March 1, 2024

Gonzaga University

Mid-Cycle Evaluation Report

Presented to the Northwest

Commission on Colleges and Universities

Contents

Part 1: Mission Fulfillment

At Gonzaga University, every interaction with our students, staff, and the broader community is deeply imbued with our mission. This shared purpose reflects Gonzaga's distinctive identity, rooted in our Jesuit, Catholic, and humanistic traditions. Our Mission Statement and Statement of Affirmation are living testaments that guide our commitment to developing the whole person (1.A.1). This commitment manifests in the cultivation of intellectual, spiritual, cultural, physical, and emotional growth in our students, preparing them for lives of leadership and service for the common good.

Accompanying our 2021 EIE reviewer's report, we received the following recommendation in relation to mission fulfillment (Recommendation 1): "The Evaluation Team recommends that Gonzaga University clearly define and measure mission fulfillment in order to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions. (1.B.2)." This recommendation will be addressed in this part (Part 1) and the other recommendations are treated in Parts 2 and 3 respectively. A summary of progress on each one is also given in the Part 5.

To address Recommendation 1, we are utilizing our Strategic Plan as evidence for defining, measuring, and assessing mission fulfillment (1.B.2). Gonzaga's 2023 Strategic Plan is a revision of the 2015 Plan, which was also the result of inclusive, coordinated institutional planning and action. In service to the current context of our institution and the region, our Strategic Plan engages the programs and activities Gonzaga considers to be of greatest service to the common good. Each of the twelve Actions directly tie to fulfilling our mission and aligning with our Catholic, Jesuit, and humanistic heritage. It is for this reason that we are living out our Strategic Plan, with its commitments, goals, actions and metrics, as evidence of mission fulfillment for Gonzaga University.

Inclusive Process

Our Strategic Planning process invited broad collaboration across the campus, allowing time for discernment and iteration on initial ideas, and developing concrete metrics for success (see p. 32 of the Strategic Plan for the list of metrics which serve as indicators). With the arrival of our new Provost, Dr. Sacha Kopp, during the autumn of 2022, the Gonzaga community joined together in response to a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to solicit ideas from faculty and staff in the form of Grand Challenge themes for the next decade (1.B.3). The community was invited and encouraged to take part in this process as we reviewed our current goals and formulated aspirations for the years ahead (1.B.1).

Our Strategic Plan ideation and feedback process ultimately led to keeping our four original Commitments (Shared Mission, Academic Excellence, Integrative Jesuit Education, and Stewardship and Sustainability). Together, we wrote new Goals, Actions, and Metrics (1.B.2) that show how this work takes shape, impacts the lives of our

students and community, and connects directly back to our Mission, Vision, and our set of [Baccalaureate Learning Goals](). Integral to this planning process is Gonzaga's commitment to [Inclusive Excellence](), which weaves through and connects to each unit. We look for iterative, multi-angle communication strategies to involve as many people as possible. Multidisciplinary initiatives such as the Humanities Institute and the Center for Ignatian Dialogue and Discernment drive colleagues across campus together in pursuit of our shared mission. In this second year (2023-2024), now that the plan is written and we are moving into a phase of implementation, we have re-issued the invitation to "call in" new colleagues and participants through a series of [Town Hall]() events (1.B.3). The community project of developing the Strategic Plan included designing and building a Proposal, Review, Feedback, and Resourcing process that directly ties our mission and purpose as an institution to our concrete actions.

Metrics and Measures

The new Strategic Plan has three important elements that will focus our attention on mission fulfillment: 1) goals within the four Commitment areas that concretely describe particular aspects of fulfilling our mission; 2) twelve actions that will enable concrete progress on these goals, and 3) 40 metrics (indicators) connected to the goals and actions that will ensure we hold ourselves accountable for progress, approved by our Board of Trustees (July 13, 2023), see our [Goals-Actions-Metrics]() mapping. We are building a dashboard of the metrics that includes names of colleagues assigned to carry out and track the initiatives, so that progress can be regularly shown on each point of focus (1.B.4). These metrics are our indicators of success used to evaluate year-over-year performance relative to our commitments and goals. We use these metrics to: monitor growth and progress of programs; evaluate the impact of the Actions in our Strategic Plan; inform resource allocation within the College/Schools; and demonstrate accountability to and fulfillment of our mission.

Resources

Mission fulfillment requires careful stewardship of our resources with responsible planning and allocation. Each "Grand Challenge" proposal, leading up to the final formation of the twelve Strategic Plan Actions, included a Business Plan with a budget showing available funds, personnel, and enhancements needed for our current infrastructure to deliver on the Actions. It is the work of this academic year (2023-24) and the coming summer to continue to budget carefully and secure new revenue from all available sources ([new degree offerings](), benefaction, and strategic partnerships such as those made possible through the successful [Phase 1 CHIPS Act "Tech Hub"]() designation) to ensure the fulfillment of our mission through these strategic Actions (1.B.3).

This responsible stewardship is evident in the ways we engage with our students, support our employees, and connect with the community, making the Gonzaga experience truly transformative and aligned with our core values and mission. For the faculty and administrators to deliver on these commitments and priorities, and to do so within the unavoidable realities of limited resources, we are obligated to an ongoing and systemic review of existing resources (such as our current budget refinement process) to be carefully managed and redeployed, as appropriate. In approaching this work, our goal is to be thoughtful and intentional about how such refinements are made, with a view towards giving our community the time and space to identify refinements that do not introduce detrimental impacts to our student experience. We have also funded commitments informed by the Strategic Plan Actions (examples include the Bollier Center, University of Washington Health Partnership, our plans for the Institute of Informatics & Applied Technology, paired with expanded customer relationship technologies [see Part 2 of this report], student housing, expanding access and affordability) all intended to stabilize and grow our diversified revenue sources. We are also investing in programs with greater potential to generate additional net revenues, both graduate and undergraduate programs, many of which connect directly to the fulfillment of our mission. Examples include the B.S. degrees in Neuroscience, Biomedical Engineering, and Data Science, a B.A. degree in Public Health, and Masters-level offerings in Cybersecurity, Engineering Management, and Data Science, all of which were approved by our Board of Trustees and the NWCCU in the summer of 2023.

External Measures of Mission Fulfillment

Two external measures of mission fulfillment are important to highlight because they engage our community in meaningful self-assessment: the Carnegie Classification and the Mission Priority Examen process. Both are mentioned multiple times in the previous and the revised strategic plan, and encapsulate key markers of mission fulfillment. The university's receipt of the prestigious Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in January 2015 offers a recognition of Gonzaga's commitment to service. Secondly, Gonzaga will seek recertification as a Jesuit institution and demonstrate how our mission aligns with the Catholic order of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) during the 2025-26 academic year. The Mission Priority Examen (MPE) process is how the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (along with the Society of Jesus) affirms the sponsorship of Jesuit institutions of Higher Learning in the United States. Prior to the MPE site visit in Fall 2025, Gonzaga will complete and submit a self-study report which is the culmination of an institution-wide examen. The guiding document for this reflection is the AJCU's Characteristics of Jesuit Higher Education. This process will touch all parts of the university and ask us to pose deep questions about how we are living up to our own mission and where growth and development is still needed. We anticipate this to be a meaningful process for our community, leading to the confirmation of our sponsorship.

