Focus Visit Report Distributed

SNC’s Focused Visit Report on Assessment and Strategic Planning was sent to the Higher Learning Commission and the Focused Visit Team on December 23, 2005. The report addresses the two areas of concern in three different ways. It begins with a detailed narrative describing our progress in assessment and strategic planning since the comprehensive site visit in December, 2001. A second section responds point by point to the 2001 site team’s critique. The final section identifies the relevant criteria from the current accreditation standards (the accreditation standards have changed since our 2001 review) and offers evidence of compliance.

Although the visiting team has already begun its review, it is not too late to modify plans or add additional reports to the OIE website. In fact, the OIE has received five new assessment reports since the report was sent to the visiting team. Additional reports are welcome and demonstrate continued momentum. There are still a few disciplines that have outdated assessment plans on the web or have not filed an assessment report for some time. If time permits, here’s…

What You Can Still Do to Help

- Look for your discipline/program under “Learning Outcomes Assessment” on the OIE website. Determine whether the documents there represent your assessment effort completely. Update or add evidence as appropriate.
- Complete any assessment work that is nearly finished. Submit any new reports to the OIE.
- Review the draft Focused Visit Report and be able to describe in general SNC’s three-level assessment strategy.
- Be willing to share your discipline/program assessment strategy, key findings, and actions derived from analysis of your data with the visiting accreditation team.
- Establish a reasonable/sustainable assessment cycle for your discipline/program. Plan to do something manageable each year.
- Celebrate how far we’ve come in four short years and accept the OIE’s thanks for all of the time and effort invested in student learning outcomes assessment.
Office of Institutional Effectiveness

**OIE Funds ACTFL OPI**
**Refresher Workshop Participation**
by Dr. Nicolas Humphrey, Associate Professor of German

Supported by OIE funds, I attended the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) Refresher Workshop at the annual conference of the American Council for Teachers of Foreign Language (ACTFL) in Baltimore, Maryland on November 17, 2005.

The workshop consisted of an intensive 8-hour day in which the participants reviewed the OPI interview terminology, elicitation techniques, question types, and role plays. After the review, the participants, who were as a rule already certified examiners, were shown three videotaped interviews at the Novice and Intermediate levels.

By using the OPI methods to establish the speaker's "performance floor" through frequent "level checks" to determine "evidence of sustained performance," followed by "spiraling up" to the speaker's "performance ceiling" through "probes" to determine the moment of "unsustained performance," the point at which the speaker exhibits clear evidence of linguistic breakdown, the participants were asked to critique and analyze the three samples. By means of a question and answer discussion format, the participants endeavored to establish the interviewee's level, carefully explaining why that level had been chosen. Still, the three samples were quite tricky, because the interviewees each had their own native inflection (Vietnamese or Hispanic), which made it more difficult to "listen beneath the flow" and not be misled by minor linguistic problems that do not seriously affect the rating sample.

After a lunch break, the participants reconvened to hear a presentation on interviewing at the Advanced and Superior levels. At these levels, the interviewee moves to a higher "text type," leaving learned individual words and phrases, as well as discrete sentences, behind, to achieve paragraphs and extended discourse.

By means of a question and answer discussion format, the participants learned to elicit less autobiographical information, in favor of abstract topics, such as popular culture, technology, sport strategies, and longer depersonalized narratives and descriptions. The participants subsequently applied these tips to critique and analyze two further taped interviews, each of which were followed up by question and answer discussions. Again, the interviewers' levels were difficult to pinpoint, though it was clear that they both performed above the Intermediate High level.

The session concluded with general remarks, reminding the examiners to conduct the given interview in a "light" manner, staying flexible with the interview format, in order to allow the interviewee time to give the best linguistic sample possible.

The details of the OPI Workshop Refresher Workshop will be shared with MFL colleagues and this newly-refined knowledge will be used to assess the GERM 400 students (as a third assessment iteration) in the upcoming Spring 2006 semester at the College.

**SNC At A Glance**

Joanne Blascak of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has been working with Todd Maki and various campus offices to develop a comprehensive data warehouse in BANNER. When completed, this data warehouse will contain and make readily available all of the data needed for all external reports (e.g. IPEDs, Common Data Set, U.S. News, Peterson’s, WAICU, HLC) as well as program review. As a first step, the OIE is releasing “SNC At A Glance” (see p. 4) which answers SNC’s most frequently asked questions. It is expected that “SNC At A Glance” will be updated annually and released on December 1st. “SNC At A Glance” will be available on the SNC website and transformed into an attractive format that can be used for recruitment as well as by offices such as Admissions and College Advancement. Widespread use of “SNC At A Glance” is intended to improve data accuracy and consistency across campus.

**Millenials at St. Norbert College**

The recent Faculty Development Conference “Millenials Go to College: Implications for Teaching and Learning” produced a number of requests for additional data about SNC’s millennial students. Summarized below and on the next page are entering student data for the last five years. Although the data appear to support the observations of those researching the “echo boomers”, the data also suggest some very interesting gender differences.

---

**Comparisons: SNC Freshmen vs Highly Selective Catholic College Freshmen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents living together</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Good Academic Rep</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father has Bachelor's or &gt;</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother has Bachelor's or &gt;</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Rankings in National Mag.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Total Income $75k or &gt;</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Past Year Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Preference</th>
<th>Roman Catholic</th>
<th>68%</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>68%</th>
<th>62%</th>
<th>Attended religious service</th>
<th>92%</th>
<th>93%</th>
<th>93%</th>
<th>86%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This College was 1st choice</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Performed volunteer work</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed religion</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drank beer</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from annual CIRP Freshmen Survey
### Opinions and Attitudes of Freshman Men and Women Entering SNC from 2001-2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much concern for rights of criminals</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The death penalty should be abolished</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex couples have right to marital status</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy people should pay more taxes</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individual can do little to change society</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate total respondents by survey year:


---

### Percent freshmen rating selves "above average" or "highest 10%" compared with average person of his/her age in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic ability</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Ability</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical ability</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer skills</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive to achieve</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership ability</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-confidence</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual self-confidence</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate total respondents by survey year:


---

### Percent freshmen indicating objective is "essential" or "very important"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becoming an authority in my field</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing the political structure</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing social values</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising a family</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being very well off financially</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others in difficulty</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to promote racial understanding</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating spirituality into my life</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximate total respondents by CIRP survey year:


---

*data from annual administration of CIRP survey from Higher Education Research Institute (HERI)

### ASSESSMENT RESOURCES

Robert A. Rutter, A.V.P. for Institutional Effectiveness (403-3964)
Jack Williamsen, Retention Coordinator/Data Analyst (403-3993)
Patricia Wery, Administrative Assistant (403-3855)
Joanne Blascak, Data Retrieval Specialist (403-3238)
Deborah Anderson, Natural Sciences Assessment Specialist (403-3199)
Ray Zarawski, Academic Programs Assessment Specialist (403-3202)
Nicholas Gilson, Student Research Assistant (403-3855)
Travis Vanden Heuvel, Student Research Assistant (403-3855)
ST. NORBERT COLLEGE AT A GLANCE - 2005-2006

Academics

Number of Majors Offered 30
Number of Minors (unaffiliated) Offered 7
Number of Graduate Programs 2
  Master of Science in Education
  Master of Theological Studies

Undergraduate Admissions (Fall 2005)
  First-Time, First-Year Freshmen Applications 1683
  First-Time, First-Year Freshmen Admitted 1453
  Acceptance Rate 86%
  First-Time, First-Year Freshmen Enrolled 511
  Yield Percentage (Enrolled as % of Accepted) 35%
  Transfer Applications 103
  Transfers Enrolled 46

Admission Quality (Fall 2005)
  Average ACT Composite 24
  Average High School GPA 3.2
  Percent in top tenth of their high school graduating class 24%

Student Enrollment (Fall 2005)
  Full-time Undergraduate 1922
  Part-time Undergraduate 65
  Total Undergraduate 1987
  Total Graduate 63
  Total Enrollment (Fall 2005) 2050

Gender - Undergraduates
  Men 43%
  Women 57%

Ethnicity - Degree-Seeking Undergraduates (Fall 2005)
  Nonresident Aliens 2%
  Black, non-Hispanic 1%
  American Indian or Alaskan Native 1%
  Asian or Pacific Islander 1%
  Hispanic 2%
  White, non-Hispanic 92%
  Race/Ethnicity Unknown 1%

Geographic Representation
  States represented 22
  Foreign Countries represented 16

Percent of Residential Students (Fall 2005) 77%

Largest Undergraduate Majors (% of Degrees Granted 04/05)
  Business 20%
  Elementary Education 11%
  Communications 11%

Degrees Awarded (2004-2005)
  Undergraduate (First Majors Only) 462
  Graduate 10

Four year graduation rate (1999 Cohort) 64%
Six year graduation rate (1999 Cohort) 71%
Freshmen to Sophomore Retention Rate (2004 Cohort) 88%

Student/Faculty Ratio (Fall 2005 Undergraduate) 13.8/1
Average Class Size (Fall 2004) 20

Instructional Faculty (Fall 2005)
  Full-time Instructional Faculty 109
  Part-time Instructional Faculty 68
  Part-time Instructional Faculty - Full-time Equivalent 32
  Percent of Instructional Faculty that are female 38%
  Percent of Instructional Faculty that are male 62%
  Percent of Full-time Instructional Faculty with a doctorate, first professional, or other terminal degree 92%
Total Employees - Faculty and Staff (Fall 2005) 615

Financial Aid (Fall 2004)
  Percent of students receiving aid 96%
  Average financial aid award per recipient $16,308
  Average need-based institutional grant of full-time UGs $11,568
  Percent of First-time, First-Year Freshmen need that was met 88%
  Percent of Undergraduate student need that was met 86%
  Average financial indebtedness of graduates who were financial aid recipients $20,770

Tuition & Fees (2005-2006)
  Tuition $22,209
  Fees $300
  Room & Board $6,068

Finances (Fiscal year 2005)
  Endowment (5/31/05) $52.1 mil.
  Operating budget $46.0 mil.
  Expenses:
    Instruction 26.3%
    Research 0.9%
    Public Service 1.0%
    Academic Support 7.8%
    Student Service 13.7%
    Institutional Support 21.8%
    Operation and Maintenance of Plant 6.0%
    Auxiliary Enterprises 16.3%
    Interest on Indebtedness 0.7%
    Depreciation 5.5%
  % of Revenue from Tuition & Fees 46.9%

Campus Life
  Registered clubs and organizations 68
  Fraternities and Sororities 9
  Percent of students who join fraternities/sororities/organizations 41%
  National Honor Society Chapters on SNC campus 8
  Student Publications 2
  Musical performance ensembles (band and choral) 5

Intercollegiate Sports
  Men: Baseball, basketball, cross country, football, golf, ice hockey, soccer, tennis, and track and field (indoor & outdoor)
  Women: Basketball, cross-country, golf, soccer, softball, tennis, track & field (indoor & outdoor), volleyball, swimming & diving

Placement: More than 95% of SNC students are employed or attending grad. school when surveyed 9 months after graduation.

Advancement
  Alumni of Record (Fiscal year ending 5/31/05) 17,319
  Alumni Participation Rate (Fiscal year ending 5/31/05) 22%