs further emphasize intercultural learning. The *Open Doors Report of the Institute of International Education* ranks the CSB/SJU 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 enables 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. "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, SOT/Sem faculty must 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.

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 revealed that all faculty were 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 includes 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 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.

- CSB/SJU 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 the award of tenure. The institutions report 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 is 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 Support Staff, and Saint John's University Staff Support. Typically there are 22-28 applicants and funding for 16-20 of these 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 CSB/SJU have access to a wide range of support services including:

- Academic Advising, which supports students in understanding academic policies and 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 provide 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, experiential learning;

Experiential and Professional Development, which provides opportunities and empowers students to explore, do, reflect and connect through self-exploration, research, and experience-based programs; and Center for Global Education, which coordinates 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 CSB and SJU perceive the quality of interactions and level of support significantly higher than students at peer institutions according to the *2016 National Survey of Student Engagement.*

3.D.3.

- The institutions see advising as a strength. As indicated by 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 needed.

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 campuses (Nursing Simulation Lab, Ardoff Science Center, Peter Engel/New Science Center, Bailey Herbarium, and the Arboretum) ensure students at 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, which are comprised of 165,000 square feet of library space, with seating for 972 individuals within study rooms and open areas, research space, collaborative rooms and classrooms. The Learning Commons within the Library houses ITS 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, and Pellegrene Auditorium) provide rehearsal and performance space for students and community events.

- Saint John's University 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.

- CSB/SJU Library faculty and staff provide guidance to students in research and the effective use of information resources. Library staff, all of whom hold an ALA-accredited degree in Library and Information Studies, are well qualified.

- 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.

- CSB and SJU 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"; seventy-seven 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 that students attribute their educational experience to helping them understand and be engaged in social, civic, and political issues. *The 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

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

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.

- College of Saint Benedict (CSB) and Saint John's University (SJU) 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 available in the evidence files, and the team noted that these reviews included an external reviewer and a 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.

- CSB and SJU exercise authority over all credit that each transcripts. Three committees, Academic Curriculum Committee (ACC), Common Curriculum Committee (CCC), and Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee (APSAC) oversee credit policies, while the 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 the catalog. There are policies regarding internships and independent projects.

4.A.4.

- The CSB/SJU 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 that there is a rigorous process through which the curriculum is reviewed, revised, and planned. Evidence included a document that defines expectations for rigor. CSB/SJU does not offer dual credit for high school students.

- Departments maintain authority over the qualifications of the faculty. The *Faculty Handbook* clearly defines faculty rank and tenure and promotion processes. Interviews with the Academic Dean indicated candidate vitae are reviewed to match faculty expertise 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 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 available to bilingual and international students. Student services personnel are diverse.

4.A.5.

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

4.A.6.

- Success of graduates is evaluated using a *First Destination Survey* given at graduation and Alumni Surveys given three years after graduation. The *First Destination Surve*y 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 response 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.

- CSB and SJU have curricular and co-curricular learning goals. The Assurance Argument and accompanying documents provide evidence of a recent self-study process with the John Gardner First Year Experience program to develop first-year learning goals. Common Curriculum Learning Goals are regularly revised. The Student Development Departments of both schools have written unified learning goals with the help of a consultant.

4.B.2.

- Evidence available to the visiting team 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 assess 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.

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 expectations, which are the product of assessment results. 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.

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 a *Procedure for Programmatic Assessment of Student Success* that includes an Action Plan, Curriculum Map, and Report on the Action Plan. Evidence suggests these processes have improved over time and include a wide range of stakeholders. Recently, a Teagle grant supported faculty and staff training on assessment. In sum, CSB/SJU 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.

- *Strategic Directions 2020 (SD2020)* identifies clear retention and completion goals. CSB and SJU have a realistic first-to-second year retention goal of 90 percent and a realistic four-year completion goal of 75 percent. Currently the rates are 87 and 68 percent, respectively.

4.C.2. and 4.

- Both institutions provide evidence they have collected and analyzed retention data. The IPEDS collection method is used to report retention. They have also collected demographic data on the characteristics of students who persist versus those who leave.

4.C.3.