Conclusion

President McCulloh's message about the Strategic Plan clearly articulates why and how our Strategic Planning work, in concert with our entire Gonzaga community, is an expression of Mission Fulfillment for Gonzaga University:

> "Father General Sosa's 2018 speech, 'The University as a Source of a Reconciled Life,' underscored that universities, as Jesuit apostolic works, are obligated to call students into greater, fulfilling relationships, into vocations that will lead social transformation in the world, and into a deeper relationship with their Creator. It is my hope that Gonzaga's updated Strategic Plan continues to acknowledge this responsibility and successfully points the way for our students, the many communities we serve, and the Earth we inhabit." (Thayne McCulloh, President's Message About the Strategic Plan)

Part 2: Student Achievement

In the time that has passed since Gonzaga's Year 7 EIE process in 2021, we have dedicated ourselves to "closing the loop" in connecting students to the resources and services best placed to enable them to succeed, based on their individual circumstances. Our progress on Recommendation 3, namely to "expand access to disaggregated student achievement data to inform and implement strategies and to allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity (1.D.4)" has been a priority for us. Gonzaga is fortunately resourced with data expertise in our office of Institutional Research. We have deepened the reach of this information for our constituents and the students we serve by the adoption of new LMS and CRM technology.

Gonzaga University, at all levels of study, **recruits and admits students with the potential to succeed** in our academic programs. Gonzaga takes a holistic approach to admission by carefully reviewing academic measures, student involvement, and character. Thus, high school or college grades, course rigor, optional test scores, essays, and extra-curricular activities play an important role in the admission process. Formal documentation on Admission Requirements and expectations is provided to prospective students and our full Course Catalogs are readily available (1.D.1).

One of the major ways we are expanding access to disaggregated data is with technology innovations such as those provided by our LMS, Canvas, and our CRM functions provided by Slate in our Admissions offices and the Student Success Hub by Salesforce in our student-facing services. Because our student achievement metrics on a macro level are consistently positive (retention rates at Gonzaga hover between 91-94%), when we identify the small number of individuals who are not persisting at Gonzaga, we pay close attention to individual student experiences and reach out to colleagues who can provide a holistic picture of the student's curricular and co-curricular experiences. Moving forward, the CRM can transform identifying students who may be more likely to leave as

a proactive project as opposed to a retroactive one. In an era of changing demographics and differently prepared, post-pandemic students, and Gonzaga's choice to significantly increase the number of recruited international students, we are working to prevent problems before they start by enabling efficiencies in academic, psychosocial (or socioemotional), and financial support activities for our students. The Center for Cura Personalis (CCP) takes this ethos of holistic care seriously, aiming to help every student feel cared for, supported, and valued. While technology is only as good as the collaborations and relationships behind it, CRM functions are allowing us to harness our data formerly siloed in different offices to facilitate coordinated action in Supporting Students. For example, with the CRM we are expanding our student of concern form to pull in teams from across campus to collaborate on cases. These efforts meet Gonzaga's goals of improving student success, communicating more effectively with our student population and each other, and growing our ability to retain and graduate students.

Measures of Student Achievement

We have developed data visualization reports that are shared both internally (with deans, department leaders, and the Center for Student Academic Success) and externally, such as on our Accreditation Metrics site and via IPEDS. This helps us to meet standard 1.D.4 that our "methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent." Since many of the disaggregated categories are not available for peer institutions (see Table 1 below for **how we compare against what we consider peer institutions on key markers**), Gonzaga University has developed a robust data architecture that allows for trend analyses so we can compare our own current and past performance over time, and also to peers (1.D.3). At Gonzaga, we use persistence/retention, completion, and postgraduation success to define and indicate baselines of student achievement. As a mission-driven institution, we also collect and utilize data about student wellbeing and measures of psychosocial development as measured by curricular and co-curricular learning outcomes assessment, surveys, formative conversations, and advising. For the standard indicators which provide useful snapshots of typical areas of achievement, we use the following metrics: 1. retention rates; 2. graduation rates; and 3. post-graduation outcomes, respectively (1.D.2). Each of these measures is disaggregated by meaningful categories that promote student achievement as well as allow us to close any systemic equity gaps. We use the following categorized variables: race/ethnicity (underrepresented minority status), gender, first-generation status, age, and socioeconomic status (1.D.2). For example, an example of our efforts to close gaps, BRIDGE is being expanded from a first year only program to a four-year program focusing on building relationships and mentoring in diverse Gonzaga environments. Please see below for our work on closing gaps for International Students.

Since graduation rates are reported publicly through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), we have developed a tool that allows us to monitor our graduation rates and benchmark them against peer institutions (1.D.3). Gonzaga

University maintains the following categories of peers in order to be flexible in providing a relevant comparison group:

Table 1: Gonzaga University Peer Group Categories

Peer Grouping	Description
Undergraduate Cross-Application Institutions	Ten (10) Institutions which rank highest in admitting the same undergraduate student as Gonzaga University. This list is monitored annually.
Private Not-for-profit Undergraduate Cross-Application Institutions	Ten (10) private not-for-profit institutions which rank highest in having the same undergraduate student applying for admission.
Statistical Comparison List	Fifteen (15) institutions identified based on classification analysis using Nearest Neighbor (KNN) approach. IPEDS Data limiting to the following factors: Enrollment, Employee FTE (faculty and staff), Pell Recipients, Race/Ethnicity, Distance education, Graduation Rate, Tuition, Core Expenses (Budget), and Endowment.
~90% Graduation Rate	Fourteen (14) Private-not-for-profit institutions whose graduation rate has averaged around 90% for at least 5 years. This is a list highlighting characteristics of institutions consistently achieving Gonzaga University's Strategic Plan graduation rate goal of 90%.
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU)	Twenty-seven (27) institutions that are a part of the AJCU. These institutions foster Jesuit, Catholic identity and mission.

On our Facts and Figures site, we provide a report that shows how we are performing compared to selected peers. Our retention rate for reporting year 2022, for example, placed us at 93%, one percentage point behind the UW Seattle Campus at 94% 0. Internally, we show that the graduation rate of under-represented minorities (URM) is 87% and for white students is 90%. Although this equity gap has been persistent over time, it is evident that the graduation rates of underrepresented minorities have risen from 62% in 2010 to 87% in 2022. During the same time period, the graduation rates for white students have increased from 81% to 90%. Thus, the rate of increase in graduation rates for underrepresented minorities has been faster than for white students (see Figure 7 in the appendix).

Student Achievement at Gonzaga Means Holistic Care for Our Students

Retention rates at Gonzaga are very high (typically 91-94%) so we are looking at small numbers when we analyze those students who are not retained. We use disaggregated data to trigger an investigation and get to individual stories quickly. As an example of this process, (addressing our standing Recommendation 3, standard 1.D.4), we complete a retention analysis of all undergraduate students that involves disaggregating and sharing student achievement data, and we do this for spring to fall and fall to spring periods of time (see appendix). Students who do not register for courses for the following semester are sent a Qualtrics survey, and our Advising office consults with faculty advisors, who reach out to their advisees at the invitation of their dean. This provides for a holistic system of care for our students needing outreach at what might be a turning point in their personal and educational lives. Support takes the form most appropriate for that student: class selection, hold removal, financial aid counseling, etc. Our community is one of high-touch and high support. This information is given to exemplify how "indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity" (1.D.4).

An example of how our rich mine of data is utilized to directly serve students is our **Academic Probation Warning** that is sent to students who fall below 2.0 at midterm. The day following the deadline for faculty to submit midterm grades, Academic Advisors in the Center for Student Academic Success (CSAS) run the Midterm Probation report in Banner (see Figure 1 in the appendix). This report is shared with academic advisors and used by their teams to determine student success outcomes for students. The notices to students, sent electronically through a ZRM Campaign in our current system on Anthology (transitioning to Salesforce), serve as an intervention to students struggling at the midpoint of the fall and spring semesters and provide each student with a list of available resources they may wish to employ to improve their standing before the completion of the term. We find that this triage of care is most effective when the adults they trust can provide direct encouragement. **To this end, the student's advisor is not the only one who receives the communication, but a copy is also sent to applicable offices such as Athletics, International Student Services, Gonzaga Global, the Office of Tribal Relations, as appropriate.** Our Salesforce Student Success Hub will enable communication between offices to be more seamless, including working with the student via Refer (student of concern) cases. In extreme cases, where midterm grades are at or below a 1.0, academic advisors create a new Refer case (auto-generated by the ZRM) and do additional outreach to these students.

Gonzaga University also uses its data resources to disaggregate results from surveys, for example, the **Resident Annual Survey**. Statistical significance tests allow Housing and Residence Life to identify gaps in service or learning outcomes of particular demographic subpopulations, enabling a shift in departmental practice to close said gaps. The data from one year can also be compared to data for multiple years, as the survey has been administered since 2016, and our PowerBI tools allow us to see longitudinal data

comparisons. The results showed that students from underrepresented populations reported lower levels of feeling welcomed in the residential space. This population of students also reported lower levels of engagement with their Resident Assistants (RAs). Once we had identified this gap, we were able to shift our relational and programmatic outreach to students by focusing the RAs' efforts on belonging related programming and relationship building. We recently began the data collection for this year's (2023-24) Resident Survey. We will be able to see impacts, if any, of our changes to programming which will give us the ability to refocus RA attention on vulnerable groups of students.

We are currently building a "Second-Year Village" residence hall and student services to highlight the resident experience of our students. The village will include additional community spaces (indoor and outdoor) that can accommodate courses, study, learning and social activities, and student success support services. Our goal is to align new housing design (as well as renovation) with goals we have for integrative learning.

Student Financial Services is a key partner in ensuring that our students are set up to succeed at Gonzaga. We have found that a key socioeconomic indicator used as a meaningful disaggregating factor is Pell Grant eligibility status. For example, Gonzaga recently made the decision to sunset the Act Six leadership and scholarship program intended to recruit and retain students from diverse backgrounds. The historical data had suggested students had high financial need, but the Pell-eligible population was smaller than expected. This was one of several factors considered as we launched the Unity Scholars program, a cohort model that provides coordinated benefits throughout a student's journey through their undergraduate career at Gonzaga, including grant and scholarship aid for four years, pre-orientation, and customized support in searching for a paid internship/job/research opportunity on campus. Unity Scholars builds on the Act Six legacy by providing additional funding to students for housing and meals, an increase in the number of recipients from eight to as many as 20 students, expanded support throughout the students' degrees, and a much-simplified application process. The Gonzaga Access Pledge is for Pell-eligible Washington residents.

One aspect of targeted support we are offering with this type of data that directly serves students is our **embedded tutoring program**. While offering open door tutoring opportunities is an important factor, meeting students in the classroom helps **lower barriers to access support**. For the Spring 2024 semester embedded tutors have been placed in the Accounting, Chemistry, Engineering, and Human Physiology courses of most need. Messaging is sent to all sections of these listed courses to encourage collaborative group sessions. For Learning Studio-based tutoring, hiring is focused on adequately staffing tutors for these fundamental courses in the semesters they are offered based on course enrollment information and past tutoring appointment data. Opportunities for group tutoring and learning strategies programming are targeted to these courses at critical times during the semester such as initial weeks of the course, leading up to important exams, and finals. Results for AY 2022-23 are in the Annual Report for Learning Strategies.

Transfer, Veteran, Returning Adults, and First Generation: The overall UG population is 1% 25-years-old and older; however, students 25 and up represent 3% of continuing students who had not enrolled during their registration window for Fall 2023. The Transfer, Veteran, and Returning Adult Student (TVRAS) office supports these student populations with multiple academic and social initiatives (see Figure 6 in the appendix). Our data dashboards allow us to disaggregate retention and graduation rates in order to determine if there are any equity gaps when compared with non-TVRAS students. (We use a time-to-degree report to study transfer students' completion rates, see Figure 6a in the appendix.) We set up our Student Success Hub to indicate to the student's assigned advisor if the student is a minor (17-years old or younger). Additional support (such as a follow-up from the student's assigned advisor) will be offered to students that fall within these age ranges. While each of these factors can be considered independently, we are monitoring this trend and will disaggregate further to see if these populations share other attributes (major, gender, etc.) to look for trends. This will allow us to provide additional support to specific populations of students who share multiple commonalities.

Student Achievement Target: International Student Success

Gonzaga also tracks and measures indicators relevant to our contexts as the needs of our students emerge and change. This year we investigated the academic achievement of a group we identified as needing additional support: international students (defined as "Non-US Residents"). Retention rates for international students tended to be lower than for the general population, except in 2019. The first-to-second year retention rate for international students in 2022 was 90%, while the general non-international student population was 94% (see Figure 8 in the appendix).

Connection to resource allocation: Gonzaga has invested in the future of our international student success with major resource commitments to our English Language Center (ELC). This includes the hiring of three full-time instructional staff and the Center's director, Dr. Nicholas David, all of whom have deep expertise and the ability to provide year-round student support. Team members in the ELC, International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS), English Writing Center, MATESOL, Gonzaga Global, English Department, and Learning Strategies are combining energy and efforts to support multilingual international students at Gonzaga through the Gonzaga Model for Comprehensive International Student Success. As another example of how we are using disaggregated data, one survey was sent to faculty of matriculated graduate students, another to matriculated undergraduate students, and a third to students coming to us through the Pathways program from Gonzaga Global, our partnership with Shorelight. From the survey results, we observed that while international students are doing well overall in classes, **faculty shared concerns falling into five categories: concern for student language readiness; content knowledge; writing; academic skills; and mental health. Faculty shared concerns about their own readiness for a newer population of students.**

Our actions taken are as follows:

- Appointment of a new Associate Provost for Global Engagement who coordinates several offices related to international recruitment and student support (ELC, ISSS, Study Abroad), collaborates with international recruitment teams, and is advised by the International Education Council.
- Appointment of a new Global Engagement Faculty Fellow, Dr. John Eliason, to help the Associate Provost for Global Engagement address international student academic concerns expressed by faculty and staff.
- Creation of the International Student Academic Advisory Board (ISAAB), chaired by Dr. Eliason, reporting to the International Education Council to create a strategic, sustainable plan to continue to build a strong international student support network. Membership includes CSAS, ELC, ISSS, MATESOL, the Office of a Pedagogy of Hope, faculty, and the Writing Center.
- Creation of a [Resource](#) page to refer faculty to as the strategic plan is being developed. The page includes the identified trends along with:
  - Gonzaga Strategic Language Plan, created by Dr. Nicholas David – ELC Director, to help guide the strategic plan.
  - Model for Comprehensive International Student Success, created by Ashley Davis – ISSS Director, to help guide the strategic plan.
- Creation of a vanity email: intlstudentsuccess@gonzaga.edu listed on the website for faculty to share their concerns.
- Creation of a "Student Referral List" shared with the ELC, ISSS, and Gonzaga Global teams. Noting: student name, ID, education level, Gonzaga Global or not, faculty referred by, date, nature of the concern, action take, by whom, resources student is referred to, if the faculty member is looped in on the action taken. In general, taking an "intrusive advising" approach with students that faculty are concerned about. Here are two examples of that in action:

  Example 1: Pathway student faculty member concerned that the student "is not comprehending important parts of a paper in a writing-enriched course". A team member reached out to the student, made an appointment, and listed "Met with student. Talked about tutoring options".

  Example 2: Undergraduate student faculty member concerned that the student is "missing assignments, poor attendance, struggles with depression and insomnia, working with members of the GU counseling office". A team member emailed the student when there was no response called an RA to get in contact with the student. After meeting with the student, talked about how to make plans with professors to pass classes. It was determined that it did not seem to be an academic concern, rather a mental health concern – faculty member was not looped in.

Plans for the future:

1. More data is needed to continue to develop strategies to address the nature of the concerns. Repeat sending out the survey within the first 2-3 weeks of classes.
2. Work with ISAAB to explore Academic Coaching topics that would reflect international student needs.
3. Survey/focus group with international students in Pathways and Undergraduate programs on what their needs are.
4. Continue to work with CTA on creating faculty workshops regarding teaching and advising international students – common trends, background, etc.
5. Explore whether units on campus would like additional support/training regarding international student academic success.
6. Work with Institutional Research to set up an efficient academic warning system in Canvas to help advisers help international students sooner than midterm grade time (this has already been set up for Athletics and we are configuring it).
7. Create a more streamlined, timely and transparent referral process with the help of the Salesforce student success system.

Post-graduation Outcomes

Post-graduation student success and achievement (1.D.2) is tracked through the First Destination Survey (see Figure 9 in the appendix).

Gonzaga University, through the Office of Career and Professional Development (CPD), prepares and administers annually the First Destination Survey Report using the guidelines developed by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). The Outcomes Success Rate for students earning degrees between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022 is 95.7%. Data were collected on 959 of the 1,221 graduates in the class of 2021-2022 resulting in a Knowledge Rate of 78.5%. NACE suggests a baseline 65% knowledge rate.

Pre-pandemic First Destination Survey Outcomes Success Rates for undergraduate and graduate students revealed positive, steady growth with small increases each year. The class of 2020 absorbed the full impact of the global pandemic which was reflected in one of the lowest Outcomes Success Rates Gonzaga University has experienced to date, falling to 89.0%. In 2021, the overall Outcomes Success Rate bounced back, experienced a full recovery, and boasted the highest Outcomes Success Rate we have experienced since collecting and reporting this data in accordance with the NACE guidelines, 96.2%. The overall Outcomes Success Rate for 2022 (95.7%) is a .5% decrease from the previous year, showing that there has been some downward trend due to the international economy and a dip during the pandemic, but remaining in the 94.3% average range over the past seven years is strong.

The Office of Career and Professional Development reviews the outcomes success rates for the college and schools and academic majors by degree level. In 2016, the outcomes success rate for the School of Engineering & Applied Science (SEAS) was significantly

lower than the outcomes success rate for the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the other professional schools at Gonzaga so the decision was made to assign a CPD staff member to SEAS to serve as their primary Career Development Facilitator (CDF) which would include implementing specific career development strategies for these students. The outcomes success rate for these students has improved significantly over the years with the class of 2022 reporting a 97.4% outcomes success rate. The CDF model of service has proven to be effective, and it has been replicated in the CAS and schools.

Conclusion

We are making progress on our Recommendation 2 about the collection and use of disaggregated student achievement data. Alongside our targeted support strategies like the Academic Probation Warning system and intentional changes to our programming to serve international students, we are proud of our culture of proactive effort to fostering an enriching, inclusive educational environment. This steadfast focus on student success aligns seamlessly with our institutional mission, demonstrating our ongoing dedication to nurturing each student's potential in a holistic and impactful manner. We look forward to amplifying these efforts with the adoption of our new CRM and Student Success Hub this year.

Part 3: Programmatic Assessment

To meet the guidelines for this section, we have included an overview of our processes across the institution, followed by two representative examples of assessment units: 1) the First Year Seminar; and 2) the Communication and Leadership Studies M.A. program.

In fulfillment of its mission, Gonzaga strives to be "an exemplary learning community that educates students for lives of leadership and service for the common good," a statement which underlies our academic programs and co-curricular work. Our Provost model, which includes Enrollment Management, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Faculty Affairs under one umbrella, means that we endeavor to serve the growth of our students holistically, that is, the growth of mind, body, and spirit. This Provost model also means that our institutional effectiveness assessment can be coordinated within areas under the Provost, enabling cross-functional collaboration and opportunities for a comprehensive approach to student success.

Accompanying our 2021 EIE reviewer's report, we received the following recommendation (Recommendation 2): "The Evaluation Team recommends that Gonzaga University more clearly demonstrate continuous, consistent, and systematic institutional effectiveness assessment, including for student support services, using assessment to inform and refine planning for assigning resources and improving student learning and achievement across all academic programs (1.B.1, 1.C.5., 1.C.7)." We are leveraging our

position as a Provost-model organizational structure to show how at every step of the student journey, measures of assessment are used to learn lessons and iterate on our processes to improve them from year to year. In specific support of our progress on Recommendation 2, we have also included an area within Student Affairs, our New Student and Family Programs (Summer Orientation) assessment process.

Student Affairs: Programmatic Assessment

Our New Student Summer Orientation, housed within New Student and Family Programs, provides an excellent example of how we use assessment data for continuous improvement, and also how we orient students to Gonzaga (1.D.1). Historically, Gonzaga's summer orientation was held several days prior to the beginning of classes in late August. In July 2023 New Student and Family Programs (NSFP) implemented a multiple summer orientation model. NSFP created the following outcomes for assessment (using the SWIBAT model and Bloom's Taxonomy):

Students who participate in summer orientation will be able to:

- Identify academic and wellbeing support services

- Describe experiences of connection with students, staff, and faculty

- Show an understanding of expectations for first year students at GU

- Express ways they experience a sense of belonging at the university

Each session concluded with a post-orientation survey (dispersed via Qualtrics) to assess students' experience. The goals of the survey were to: 1) differentiate how orientation was received by various student populations using disaggregated demographic data of both students who did and did not attend the Orientation (see Figures 10 and 11 in the appendix); and 2) compare results with previous model to look for areas of growth and improvement opportunities.

The results from this assessment process actively informed amendments to the plans for next year. For example, during orientation, students had the chance to meet with the Academic Advisors in the Center for Student Academic Success (CSAS) and a faculty member in their intended major. CSAS Advisors discussed content related to the core curriculum, transferring in AP and/or university credit, and overall university graduation requirements. The faculty introduced students to their major curriculum and opportunities within the department. There were 131 qualitative student feedback comments regarding these two experiences being the student's 'favorite part' of orientation. We had 49 faculty participate in these sessions during the summer and, because of the positive impact students reported, are going to continue requesting their participation in welcoming the students (this is directly related to 1.D.1). From all this the

NSFP team discerned that they had received sufficient data and positive responses from students to questions on understanding campus resources, social expectations and academic expectations, and feeling welcome and connected to GU (see Figure 12 in the appendix) to build the foundation for our proposal to continue with summer orientation.

An overview of our process for program review and learning outcomes assessment in Student Affairs is as follows: first, an assessment plan was created for each department. Each plan maps to Gonzaga University's Mission, our Baccalaureate Learning Goals (institutional learning outcomes), the Student Affairs Learning Outcomes, the University Strategic Plan, the Inclusive Excellence Strategic Plan, the former NWCCU Accreditation 'Core Themes' and the NWCCU Accreditation Standards. Many departments are looking at longitudinal data, so the assessments can continue for future academic years. A Canvas Course Resource page was created to help support Student Affairs Departments in their assessment practices. All assessment mapping was collected and was uploaded into Nuventive Improve. From there, we create PowerBI dashboard visualizations (such as Figure 12) to show (1) how each area's learning and/or experience outcomes map to university and strategic initiatives, (2) methods of assessment, and (3) eventually the narrative for each area's yearly report. This information is used to see where student affairs can better support our students as well as cross-department collaboration.

The Student Affairs Division will also begin a renewed program review cycle in fall 2024 using the CAS Standards. Units in student affairs are organized in communities of practice that are defined by three pillars: Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI); Student Wellbeing & Flourishing (WBF); and Integrated Approaches to Student Learning & Development (ILD). Three to five departments will begin each year on a five-year cycle:

Table 2: Student Affairs Program Review Cycle

Fall 2024	Fall 2025	Fall 2026	Fall 2027	Fall 2028
New Student & Family Programs (ILD)	Center for Student Involvement (ILD)	Housing and Residence Life (ILD)	Outdoor Programs (GU Outdoors and Integrated Outdoor Learning) (ILD)	Health Services (WBF)
Transfer, Veterans, and Returning Adult Students + First Generation Students (DEI)	Lincoln LGBTQ+ Resource Center (DEI)	Payne Center for Leadership Development (DEI)	Unity Multicultural Education Center (UMEC) (DEI)	Center for Community Engagement (DEI)

Counseling Center (WBF)	Academic Advising & Assistance (WBF)	Disability Access (WBF)	Learning Strategies Management (LSM) (WBF)	Office of Sustainability (DEI)
	Center for Cura Personalis (WBF)	Resolution Center for Student Conduct and Conflict (WBF)	Office of Health Promotion (WBF)	

The Associate Director of Student Experience, Research, and Assessment meets with each department director to determine learning and or experience outcomes along with specific departmental goals to assess for the academic year.

Academic Programs: Programmatic Assessment

Our annual Learning Assessment Day (LeAD Day), an institution-wide learning outcomes assessment workshop, exemplifies our commitment to best practices around assessment of student learning. This is done by producing new, innovative ideas, in an environment of productive peer-sharing. The goal of this community endeavor is to refine learning outcomes, connect course-level and program-level outcomes. In 2023 the focus was on the interventions of our Instructional Design and Delivery Team to integrate ChatGPT and students' utilization of AI in their assignments into our assignment design and assessment landscape. In 2024, our focus is to refine our use of rubrics via our LMS, Canvas. These interventions supply us with ready examples of how we are making progress on "systematic institutional effectiveness assessment" across Gonzaga (Recommendation 2).

For an example of how attentiveness to assessment feeds in at every level, every course proposed must include a course syllabus as well as learning outcomes and assessment criteria, all of which are reviewed by faculty committees (fulfilling 1.C.5). In an effort to close equity gaps by implementing inclusive and equitable pedagogy, we start with the essentials such as our Universal Access to Course Information Policy which states "all faculty are expected to post a syllabus (with learning outcomes and all course-related policies) as well as midterm (for undergraduates) and final grades to the University Learning Management System (Canvas) for every course section beginning Fall 2023 (*Approved 04/08/2023*). We keep track of whether or not courses have a syllabus posted in Canvas (see Figure 13 in the appendix). All student outcomes for graduate and undergraduate programs appear on public-facing Academics web pages (1.C.3).

Two subcommittees of the Academic Council provide oversight of continuous improvement in these areas: Program Review and Assessment. Working with Institutional Research and external reviewers, academic programs are reviewed in a regular cycle (see the Program Review Guidelines) (1.C.5 and 1.C.7). To assist programs in the review process, the Program Review Committee appoints a committee member as liaison to work with the program under review. The presence of the liaison ensures ongoing communication between the program and the Program Review Committee. The liaison acts as a consultant to the program, i.e. to make available to the program her/his knowledge of procedures and her/his expertise about the review process. A breakdown of the committee's Operating Procedures and the liaison's role with timelines and responsibilities is available in the appendix.

Specialized or school specific accreditation also contributes to the content and rigor of Gonzaga's academic programs. Meeting these accreditation standards reflects an effort to maintain high academic standards, and as appropriate, the standards and expectations of professional associations and accrediting entities inform the faculty's work. Please see our Accreditation site for lists of Gonzaga's externally accredited programs.

The Assessment Committee, to ensure consistency and a normative referent for assessment, provides academic unit assessment personnel with a General Expectations for Assessment Guide and the Assessment Rubric the committee uses to review assessment reports. This combination of guidance and reflection gives assessment a common frame of reference and places student learning at the forefront of assessment. Each academic unit submits an annual assessment report that examines learning outcomes, the method of assessment, desired results, actual results and, if needed, any actions planned resulting from the assessment. To close the loop, the Academic Council Assessment Committee reviews these assessment reports and responds as appropriate (1.C.7). The responses focus departmental attention on closing the assessment loop to make program changes to improve student learning. This mechanism provides a means to address problem areas and develop strategies for improvement by ensuring adequate feedback to the academic areas. As a consequence of the Assessment Committee's review, many departments and programs, especially if desired results were not met or were inconclusive, develop action plans and follow-up to address areas where improvements can be made.

To support these efforts, and the efforts of our student learning outcomes assessment process, we have acquired the latest version of Nuventive, a continuous improvement platform with built-in analytics that assists us in reporting and tracking our planning process, displaying in detail the sequence of actions and outcomes related to our goals and objectives, and the ability to audit and track the participation of units in efforts to assign specific personnel charged with "closing the loop." This supports our progress on Recommendation 2 in reference to standards 1.C.5 and 1.C.7 in particular.

Core Curriculum: Student Achievement Integrates with Mission Fulfillment

In 2016-17, Gonzaga University launched a new outcomes-based university core curriculum. We identified five programmatic-level learning outcomes, based on our Baccalaureate Learning Goals, around which to design the new core (see appendix for relationships between BLGs and core learning outcomes). Fifteen core course requirements and three core designation requirements (45 credits; designations double count) comprise the new core. Every requirement is designed around a set of learning outcomes that support the five programmatic-level learning outcomes. Moreover, each section of every course is reviewed and approved by a core area curriculum committee. The course approval process brings faculty into proactive, supportive discussion, and drives the primary purpose of assessment: to improve our teaching and student learning.

The comprehensive Plan for Core Assessment, which includes 2016-2020 comprehensive data, is the basis for our yearly cycle. In 2021, the NWCCU Accreditation Team observed in their EIE report that we had not yet completed a complete cycle of Core assessment. Each year since 2016 has been one of progress, including efforts made during the COVID period when some units paused their data collection efforts and focused on revising their plans. Thus the curriculum committees are making yearly progress on the 2021 NWCCU evaluator team recommendation, and sticking to that initial plan for cycling through each learning outcome in turn. Please see the 2022-23 Core Assessment Report (also in the appendix) for evidence of this continuous process.

The Core Curriculum is inherently connected to wider initiatives and resource allocation connected to our University Strategic Plan, our plan for mission fulfillment. In support of the Integrated Jesuit Education Strategic Plan initiative (Action #3), the FYS curriculum committee recognizes the need for FYS integrated alignment throughout the university so that all stakeholders understand and share the FYS transformative vision. This means increased opportunities to bring faculty, staff, and administration together around the first-year experience. Pedagogy and Design sessions for Writing Enriched designated-courses co-sponsored by the Center for Teaching and Advising and the University Core are another key example of resources being put to support cross-disciplinary initiatives.

Living Learning Communities continue to build momentum towards a final summative assignment (a portfolio with artifacts). The connection between the FYS and the senior year **Core Integration Seminar** is crucial to the fulfillment of an **integrated curriculum** at Gonzaga. To this end, we are connecting directly to our mission-aligned Strategic Plan commitment of "Integrative Jesuit Education," we are adapting the AAC&U rubric for Integrative Learning for this purpose. Seven CIS instructors used this rubric to score students on the outcomes: "Connections to Experience: Connects relevant experience and academic knowledge" and "Reflection and Self-Assessment: Demonstrates a developing sense of self as a learner, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts."

