



ASSESSMENT REPORT/PLAN

College/Division: Humanities and Natural Sciences

Academic Year: 2011-2012

Department/Center/Office:

Submission Date: February 20, 2012

MISSION STATEMENT:

In fulfilling its role to provide all Loyola students with a foundation in the liberal arts and sciences, the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences has as its mission to educate and graduate students who are prepared to lead meaningful lives with and for others; who appreciate and contribute to the understanding of global cultures, who comprehend the interrelated nature of all knowledge; who are able to think critically and make decisions for the common good; and who have a commitment to the Ignatian tradition of a life of justice and service to others. It is the mission of the College to contribute to the expansion of knowledge through the scholarly and creative activities of its faculty and students.

OBJECTIVES/GOALS:

- 1) To standardize and improve protocols for review of tenure-track faculty and for Rank and Tenure
- 2) To regularize program reviews and initiate external reviews of programs
- 3) To institute new academic programs that are consistent with mission
- 4) To address compression and equity salary issues for full-time faculty
- 5) To grow the faculty
- 6) To make transparent and develop a protocol for college-wide decisions on merit salary reviews
- 7) To institutionalize processes for evaluation and retention of full-time adjunct faculty
- 8) To strengthen staff performance reviews
- 9) To address and improve retention
- 10) To strengthen advising at the college and departmental levels
- 11) To institute a pre-law advising initiative for the university
- 12) To strengthen the pre-health/pre-med program

ASSESSMENT (What assessment tools are you using and how do they address the objective/goals cited above?):

- 1) Problem of inconsistent protocols discovered with review of applications for rank and tenure in 2009, review of all relevant documents and reports from faculty and chairs; dean worked with CRTC to create uniform protocol across the college, consistent with university protocols; fall workshop on process and materials needed provides feedback from tenure-track faculty, mentors and chairs; applications for tenure and promotion reviewed annually for any continuing problems with process and description of needed materials at the departmental or college level; updates and corrections made on an annual basis in consultation with the CRTC, chairs and CPT. [Updated protocols on college intranet site.](#)
Standards for first- and subsequent year review of faculty are posted on the college intranet. Protocols for

the in-depth fourth year faculty review were revised in 2010-11 by dean and CRTC to adhere more closely to the format required for tenure and promotion. These protocols are reviewed annually by the dean in the process of reviewing fourth-year faculty reports.