- As a result of their data analyses, CSB and SJU have developed retention initiatives. They are addressing retention goals through an improved First Year Experience and better communication with students. For example, upon seeing a dip in retention among part-time students, they began to address this issue. They have also 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

CSB and SJU share a strong faculty that has many processes to ensure 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 schools provided evidence that they have collected and analyzed retention data. They effectively use evidence to develop retention initiatives.

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

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 the College of Saint Benedict's (CSB) 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 Saint John's University (SJU), 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.

- As documented in its audited financial statements, CSB has had a history of effective fiscal management that has produced consistent budget surpluses. Its net assets have grown from $114 million to $174 million since 2012. The institution currently has a Moody's Baa1 rating with a stable outlook as a result of consistent operating surpluses and cash flow, moderate

reserves, and manageable debt service. The College has maintained a composite financial index of 3.0 since 2012, which is further evidence of its strong financial stewardship.

- The institution has supported its operations and programs with three sources of revenue. Seventy–five percent of its annual budget has been supported by net tuition and fees; 11 percent of institutional support has come from the endowment and annual fund; and auxiliary operations have provided an additional 11 percent.

- The first-year discount rate has risen from 52.4% to 60% and the total discount rate has risen from 48.8% to 56.8% between FY12 and FY18. CSB has been able to achieve a net revenue surplus in spite of these increasing rates. The *SD2020* plan projects that the rates will stabilize over the next several years at the current levels. CSB's goal is to raise sufficient endowment funds to increase funded financial aid and decrease unfunded aid. Its next capital campaign will include a focus on endowment.

- New bond debt structuring in 2016 allowed the institution to fund deferred maintenance without increasing annual debt service and to maintain a favorable bond rating. In addition, historic debt restructuring in 2017 allowed CSB to reduce its annual debt service.

- CSB's fund-raising efforts have helped to solidify its financial position. During the past eight years, its endowment has nearly doubled, rising from $37.3 million to $72.1 million in FY17. However, annual gifts have decreased somewhat, and the percentage of alumni who give is below the levels seen in peer liberal arts institutions and aspirational peer institutions. A new $100 million capital campaign has reached two-thirds of its goal to date during the silent phase. This campaign included three featured objectives each of which is linked to CSB's strategic plan: $25 million for facilities projects, $60 million for endowment, and $15 million for annual fund. The institution uses a 12-quarter constant growth method to determine annual endowment payout, which must fall within the range of 4-6%.

- CSB has sufficient physical facilities to support its institutional objectives. It developed a facilities master plan, *Five-Year Repair and Replacement Lookahead* in 2006-07 and has completed most of the projects in that plan which include a new athletics field; new space for administrative services and four academic departments; renovation of facilities for Nursing that includes state of the art labs; and student housing improvements. The institution has plans to complete additional classroom improvements and facility adaptation.

- A campus tour corroborated that CSB has sufficient facilities to support its mission. The institution has well-maintained classrooms, library, and cafeterias. Additionally, CSB has a theater, orchestra space, and a variety of other spaces for students to participate in curricular and extracurricular activities. Students may also use the library, athletic facilities, and other spaces at SJU. A shuttle bus that operates every few minutes permits students to go the six-mile distance between the two campuses. Most classrooms included up to date technology and seating, but some are still equipped with blackboards and tablet style chairs as a seating arrangement.

- CSB's total budget allocations for technology (Instruction Technology and Media) have been stable, ranging from 4.4% in 2014 to 5.7% in 2016 of the annual budget. CSB and SJU share technology services, which creates efficiencies and opportunities for shared price leveraging. The current joint funding stands at $4.9 million in comparison to the EDUCAUSE median for private colleges of $3.8 million and the CSB/SJU peer group of $3.3 million.

- The Information Technology Services (ITS) department 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 indicated that the institution has already taken action to improve these areas, including the hiring of additional support staff.

- CSB has had a human resource base to ensure effective delivery of its academic programs and student support services and to manage its operations effectively. The institution's strategic plan called for right sizing its faculty/student and staff/student ratios using a faculty-staff composition design process that is aligned with its mission and takes into consideration financial constraints. First implemented in 2014, the design plan is updated annually. The current FY plan includes 149 faculty FTE, 145 administrative FTE and 143 staff FTE. Overall employee ratios have been relatively stable since 2010, albeit with some area fluctuations: FTE reductions occurred in the areas of academic affairs (-5.2%) and finance/administration (-6.7%), while increases occurred in the areas of marketing and communications (+2.9%) and student development (+7.1%).