Summary of Assessment Practice: Students were assessed in the Core Integration Seminar, which serves as the Capstone experience in Gonzaga's Core. Students in each participating section reflect on their experience in Gonzaga's Core and contemplate how they will continue to pursue lifelong learning and personal formation after graduation. Each section identifies a topic or area that students will encounter after graduation and that pulls together various components of Gonzaga's Core. The sample sections we reviewed looked at existentialism, Africana, film, healthcare, and art. Instructors each assessed work submitted by seven students who were selected using the same randomized sampling method used by the First Year Seminar. Instructors also submitted brief summaries of the grounds for the assessments they reached. Several common themes emerged on each of the AAC&U VALUE outcomes we assessed.

Summary of Findings: LO 1: Connections to Experience: Since Gonzaga's Core goes beyond the hope of broadening student perspectives through exposure to multiple disciplinary approaches to a wide range of topics. It also focuses on student formation as part of our commitment to the Catholic and Jesuit traditions. It is important, therefore, to track student development in mind, body, and spirit, which requires students to make clear connections between classroom learning and other experiences on campus. All instructors assessed a final assignment in which students looked back on their experience of the Core. In the film section, students connected a range of thinkers, from Aquinas to Dewey, to several contemporary films and explained how both illuminated their response to a range of challenges they personally face in their lives. In the art section, students reflected on the way analytical reasoning has come to inform their approach to creativity, which the Core has led them to view as critical to human nature. In the Africana section, students consistently responded to a range of perspectives they encountered on faith, life, and community. Students drew out specific concepts on elderhood, sexuality, and craft that enabled them to rethink the choices they have made in terms of majors and future careers as well as process important life events. In the healthcare section, students engaged in small-group final reflections on the way the Core has informed their experience of a field of study designed to prepare them for a career in healthcare. Finally, in the existentialism section, students used a reading by Nietzsche to reflectively engage their experiences with the unhoused local community, social media, their own faith tradition, as well as our nation's history of slavery. In all five sections we assessed, the qualitative descriptions offered through the OA process, revealed that students are forming effective connections between the material they encounter in Core classrooms and the experiences they have in college. **Quantitative measures align with that claim since the average student assessment on the first LO we measured was 3.46.** We believe this reflects progress toward our goal to encourage students to connect the learning that took place outside of a formal classroom with the academic curriculum they encountered in their Core classes. As mentioned earlier, **that connection is central to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals that shape our education and are directly drawn from our mission.**

Two examples follow here to show our progress in the areas of the First Year Seminar and the Communication and Leadership M.A. program.

Example 1: First Year Seminar

As the foundational course of the Core, the First Year Seminar (FYS) is the first of two bookends, the second of which is the Core Integration Seminar which completes the University Core experience. Gonzaga's FYS is more than a "how-to-University" course. Instead, it is an intentional process of connecting students to themselves, to their peers, and to their community. As an educational institution with a mission that includes *cura personalis (care of the whole person)*, our integrated approach to learning can be a step towards integration and transformation, key elements of Gonzaga's mission.

The FYS is a key example of how assessment data is directly used to refine planning for assigning resources and improving student learning and achievement in a course taken by all first-year Gonzaga students. The faculty and staff engaged in this work are committed to continuous improvement and to the annual in-depth review of their learning outcomes assessment data. The plan for their assessment work is annually communicated by the Core Curriculum Committee Chair to the faculty teaching the First Year Seminar before they finalize their syllabi to allow for the successful incorporation of the process into assignments and in-class work. Best practices in assessment are followed, including the use of a rubric by instructors; there is a rubric for each outcome that is stored and referenced from our compilation of Rubrics for Core course descriptions and learning outcomes, available in the Core Assessment Report in the appendix.

The First Year Seminar has three learning outcomes, with the target of 60% of students at the "Exceeding/Excellent" or "Meeting/Good" level (4 or 3 out of a 4-level scale) for all students:

At the completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. differentiate the ways in which knowledge is constructed across multiple disciplines.

2. articulate how their own personal and cultural perspectives affect their discovery and generation of knowledge and understanding.

3. integrate the principles of Gonzaga's mission with their academic, personal, and spiritual aspirations.

Based on the 2021-2022 review period, the decision was taken to focus on faculty development and the actions planned for this committee were to continue to build a collaborative FYS instructional community for innovation, support, accountability, and growth. As an example, the chair of our FYS curriculum committee, Professor Scott

Starbuck, organized a three-part workshop for faculty who teach in the First-Year Seminar, either for the first time or who wanted an opportunity to serve as mentors and refresh their own courses. Colleagues from across campus, including the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (SEAS) teaching the FYS for the first time, attended alongside seasoned FYS instructors who serve as their mentors.

Continuing the same approach during the review year 2022-2023, the main objectives of the process are to foster a classroom environment of deep learning, metacognition, and intercultural knowledge and competence. To see the results of this process, please see the full report linked in the appendix.

Closing the Loop: It is important to compare current year results with those of the previous year in order to track the impact of improvements over time. Doing the assessment reporting in a consistent manner reinforces the efficacy of this process. The results table for 21-22 compared with 22-23 is as follows:

2021-2022 FYS LO2	Exceeding/ Excellent	Meeting/Good	Approaching/ Minimal	Not Met
Score/Percentage	21 = 38 %	17 = 30%	15 = 27%	3 = 5%

2022-2023 FYS LO2	Exceeding/ Excellent	Meeting/Good	Approaching/ Minimal	Not Met
Score/Percentage	41 = 34.7 %	36 = 30.5%	23 = 19.4%	18 = 15.2%

Reflecting on these results, although the goal of 60% as EE/MG was met in both years, there is the desire among the FYS CCC to reach a stronger percentage. At the same time, because of the nature of the FYS and the allowance for student agency and personal development, the FYS CCC recognizes that for many first-year students a score of "Approaching / Minimal" (AM) is appropriate. The committee celebrated significant growth in representative archives and faculty participation in assessment, **closing the loop** on that aspect of last year's goal. A change was agreed upon to augment the FYS proposal process to include the FYS rubrics and assessments keyed to assignments, and to focus resources on the Peer Mentor project. The assessment process was valuable for instructors to assess their own assignments, and useful to discuss it together to improve the processes year by year. It is their observation that a summative assignment (portfolio with artifacts) would better represent student growth.

Connection to Allocation of Resources: Peer Mentors connected to our First Year Seminars are a visible example of resources following needs surfaced by assessment

efforts. The Core Fellow for Peer Mentorship worked to double the number of peer mentors placed in FYS LLC courses in 2023-2024, coordinating with Housing and Residence Life and department chairs.

Assessment data serves to continually improve the program and to allow us to **leverage resources**, for example co-curricular event programming. For an example of this kind of leveraging, see this comment from a Philosophy faculty member in an assessment survey:

> "The greatest help from having a PM [Peer Mentor] (and Tristan in particular) was the ability to blend learning (the pursuit of the intellectual life) inside and outside the classroom. We have three different outside of class events together and he did two more, and they were really successful. This is one of my main goals in all my classes. I do generally have pretty good success, but it was even better with [the Peer Mentor's] help!"

The students also provided **academic support** to each other, building their transferable skill set in the areas of perspective-taking and translating lessons learned from one experience to another. A Religious Studies professor teaching FYS reflected in an assessment survey: "The peer mentor was most helpful as a 'second set of eyes' to give me feedback on what was working, what was not working, and to offer suggestions for activities in the classroom." The peer mentors offer a precious mutuality of support between faculty, fellow-but-more-experienced student, and freshman. As one of our Jesuit priests teaching the FYS put it, "Having a mentor in class helped to stimulate conversation. Students could hear viewpoints and/or questions of their own peer and realize that it was okay to ask or share them."