- 2) Uniform College-level form for Annual Reports developed in 2009; due date set for December in consultation with chairs and with higher administration; reports submitted and feedback reported to chairs; university review of Annual Report form and due date again in 2011; schedule for departmental external reviews developed in 2009; reassessed by CPT every year; additional reviews (of programs, centers and institutes) added in 2011; protocol for self-study developed in 2009 and revised annually based on effectiveness of process; external reviews are being done on a ten-year rolling basis, to be followed by internal review five years later; departments work with dean on self-study; external evaluators come in spring; report due in May and reviewed by dean and department for action; there are periodic updates on actions taken in response to external review.
- 3) New programs instituted ([Walker Percy Center for Writing and Publishing](#), [Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies](#), [Program in the Environment](#), new concentrations in [History](#), [Chemistry](#) and [English](#)) are periodically reviewed as part of the process described in #2 above. They are instituted after review by dean, the College Curriculum Committee, UC&CC and by SCAP. SCAP protocol requires market and mission analysis as well as assessment mechanisms.
- 4) Compression issues addressed in 2010 based on several previous college-wide analyses of salary disparities (pre-Katrina, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010). 2010 implementation model was developed by Institutional Research in consultation with the Ad Hoc Senate Salary Sub-committee. College-wide implementation done by dean and SORC and reported to Faculty Assembly. Equity issues are being addressed in the same way in 2012. Preparation for use of the model has required detailed corrections of inconsistencies in determining Years in Rank and Years in Service done by dean's office in consultation with Institutional Research. Model also includes annual merit review data over past decade.
- 5) Faculty needs assessed in 2009 with Dean's report on lost lines since 2005. Annual departmental needs assessed and reported each year in Annual Reports. Five-year departmental self-studies (external and then internal) assess faculty needs. Annual review of faculty needs done by dean in consultation with Office of the Provost. Needs for part-time faculty assessed each spring with department chairs and faculty.
- 6) In 2010 dean and chair of the Salary Oversight Review Committee developed protocols for the Committee that were reported to the Faculty Assembly and put on the college intranet. Further review of protocol done by SORC and dean in 2012 and revised protocols are being developed to submit to Faculty Assembly. These protocols should be reviewed on a biennial basis. Results of merit review at departmental and college level transmitted to department chairs annually. Appeal process allows for corrections. Final statistical results reported to Faculty Assembly on an annual basis.
- 7) Review of all salaries of full-time adjuncts in 2009 led to dean's goal to raise salaries to a minimum of \$40,000 per year. Protocol for full-time adjuncts developed in 2010-2011 resulting in annual review of merit and COL for full-time adjuncts by an elected salary review committee and by dean. Annual review of the protocol is done at the same time. Current review of contracts for every full-time adjunct is being done by the dean to align contract with current duties of each full-time adjunct. This review should be done on an on-going basis.
- 8) Staff performance reviews are done each year by departments and the dean. Each staff member meets annually with the dean to discuss results of the performance review and to enable staff to bring forward concerns or problems with departmental, college or university systems and practices.
- 9) In 2007, the fall to fall cohort retention rate for the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences fell to 67%. In response to the decline in retention, the Dean added retention initiatives to the College's Strategic Plan, and in an effort to understand retention issues and inform initiatives, the Dean and Associate Dean began to systematically review all available institutional retention data. While the institutional data was useful in terms of benchmarking retention, the data did not identify why students did not persist at the University and therefore could not inform specific initiatives. In response, an aggressive initiative to interview all students in the College who withdraw from the University was launched and a comprehensive database was created.
- 10) In 2009, the Dean launched an initiative to enhance the quality and effectiveness of academic advising to improve student success and to improve retention and graduation rates. This College initiative supports the University-wide advising initiative launched by the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs. Assessments of strength of advising done annually through senior satisfaction survey (SSI) and NSSE data.
- 11) In 2010, the Dean of College of Humanities and Natural Sciences, in response to concerns articulated by the Dean of the College of Law and data that showed Loyola graduates with low LSAT scores that did not correlate with high GPA, initiated the establishment of a comprehensive [pre-Law Advising Program](#), including discounted LSAT prep courses on campus and intensive advising. Although funded and housed in HNS, this program services all Loyola University New Orleans undergraduates and alumni. In 2010 instituted on-going assessment of the program effectiveness with data on LSAT scores, GPA, major(s) and success in law school applications.
- 12) Currently the pre-health/pre-med program does not have adequate data for assessment. Plans for a 4+1 pre-health program with LSU and/or Tulane as well as a goal of greater outreach to the university committee and increased success in post-graduate applications to medical school and health science professional programs will require better data for assessment and advising across the curriculum rather than simply in the Biological Sciences and, to some degree, in Psychology.

WHERE ARE THE ASSESSMENTS LOCATED?

All of these assessments are located in the Office of the Dean; departmental offices also keep on file their annual reports, self-study documents, reports of external evaluators, results of merit reviews, annual reviews of faculty, 4th year reviews of faculty and results of rank and tenure decisions. All protocols are posted on the [intranet](#); links are noted above (DELETE?). Information that the College has used to address salary issues, faculty numbers and student satisfaction are located in Institutional Research and the Office of the Provost.

EVALUATION METHODS (How were the assessments evaluated?):

See above under Assessment

RESULTS/OUTCOMES:

- 1) Revised protocol for Rank and Tenure and listing of materials needed available on the college intranet— similarly for annual and fourth-year review of tenure-track faculty; the result has been a more uniform and transparent process of faculty review in the college and across departments
- 2) On-going departmental reviews through Annual Reports, five year internal self-studies and schedule of external reviews every ten years. Departmental weaknesses addressed regularly.
- 3) Successful implementation of new programs that have attracted additional majors and minors, created a greater variety of programming on campus, increased engagement with the community, brought conferences and speakers to campus, and attracted outside funding to these programs.
- 4) Fairly successful effort in 2010 to address the compression issues among tenure-track and recent associate professors. Equity initiative in spring 2012 intended to address salary inequities among more senior faculty.
- 5) Successful increase in hiring of faculty to address loss of pre-Katrina faculty. Faculty numbers in the college have increased to equal pre-Katrina numbers; this has been done, however, at some expense to the Ordinary faculty. The percentage of full-time adjunct faculty has risen from 10% pre-Katrina to 25% currently.
- 6) Merit review of salaries at the College level is more transparent and more consistent from year to year.
- 7) Annual salaries of full-time adjunct faculty are now nearly all at \$40,000 and above. Three-year contracts are now available, based on recommendations from the departments. Process of salary allocation for full-time adjuncts is now more transparent and consistent. Full-time adjuncts now have a protocol and a committee that represents them.
- 8) Staff performance reviews are now more thorough and enable staff to articulate concerns.
- 9) Creation of comprehensive database based on interviews of every student in the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences that left the University and correlated with all other relevant student data (including major, gpa, residency status, admin status). Analysis of data revealed primary patterns in student attrition: financial difficulties, academic difficulties, health/wellness issues and program offerings. Based on this data, the College has more aggressively worked to find financial support for students, instituted a college-wide experimental early, early warning system, strengthened its advising capacity, worked with faculty to better understand health and wellness issues, and expanded program offerings, with plans to develop an office of teacher certification in response to students leaving because they cannot get certification at Loyola.
- 10) Since 2008, all institutional data concerning academic advising, including NSSE, SSI, and Senior Exit Surveys, is analyzed and used to inform initiatives to enhance undergraduate academic advising. Collectively, this data indicates that academic advising is strong at the College level and that we outperform our Jesuit, Carnegie, and Peer groups. In an effort to capitalize on this strength and improve retention/graduation rates, as well as overall student satisfaction, the College has used this data to inform advising initiatives.
- 11) In response to the disappointment LSAT results and the challenges that our students had in getting into Law school, the College of Humanities, in collaboration with the Law School, expanded the Pre-Law Advising program. Annie Goldman, a lawyer with academic advising training/experience, was hired by the College to spearhead this initiative and serve as the Director for the University's pre-law advising program.
- 12) This issue is still to be addressed. Data on the program is currently not organized and sometimes anecdotal.

USE OF RESULTS (What modifications, adjustments were made based upon the evaluation of the assessment materials?):

Adjustments have been made all along the way with virtually every one of these goals and processes. The protocols

have been adjusted either annually or biennially. The college committees (CPT, SORC, the Council of Chairs and the Faculty Assembly) are involved in crafting and/or reviewing these adjustments. Adjustments have been made in the processes for faculty and staff salary reviews; ongoing adjustments have been made in the protocols for faculty and staff performance reviews, in the rank and tenure process, in compression and equity evaluations, in how departmental reviews are done, in the institution and review of new programs, centers and institutes, and in the college and university's decisions on faculty hiring. In addition, the College strategic plan, written in 2008, revised in 2009, updated in 2011 and currently under revision in the spring of 2012, has helped keep the college focused on these goals. Areas that need improvement or are underway include the revisions to the SORC protocol and making sure that they are reviewed every two years, review of the strategic plan every two years, integration of the newly promulgated standards for program review by SCAP and the program review protocols for the college, and an ongoing budgetary review in light of the 38-40% cut in operating funds post-Katrina.

(9,10) Retention rates are improving. From 2007 to 2008, the college retention rate went from 67% to 81% remained at 81 % for 2009. The database is maintained in the Office of the Dean and is shared with the Office of Enrollment Management, the College Planning Team, Department Chairs, and summary reports are given to faculty at the College Assembly. Efforts have resulted in earlier intervention and the development of a more intrusive referral system for students experiencing health/wellness issues. Regular contact with students on medical leave to assist in re-matriculation and successful degree completion has been established. Students withdrawing for financial reasons are now referred to Elizabeth Rainey in the Office of Enrollment Management to review financial aid and scholarship packages and the College has reformulated how we award College scholarship monies. Each summer, we now review all available academic data of the entering first-year cohort to better understanding of the profile of students entering the College and develop academic and administrative strategies to promote academic success. For example, the College has launched a separate early warning system several weeks before the Official Early Warning period begins specifically to target attendance issues that contribute to poor academic performance. This data is also used to inform registration for first-year students. For example, students that fall into groups identified with lower retention rates are put into special sections of common curriculum courses with a smaller class size and taught by a faculty who has demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising and have expressed an interest in working with "at-risk" first year students. The assessment of retention data also inspired the creation of a successful intervention program for students on academic probation. Assessment of retention data is also used to inform curricular decisions. For example, SAT/ACT scores of incoming pre-health Science students was correlated with successful course completion rates in the MATH A257 (Calculus) requirement. As a result, the SAT/ACT placement scores that determines Calculus eligibility was raised and a new math course was established to prepare students who are not eligible for MATHA257. This data will be evaluated at the end of the spring 2012 semester to determine the success of this initiative. Analysis of retention data also revealed that students transfer to other institutions to pursue majors not offered by Loyola. This data helps us better understand student demand and informs initiatives to develop new programs when appropriate (the Program in the Environment and the current initiative to establish a Secondary Ed. Certification program). While these efforts have been effective, retention rates are not stable. In 2010, retention fell to 77%.