5.A.2.

- CSB is authorized by the State of Minnesota as a 501c (3) organization and, thus, does not disburse revenue to a superordinate entity, such as a corporate investor or other organization.

5.A.3.

- CSB 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, and efficiency." The model includes goals and objectives related to balancing long-run revenues and expenses; creating a faculty and staff resource base that is responsive to market demands and that maintains academic quality; and developing a comprehensive brand identity. The institution has used a four-year forward projection process to update the plan, and annual indicators of progress (*Strategic Plan 2020 Developmental Outcome Metrics 2017)* inform these updates.

5.A.4.

- As documented in Criterion 3.C.6, CSB has had processes in place to ensure that it hires qualified staff members.

- Several administrative areas have set strategic goals for employee training and professional development. Institutional grants and departmental funds have been available to support employee development, and the Human Resources Office offers a series of lifelong learning events on topics within three tracks: Communication, Health/Wellness, and Financial.

- A Human Resources Inclusion Advisory Committee was formed in 2017, and the committee has developed an action plan that includes professional development related to diversity and inclusion.

5.A.5.

- CSB has had a process for developing a budget to support annual operational needs and to fund long-term strategic objectives. This process is aligned with its economic model and has been informed by an annual environmental scan. The annual budget is modeled on projected actual enrollment minus 26 students.   Any net revenue surplus is used to sustain a Stabilization Reserve. This reserve fund is used in lieu of drawing on a line of credit to cover unexpected expenses or revenue shortfalls. In most years, a surplus has been generated and the Stabilization Reserve has grown.

- The institution monitors key financial indicators at least annually and in some cases, quarterly. The Business Office prepares monthly budget reports for department heads and their respective vice presidents that provide budgeted-to-YTD-actual expenses. This allows personnel to make budget adjustments both within units and across units. CSB provided the document, *E & G Budgets to Actual by Department Including Revenue and Transfers FY 2018 as of 3/8/18* to demonstrate its budget modification activities.

- CSB provided an example of its process for budget adjustment -- net revenue for FY 2018 was approximately $16,700 below expectations, and this resulted in a lower net surplus of approximately $229,000.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

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 various constituent groups provided evidence that CSB's leadership and decision-making structures promote effective leadership and collaboration across multiple constituencies to fulfill the institution's mission. Article VI of the *College of Saint Benedict Bylaws* outlines the legal and fiduciary responsibilities of the Board of Trustees (BOT) and the relationship between the Board and other governance entities at the institution.

- 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.

- The CSB Board has reviewed itself regularly and has participated in discussions and board development events that help its members to remain knowledgeable about current trends in higher education and how these trends impact the institution.

- The team observed that board members are highly engaged, well informed about trends in higher education, and active participants in strategic planning. For example, BOT members with whom the team met were fluent in their knowledge of cyber security risks and challenges, in the relationship between retention and investment in student academic support, and financial aid.

- Conversations with members of the BOT confirmed that Trustees provide oversight of CSB functions in a manner consistent with the institution's Bylaws. They are passionate supporters of each individual institution as well as the CSB/SJU joint operations. Board members point to several aspects of their work that help to make the joint effort successful: the individual board

chairs meet regularly outside of scheduled BOT meetings; some Board operations are facilitated through joint committees; board members value and depend upon the insights and perspectives offered by students and faculty; and positive relationships exist among board members.

5.B.2.

- The team found evidence in documents and in conversations with CSB constituent groups that the institution is committed to shared governance and has a committee structure, policies, and procedures to engage the campus community in decision making. These shared governance structures and policies provide for internal collaboration across CSB stakeholders as well as collaboration with their SJU counterparts, as appropriate.

- As described in the Assurance Argument and noted in Criterion 2.C.2, in 2016, CSB sought the advice of an external consultant who reviewed the Bylaws and made recommendations for revising portions of the Bylaws to be more aligned with best practices in governance. As a result of this effort, the BOT decided to eliminate members of the faculty and students from serving as voting members of the Board. This decision was based on a desire to avoid actual, apparent, or perceived conflicts of interest that faculty members and students might have in carrying out the fiduciary responsibilities expected of board members. In taking this action, CSB preserved its commitment to shared governance by continuing the practices of faculty and students serving as voting members of five BOT committees (Academic Affairs; Student Development; Resource Development; Building & Grounds; and Enrollment and Marketing) and of faculty and student representatives attending BOT meetings. In addition the Finance Committee roster includes one faculty member who serves in a non-voting capacity.

- Board members acknowledged and appreciated that the change in voting rights would not be well received. However, it was noted that new governance pathways emerged as a result of the change. More so than in the past, there now exists an expectation that opportunities for student and faculty input outside of board meetings (as well as in BOT committee meetings) will be needed, which demonstrates the BOT's commitment to including the perspectives of students and faculty in its deliberations.

- Examples of board deliberations and decisions that were influenced by faculty and/or student input include promotion and tenure decisions, branding of athletics, and exploration of student housing options.

- The document, *Shared Governance Pathways* confirmed participation of students and faculty in CSB governance and summarizes the faculty and student roles in university 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 students and faculty 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.

- The CSB President's Cabinet meetings have included faculty staff and students when issues of

mutual interest arise, but there is not a standing invitation for faculty participation. An example of cross-institutional collaboration is the joint Strategic Directions Council. In addition, the Provost, Vice president for Admissions and Financial Aid and the Vice President for Planning and Strategy serve both institutions.

- Several times a year, CSB and SJU cabinet members and senior leadership from the Faculty and Student Senates of both institutions meet in Coordinated Cabinet sessions. An example of faculty input to this body is the set of recommendations that emerged from the Quality Initiative on Gender Identity Development.

5.B.3.

- Article 1.4.1 of the *CSB Bylaws* and 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 and 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 her staff.

- According to the Assurance Argument and confirmed on the team visit, the Saint Ben's Senate, which represents the students' voice at CSB, has met regularly and has offered opinions and feedback regarding polices, has promoted students' rights, and has concerned itself with academic, social and cultural activities that serve the best interests of the students. Student representatives have also served as voting members of various committees of the BOT.

- CSB has formed an Administrative Assembly and a Support Staff Assembly to ensure that these two stakeholder groups have a role in shared governance. The *Administrative Staff and Support Staff Handbook* defines the mission, functions, membership, subcommittee structure, and meeting expectations for these two bodies, and each Assembly has a steering committee.

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.

- The *Strategic Directions 2020 (SD2020)* document, which was developed in 2015, included a goal for a sustainable future that outlines the economic model that documented CSB's plan to align its resources with its mission and priorities. The institution's mission and priorities were outlined in the *Base Financial Assumptions* of the model, and its *Narrative of Financial Levers* described potential economic influences affecting the institution. Together, these documents provide a long-range context for budgeting; both are reviewed and revised annually.

- CSB prepares an annual report that summarizes progress on the *SD2020* goals and objectives, which enables the institution to maintain its practice of aligning budgeting with institutional goals. The most recent summary included metrics related to endowment growth, increases in debt capacity, capital projects growth, and net revenue growth.

- The May 2017 summary of *SD2020* outcomes described the success achieved in new mission/priority driven initiatives, and included the acquisition and construction of new academic facilities, a new faculty development program, and new blended learning experiences.

5.C.2.

- Several examples provided evidence that CSB links its assessment of student learning processes, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. Using data collected by the John Gardner Institute, CSB invested $50,000 to develop a comprehensive First Year Experience (FYX). In addition, department program reviews have been used to inform annual resource allocations, including funds for faculty positions. ITS developed a plan to infuse instruction with more technology. CSB shares a budget analyst with SJU who reports to the Provost and

the Chief Financial Officer, which helps to ensure that student learning is reflected in budget priorities.

5.C.3.

- The Assurance Argument, associated documents, and conversations with campus groups confirmed that the CSB *SD2020* planning process engaged a wide range of stakeholders and included input from faculty, staff, students, alumni, administrators, the BOT, members of the monastic community, and local business and community leaders. Ideas and feedback were solicited in face-to-face gatherings and through other communication channels. The institution used a website to post a summary of the contributions of these groups and to provide regular progress updates on the plan's development. These updates included an environmental scan.

5.C.4.

- The *SD2020* plan included short- and long-range elements that demonstrate that CSB has a sound understanding of its current and future capacity and that it anticipates potential impacts of fluctuations in revenue. In its *Narrative of Financial Levers,* the institution projected the impact on net revenue of enrollment and retention gains/losses. These projections are updated annually and considered in light of historic data on peer institution enrollment and retention. In addition, the institution has tracked net price of attendance and financial aid data (including discount rate) to model potential changes in net revenue.

- CSB has projected the impact of increases in gifts to the annual fund and endowment income on operating funds and the impact of increases in salaries, benefits, and the student-faculty ratio on overall budget savings or deficits.

- CSB revises its long-range budget planning annually with a *Budget Revision Plan* that provides a road map for future budgeting based on annual surpluses or shortfalls. The revision plan has outlined priorities for spending holds, compensation adjustments, use of/repayment to the Stabilization Reserves, and other strategies to right-size expenses as needed.

5.C.5.

- The CSB Strategic Directions Council prepared an extensive environmental scan to guide the *SD2020* planning process that was framed using four key challenges to higher education: affordability, accessibility, accountability and sustainability. These challenges guided campus conversations within CSB and its collaboration with SJU about shared identity, common resources, and independent and joint directions in four areas: Success of Women/Success of Men; 21st Century Liberal Arts Experience; Values, Community, and the Common Good; and Financial Sustainability.

- CSB's environmental scan and its 2016 revision demonstrated that the institution is future-focused. For example, the institution examined historical and projected shifts in national and regional high school graduation rates, college enrollment and retention rates, and the relative demand for private versus public higher education (as well as traditional liberal arts education) as context for its strategic enrollment planning and plans for competitive advantage. CSB also examined historical and anticipated shifts in the student profile and geographic footprint of matriculates to anticipate addressing the needs of an increasingly ethnically, economically, and culturally diverse student body. In addition, the scan considered how to balance anticipated family income, net price of attendance, the increasing importance of financial aid in students'

college choice, and its dependence on tuition as the primary source of revenue.

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

5.D.1.

- A review of the Assurance Argument, associated documents and artifacts, and conversations with various stakeholder groups produced evidence that CSB 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 institutional strengths and weaknesses. CSB's net assets have been steadily increasing since 2012. Its primary reserve ratio has been well above the minimum standard, but has been somewhat below that of institutions with comparable sized endowments. 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, recent debt restructuring should result in a turnaround in the next calculation. CSB's unfunded tuition discount has been consistently above that of its peers and currently stands at 50%. Taken collectively, the financial ratios that contribute to the Composite Financial Index have resulted in a consistent 3.0 value since 2012, which signifies overall sound fiscal management.

- CSB 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.

- CSB tracks 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. With the assistance of Applied Policy Research, CSB has used these data to determine enrollment and financial aid strategy modifications for the future. CSB application yield rates have consistently exceeded the average yield rate of Minnesota private colleges.

- As part of its evaluation of *SD2020,* CSB 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. 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* summarizes 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. CSB 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.

- CSB 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; selecting 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.

- CSB 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 the campus through participation by representatives in CIC workshop on Diversity, Civility, and the Liberal Arts.

- In meetings with various constituent groups, several examples of collecting and analyzing operational effectiveness data 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 CSB 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 CSB culture.

- The CSB 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

CSB, 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." As noted in November 2017, CSB operations have been recognized by *U.S. News and World Report,* which named CSB "No. 1 among national liberal arts colleges for operating efficiency, according to an analysis."

CSB 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.

CSB'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 CSB'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 CSB. 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
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
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
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

Conclusion

The team found the College of Saint Benedict 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 emphasizes 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. The College of Saint Benedict 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 are considered as the college 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

Sanctions Recommendation
No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation
Eligible to choose

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

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: College of St. Benedict

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

☐ Evaluation team

☒ Federal Compliance reviewer

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 1

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

Name:

☐ 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:

       o Associate's degrees = 60 hours

       o Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours

       o 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 (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

College of St. Benedict (CSB) offers instruction in a traditional 16-week semester system and in a 12 week summer session. Both B.A. and B.S. degrees require 124 credit hours.

No differentiated tuition by program exists at CSB.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 2

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 (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Policies and procedures for addressing student complaints are published in the college catalog with links from additional websites such as undergraduate program handbooks and the graduate handbook.

Staff from Academic Affairs and Student Development collaborate to address complaints, review the formal complaints, and recommend changes to policy or process.

The log of formal complaints is maintained in the Provost's office. For the one-year period, November 2016-November 2017, five formal complaints were resolved.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 3

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 (insert appropriate reference).

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 4

Rationale:

CSB has robust and readily available transfer policies accessed through the Registrar's, admissions and academic program webpages and college catalog. The standard transfer policy requires transfer credit to be from a regionally accredited institution and a grade of C or better. The institution also considers and evaluates course-level equivalencies; program applicability; readmission requests; and PSEO, AP, IB, CLEP, and summer work requests in making decisions about awarding transfer credit. The process is overseen by a committee, while the Registrar has authority for preliminary evaluations of transfer credit requests.

No formal articulation agreements are in place at CSB, but the institution publishes transfer guidelines for 23 MNSCU (Minnesota Community and Technical Colleges) institutions.

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 (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

There are limited distance programs at CSB. Students are assigned an ID, email access, and related passwords. Live sessions for online courses are initiated through email links with

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 5

special passwords, as is access for exams and grades on the Canvas system. Canvas requires unique usernames and passwords.

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.)

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 6

- o **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.

- o **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.)

- o **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.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 7

☐ 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:

There have been no negative reviews or findings from DOE related to CSB's Title IV programs for the previous 10 years. The program was recertified in 2012.

Audits for 2016, 2015, and 2014 reported no negative findings or material weaknesses. The institution's CFI has been 3.0 for the 3 years of reporting (2011/12-2013/14). Default rates for recent 3-year periods range from a high of 1.0 to a more recent low of .4. The institution is well below the average default rates of comparison/peer groups, which include both national private institutions and Minnesota private colleges.

Information related to security such as annual reports and crime logs, and to completion rates include aggregated and disaggregated data for gender, race, and financial aid status, and are available on the CSB Consumer Information link.

Undergraduate and graduate Satisfactory Academic Progress policies are available in the catalog, program handbooks, and on various websites. Student attendance policies are outlined in the catalog, and specific requirements appear in course syllabi. An appeal process exists for both undergraduate and graduate students.

There are no contractual or consortial relationships in place at CSB, other than the relationship with St John's University.

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.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 8

☐ 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:

Program information, fees, cost of attendance, policies, and other appropriate information is available on the CSB websites, the catalog, and the handbooks. The Consumer Information site and links to admissions/financial aid, and registrar pages include information and policies on academic policies, cost of attendance, net price calculator, security, student development, student rights and responsibilities, and parent rights to information.

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.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 9

☐ 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:

CSB's accreditation status with the Higher Learning Commission is provided on its homepage with additional information on the Academic affairs links to assessment and accreditation. Similar information appears in the college catalog. Specialized accreditations include American Chemical Society, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation and Licensed by the State of Minnesota Board of Teaching, Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education and Licensed by the State of Minnesota Board of Nursing, Association of Theological Schools.

Information related to state licensure programs for education, nursing, and nutrition, and professional accreditations in chemistry and music appear on Fact Book, Consumer Information, Academic and student programs, Registrar, Admissions, and other appropriate sites and in the college catalog.

Admissions examples of the Raft U email flow introduce CSB's mission, focus, and preliminary information related to application, financial aid, and relevant opportunities and topics.

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.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 10

☐ 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:

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) is responsible for the review of student outcomes. In addition to IPEDS reporting and tracking of entering cohorts, IRP outcome information, expectations, and market performance appear on the institutional web Fact Book and Consumer Information sites. CSB also maintains alumni data and survey data. Outcome data has informed institutional goals, such as the goals to increase retention and 4-year completion rates in the 2020 Strategic Plan.

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 (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

CSB notes that the College Scorecard information is often outdated; consequently, the institution collects and publishes current data on graduation, retention, senior and alumni

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 11

surveys, and Retention Committee recommendations.   The Fact Book and Consumer Information web sites provide timely information. A Sharepoint site for institutional research also provides access to survey information.

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 (insert appropriate reference).

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 12

Specialized accreditations include American Chemical Society, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation and Licensed by the State of Minnesota Board of Teaching, Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education and Licensed by the State of Minnesota Board of Nursing, Association of Theological Schools.

Information related to state licensure programs for education, nursing, and nutrition, and professional accreditations in chemistry and music appear on Fact Book, Consumer Information, Academic and Student Programs, Registrar, Admissions, and other appropriate sites and in the college catalog.

CSB Programs in nursing, education, and dietetics are licensed by the State of Minnesota, and all have undergone successful formal reviews between 2012-2017.

In addition to professional disciplinary associations, CSB also has membership in SARA. These are identified in the catalog and other relevant sites.

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 (insert appropriate reference).

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 13

Invitations to comment appeared in alumni publications; local newspapers; the CSB website; and emails to current students, faculty, staff, parents, and community groups. No public comments were received.

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   .

Not applicable

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 14

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

Federal Compliance submission and all appendices

Criterion 3, 4, and 5 and links

CSB websites: homepage, all top banner links, program information websites, consumer information links

CollegeScorecard.gov

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2018 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: legalaffairs@hlcommission.org
Page 15

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

Institution Under Review: College of St. Benedict

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:

CSB offers instruction in standard 16-week semesters and one, 12-week summer session. Graduation requirements are for 124 credit hours, with the final 40 credit hours in advanced course work.

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

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 1

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.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 2

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

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 3

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

ACFN 111, 310; ART 118, 248, 344;   ASCS 106, 115; BIO 202, 317; CHEM 305; ECON 111, 308; ENGL 223; ENVR 150, 250, 310; ESSS 202, 306; MUSCGBUS 201, 300;   HONR 240, 351; ISCI 151;   MUSC various lessons and ensembles; NUTR 110, 303; PCST 111, 346; PSYC 330; THEA 117, 240, 380; THEO 111, 221, 381

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

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 4

Comments:

The CSB 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 comprehensive sample 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 have existed for credit hours across the institution, but had not been collected and integrated into a single document.

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 team reviewed a sample of syllabi for CSB courses. This sample included those with variable credit, 2 credits, and the predominate 4 credits. The team observed consistency, but not standardization, of information related to course expectations: identification of objectives, goals, accreditation standards, aims and/or "official college-approved goals," and academic integrity (also academic misconduct, plagiarism policy, academic honesty/dishonesty), as well as identification of texts and Canvas resources.

However, most, but not all, syllabi identified the course meeting times and included a course calendar of activities and assignments. Most, but not all, syllabi did not identify the course credits, perhaps because the 4-credit course is the predominate offering. Very few syllabi included an explicit narrative section related to out-of-class preparation or activities that justified the credit assignment. Course calendars and the typical injunction that students should "come to class prepared" provide implicit evidence of the expectations beyond the course contact hours.

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

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 5

Comments:

NA

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:

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:

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:

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:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 6

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:

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:

See 1b above.

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:

The CSB credit-hour policy and assignment/award of credit hours is consistent across the institution and was reflected in course descriptions, learning outcomes, and calendar of class and out-of-class requirements.

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

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 7

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:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 9

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

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE:	College of Saint Benedict, MN
TYPE OF REVIEW*:*	Open Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:	Visit to College of St. Benedict in conjunction with visit to Saint John's University. Visit length extended to three days. A Federal Compliance Reviewer is required.
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

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 HLC approval is required for substantive change as stated in HLC policy.
Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

Additional Location:
Prior HLC approval required.
Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

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: NO CHANGE

Institutional Data

Educational Programs		**Recommended Change: NO CHANGE**
Undergraduate		
Certificate	0	_____
Associate Degrees	0	_____
Baccalaureate Degrees	37	_____
Graduate		
Master's Degrees	0	_____
Specialist Degrees	0	_____
Doctoral Degrees	0	_____

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

None

Recommended Change: NO CHANGE

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

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