Assessment data is used to foster feelings of **welcoming and belonging,** of critical importance not only for retention goals at our university, but for us to enable each student to find their unique place. For example, "In the student reflections, several mentioned that the peer mentors were a great resource to help them succeed in the class and that it felt comfortable going to them with questions. They also really helped in small group discussions and in helping build a sense of a welcoming and inclusive community" (survey comment from Honors faculty teaching FYS).

Example 2: Communication and Leadership Studies M.A.

This reflection includes descriptions of ongoing innovations in the Communication and Leadership department, informed by their 21-22 and 22-23 assessment submission and review efforts, and a report of assessment work for the current year. During the 22-23 academic year, faculty in Organizational Leadership and Communication Leadership, a shared core course among both M.A. programs, made updates and adjustments to the

required COML 597 / ORGL 610 Communications Ethics course. They studied benchmark objectives of the three sub-dimensions of the Ethical Communication LO evaluated during the previous (21-22) year's assessment cycle. Assignments from six sections of the capstone course (N = 54) over the fall and spring semesters of the 2021-22 academic year were directly assessed using a rubric. 85.2% of students met or exceeded expectations in that their submission demonstrated the ability to provide a clear introduction or ethical perspectives related to capstone work. 68.1% of students met or exceeded expectations in that their submission demonstrated sufficient integration and explanation of relevant theoretical content related to capstone work. 75.9% of students met or exceeded expectations in that their submission demonstrated sufficient accurate application of relevant ethical perspectives and content to capstone work.

The desired results for each area was set at 70% (the rationale for this target is that it is a commonly used benchmark at Gonzaga that allows room for improvement, but also will make it clear that attention is needed if it falls below this clear majority). So, two of the areas met this benchmark and one did not in 2021-22 (the last time that LO was assessed, 2019-2020, the benchmark had been met). In addition, the reviewer for the 21-22 report suggested that the conceptual definition for the other outcome we measured, Specialized Communication Knowledge, which met/exceeded established student success benchmarks, was overly broad and warranted more specificity for future assessment.

Going into the 2022-23 year, two LOs, Leadership and Oral Communication Competency, were directly assessed in targeted course assignments.

Rubrics were developed and used by two FTE professors in the final 602 COML Capstone Seminar course (for the Leadership LO) and two full-time professors in the COML 599 Content Creation and Strategy course (for the Oral Communication Competency LO). The Leadership LO was assessed for the first time as an assignment integrated into the capstone course, which provides the opportunity to assess the students in the last course of the degree program, where most students have completed 27 credits and are taking their final class. Results (see Results section of the report in the appendix for further details and benchmark expectations) suggest that overall, our students enter the capstone course prepared to discuss and integrate their leadership philosophy as it informs their study design and relevance to DEI and intercultural communication concerns. The rubrics used are linked in the appendix.

Opportunities for improvement are warranted as it relates to students being able to competently include and discuss opportunities related to limitations and considering further and future development related to DEI/Intercultural communication. Regarding the components of oral communication competency, we assessed students' work submitted as the final digital portfolio assignment for our residency course, COML 599,

Content Creation and Strategy. Results indicate that the course is useful and practical, which is congruent with consistently positive student feedback.

These results suggest that we are effectively meeting our outcome goals in important areas, with some opportunity for improvement and potential adjustments in the capstone course assignment, or through adjusting content in other required courses such as COML 598 International and Intercultural Communication. The results provided important information along with future directions to consider and should be a catalyst for ongoing faculty conversations regarding student learning and outcomes.

Closing the Loop: Building on last year's reflection, the COML department has spent a considerable amount of collective effort and time over the past few years in ongoing discussion and continual improvement revisions of curriculum and the capstone course. This work was done to better accommodate students' professional and/or scholarly projects and studies and align curricular content more effectively with our outcome goals.

Connection to Allocation of Resources: Most recently, the COML faculty met in an off-campus retreat environment at the Hive to dedicate time to revising Learning Outcomes and diving into best practices in the use of our LMS, Canvas, to better integrate modes of assignment evaluation and course and program outcomes assessment. **The use of Canvas Outcomes represents a significant investment of time and financial resources.** The session was a catalyst for COML faculty to more intentionally integrate a culture of ongoing evaluation and improvement throughout the COML curriculum. Specifically, members of the team worked together to discuss and identify opportunities to improve language related to overall program outcomes along with how these improvements could lead to better direct assessment approaches. What emerged from this discussion included revisions to the language of the stated learning outcomes, and an increased awareness among our faculty about how to better integrate modes of assignment evaluation and course and program outcomes assessment work. In addition, it created a needed context for future curriculum mapping that compels the COML faculty to think about the curriculum more holistically, in addition to identifying specific modules and assignments that align directly with program outcome goals.

Conclusion

These findings, overall, are encouraging in that our courses provide effective scaffolding for student success, and indicate that we are effectively meeting the majority of our aspirations for student learning, with the consideration that we should strive to continue to iterate and adapt our approach to teaching, course design, student support, and learning to best serve the students and meet them where they are.

Part 4: Moving Forward

Adapted from and building upon the 2022-23 Report of the President, this section discusses our plans for the future and our preparations for our next EIE visit.

For the last year, individuals and departments across campus have embraced "The Grand Challenge," the process of updating the 2015 Gonzaga University Strategic Plan. All strategic planning techniques reveal complexities and opportunities for improvement, and through collaboration and expertise from within the institution, we are ready to proceed with action. This will continue to be our process for living out our Mission Fulfillment, continuing to make progress on our Recommendations, and preparing for our next EIE visit in the NWCCU cycle by monitoring our progress in these areas.

The Strategic Planning process puts us in good stead as we prepare for the PRFR report in 2027 and the EIE report and visit in 2028. We have assembled a team of colleagues with deep knowledge of assessment, program review, accreditation, and institutional research that puts us in a strong position to prepare these reports and leverage our collective experience to sustain and elevate Gonzaga to be the university that fulfils our mission for years to come.

Priorities for the Future

Mission Engagement leads faculty and staff in the practice of Ignatian discernment, exploring the topics of cura personalis and justice, and other spirituality programming. A priority this year that prepares us to deepen future efforts has been the orchestration of deeper formation opportunities for faculty and staff to explore Jesuit spirituality and Ignatian pedagogy. Our **University Ministry** team serves students with retreats, small group faith experiences, and opportunities for connection, and we have recognized these as key areas for focus in the future as we live our distinct Jesuit mission.

New Degree Programs: With many professions becoming increasingly data-driven, and the challenges of finding strong, service-oriented leaders common across industries, GU is offering three new opportunities: a Master of Science in Business Analytics, an online Master of Business Administration and an online Master of Education in Educational Leadership with Principal Certification.

Degrees on the Horizon: Effective Fall 2024, the following new programs will be offered: Bachelor of Science in Data Sciences, Bachelor of Science in Neuroscience, Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering, Bachelor of Arts in Public Health, an expanded Accelerated 3+3 Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science and Juris Doctor (in partnership with the School of Law), Master of Science in Cybersecurity, Master of

Science in Data Science, and Master of Engineering Management. Effective Fall 2025, we expect to add Master of Public Health.

Centers and Institutes: The Board's approval of the Strategic Plan allows the Provost's office to move forward in developing a Humanities Institute, a Center for Ignatian Dialogue and Discernment, and an Institute for Water, Climate, and the Environment. Through an Institute for Informatics & Applied Technology, funded by a $5 million gift from the Reisenauer family, to establish a directorship, GU will partner with local industries, government agencies and health providers to serve the needs of our community and grow Gonzaga's future.

School of Health Sciences: Comprehensive health education and access to care in rural areas remain high needs for our region. Building on Gonzaga's existing programs in nursing and human physiology, what was once the School of Nursing and Human Physiology is now the School of Health Sciences. This School looks forward to strengthening the University's ongoing partnership with the University of Washington School of Medicine.

The following are the 12 Actions which form the basis for our foci for the future:

- **Action 1: School of Health Sciences**

- **Action 2: Institute for Informatics and Applied Technology**

- **Action 3: Integrative Jesuit Education**

  - Integrative Jesuit Educational Experience

  - Housing Master Plan

  - Mission Integration + Academics

  - Honors + LLCs

  - Global/National Education

  - Student Success

  - Outdoor Learning

- **Action 4: Re-imagine the Learning Environment**

  - Center for Faculty Development and Formation

  - Reimagining Foley Library

  - Online

  - Technology, CRM, etc.

- **Action 5: Strategic Enrollment**

- **Action 6: Inclusive Excellence**

- **Action 7: Service and Action Within Our Community**

  - Opportunity Northeast

  - Early Child Development

  - Tribal Research and Engagement

- **Action 8: Humanities Institute**

- **Action 9: Center for Ignatian Dialogue and Discernment**

- **Action 10: Institute for Water, Climate, and the Environment**

- **Action 11: Intercollegiate Athletics**

- **Action 12: Affirming Our Defining Relationships**

A key to success is constantly evaluating opportunities that position Gonzaga for distinction and competitive advantage. The Strategic Plan process has resulted in this action-oriented set of opportunities that align well with our mission and vision as an exemplar Catholic, Jesuit, and humanistic institution. There is still much left to this journey. In a time when the value of higher education continues to be questioned, it is more important than ever that Gonzaga rise up and show the world why we, more than any other institution, take on grand challenges with grit, determination, and resilience.

Part 5: Addendum

Appendix A: Response to the recommendations made by the EIE evaluation team in Spring 2021

(See also Parts 1, 2, and 3 for further illustration of our progress on each Recommendation; what follows here is a summary of efforts for each one.)

Recommendation 1: "The Evaluation Team recommends that Gonzaga University clearly define and measure mission fulfillment in order to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions. (1.B.2)."

Response to Recommendation 1: The Commission's decision to eliminate "core themes" has been seen by Gonzaga as an invitation to clarify our definitions and measurements for mission fulfillment through a process of revision of, and

alignment with, our strategic plan. The Core Themes as developed in 2010 still underscore our articulated priorities. For context, the Core Themes were: 1) Exemplary Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship; 2) Enriched Campus Community; 3) Exceptional Stewardship; and 4) Engaged Local and Global Relationships. The themes emerged directly from our Mission Statement and our Strategic Plan (at that time, "Vision 2012"), and they are incorporated in our Baccalaureate Learning Goals, which developed into the proposal for the Core Learning Outcomes and also form our Institutional Learning Outcomes, mapped to curricular and co-curricular experiences in fulfilment of our mission.

The 2023 Strategic Plan is a revision of the 2015 Plan, and both maintain the spirit of the Core Themes in the four Commitments. The connections are as follows: Commitment 1: Foster Responsibility for Shared Mission (with clear ties to Core Themes 2 and 4); Commitment 2: Animate Academic Excellence across the Institution (with a clear relationship to Core Theme 1): Commitment 3: Provide an Integrative Jesuit Educational Experience for Our Students (drawn from Core Themes 2 and 4); and Commitment 4: Optimize Institutional Stewardship and Sustainability (in line with Core Theme 3).

The 37 overarching goals of the 2015 Gonzaga strategic plan carried the institution forward and informed important and transformative actions in the period 2015– 2022, including strong academic rankings, the construction of new facilities, and an increasingly diverse student body, faculty, and staff. It is imperative that we build on these defining goals by identifying revitalized long-term strategic actions that will inspire and guide the institution in being an exemplar of Jesuit higher education in a changing and challenging environment.

During the 2022-23 academic year, the Gonzaga community came together to review and ultimately revise the University's Strategic Plan through a process known as the "Grand Challenges." We began with an inclusive, "grassroots" Request for Proposal (RFP) process to surface current mission-driven goals and objectives of our Institution. The process invited broad collaboration across the campus, refreshed philanthropic goals, and allowed time for discernment with our Board of Trustees. We have also developed concrete metrics in the areas of student achievement, academic excellence, faculty/staff development, and institutional stewardship, and shared mission for successfully aligning the goals with our mission. This new Plan both affirms our core values and attempts to be responsive to the needs of students, to the needs of society today, and underscores our mission as an exemplar Catholic, Jesuit, and humanistic institution.

<div align="center">***</div>

Recommendation 2: "The Evaluation Team recommends that Gonzaga University more clearly demonstrate continuous, consistent, and systematic institutional effectiveness assessment, including for student support services, using assessment to inform and refine planning for assigning resources and improving student learning and achievement across all academic programs. (1.B.1, 1.C.5., 1.C.7)."

Response to Recommendation 2: Each academic unit submits an annual assessment report that examines learning outcomes, methods of assessment, desired results, actual results and actions planned. To close the loop, the Academic Council Assessment Committee reviews assessment reports and provides feedback (1.C.7). The responses focus departmental attention on closing the assessment loop to make program changes to improve student learning. In order to make Assessment and Program Review cycles more mutually informative and tie more directly to resource allocation, the Assessment Committee is connecting their work more directly to the Program Review calendar. Each program still assesses two outcomes each year, and each program still receives feedback every year. Substantive feedback is provided on assessment reports in every third year so that longitudinal data can be collected for review and feedback, tying assessment practice more directly to data-driven resource allocation requests via Deans.

We have a clear win in the Assessment area with the transition to Canvas which is allowing us to be more intentional and systematic about capturing assessment data and using it for the continuous improvement of student learning. Additionally, the implementation of Canvas is triggering further progress: as supported by the Academic Council and the Faculty Senate, the Universal Access to Course Information Policy (related to Canvas utilization) was passed and has been posted to the Provost website and is in effect as of Fall 2023. It states that all faculty are expected to post a syllabus (with learning outcomes and all course-related policies) as well as midterm (for undergraduates) and final grades to the University Learning Management System (Canvas) for every course section and was in effect Fall 2023.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

Recommendation 3: "The Evaluation Team recommends that Gonzaga University expand access to disaggregated student achievement data to inform and implement strategies and to allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity. (1.D.4)."

Response to Recommendation 3: Gonzaga University, through the office of Institutional Research, has developed dashboards showing disaggregated student achievement data. These dashboards allow for greater access and wider distribution of student achievement data to better inform efforts to mitigate equity gaps. For example, our Center for Student Academic Success sends disaggregated student achievement data to the Deans to share how students in each of our programs are performing. Our new LMS, Canvas, has dashboards related to student success available both at the instructor level and to student services professionals. With newly implemented Canvas Data 2 and Google Analytics platforms extremely granular data is available that can be shared to mitigate achievement gaps both at an institutional level and for individual students. Further, Gonzaga is implementing a CRM (Salesforce) to add predictive analytics to student data. In concert with our strategic plans for the retention and care for our students, the CRM will utilize historical student data to create predictive models designed to help identify and intervene with at-risk students and support all students on their educational path.

502 E. Boone Ave

Spokane, Washington 99258

www.gonzaga.edu

GONZAGA
U N I V E R S I T Y