(10) The Dean charged each departmental chairperson with identifying a chief academic advisor to mentor colleagues and assists students in their department with issues that their academic advisor cannot address. College workshops for faculty advisors are being offered by the College every semester and complement University-wide advising initiatives. To promote student success and promote collaborative intervention, the College early warning notifications are now shared with academic advisors and we now document intervention efforts on the 148 screen of SIS to assist other divisions in their efforts to assist students. A comprehensive review and rewriting of the faculty academic advising handbook was developed in 2011 and [an academic advising website for student and faculty](#) was launched. The Associate Dean maintains a blackboard site that serves as a clearinghouse for the latest research on academic advising available to all faculty and staff. The Associate Dean is also working with DSAC student representatives to create an academic advising handbook written by students for student. They are also working on on-line academic advising video tutorials. We will continue to analyze all relevant data to evaluate the success of these initiatives and to inform future efforts.

11) After careful analysis of LSAT data, student applicant GPAs and Law School Admission reports on applications and acceptance, Ms. Goldman brings a LSAT preparatory course to campus twice each year at a discounted rate and established a scholarship fund to support students who could not afford even the discounted prep course. After evaluating all data, it was determined that the lack of comprehensive and centralized pre-Law advising left students poorly prepared to pursue careers in law. As a result, incoming students are introduced to the pre-law program at all summer orientations and Ms. Goldman starts working with students earlier in their undergraduate careers to better prepare them for a career in law, finding internship opportunities, and helping students understand the application process. As part of this initiative, a one credit elective course was developed to prepare students for law school. Since the course is new and has only been offered once, there is not enough data to measure its effectiveness. However, student course evaluations are promising and LSAT scores and acceptance rates are being assessed to measure the success of these initiatives.

12) Lack of data and insufficient outreach to the university has convinced the Office of the Dean that we need an advisor in the Office of the Dean who will work to collect data, assess the program, advise a wider group of students and work closely with the Professional Health Board in the College.

RESOURCES/TIMELINE/APPROVALS (Based upon the modifications/adjustments included in the USE OF RESULTS section, identify the timeline, resources and approvals required to implement the change.):

SORC protocols should be revised and ready for putting on the intranet by the end of this spring semester; the revised strategic plan for the college should also be completed by the end of this spring semester. The equity study and adjustments to it should also be completed this spring. Integration of the SCAP guidelines for program reviews and the college guidelines is currently in process and should be completed by April. In the fall of 2012, we will have two years of data on the results of LSAT exams and law school admissions success; this will provide us with sufficient data to judge whether the law school initiative is working as it is or whether we need to rethink it. We will continue to track retention data and senior surveys to judge whether the advising and retention initiatives put in place over the past two years are producing positive results. Additional resources are needed in the Office of the Dean with regard to advising, and it is our expectation that we will be able to hire this person for the fall of 2012. One major responsibility for this person would be to work with undergraduates applying to academic graduate programs and to develop databases that will allow us to track graduate success. A second responsibility will be for this person to work with the pre-health/pre-med program to develop data to assess effectively the outcomes of our pre-health/pre-med program—data that we do not presently have—and to work to improve it.

Budgetary constraints that have made it difficult to move forward with initiatives and resources to address the needed changes were relieved partially this year with a 10% increase in the operating budget; the budget for 2012-2013 allows for an additional 2 ½% increase in the college operating budget, and the college has requested, from new initiative dollars, an additional 10% increase in next year's budget.

SIGNATURE: DEPT. CHAIR/DIRECTOR	SIGNATURE: DEAN/VICE-PRESIDENT
Name:	Name: <i>J. A. McVan Creeg</i>
Date:	Date: <i>2/22/2012</i>
Final Approval:	Implementation Date: