Institutional Student Learning Outcomes Report

Fall 2022

In 2017, Gustavus Adolphus College adopted a new set of institutional student learning outcomes with a preamble:

Gustavus Adolphus College students experience an innovative and rigorous liberal arts education, which equips students to develop their skills to engage broadly and purposefully with the world. As an institution, we commit our time and resources to helping students attain their full potential as persons, developing in them a capacity and passion for lifelong learning, ethical reflection, civic engagement, and global concern that prepares them for lives of leadership and service while maintaining their personal wellbeing. We are also committed to the regular assessment of four institutional student learning outcomes that measure skills that will help our students attain their potential so they can be productive, engaged members of a global community working for the common good. These four outcomes do not replace nor take precedence over our larger commitments, but serve them. Students shall develop, practice, and demonstrate these skills across the college, just as all parts of the college are united in the commitments above.

- Analyze enduring and contemporary questions from multiple perspectives.
- Demonstrate the ability to reason and communicate effectively in written and oral modes.
- Demonstrate competence with the content and methods of a particular field of study.
- Implement an effective strategy to address an open-ended question or to solve a multi-faceted problem.

Our institutional assessment plan prioritizes assessment at the department, program, and office level because we believe that we can most effectively evaluate student learning and institute change at that level. We do, however, gather information related to our institutional student learning outcomes, both to consider whether there are patterns or problems we should address and to lift out some of the many places students learn and demonstrate the habits, skills, and aptitudes. Thus, our institutional assessment report includes two parts.

1. Qualitative data taken from Division of Student Life and co-curricular assessment reports related to one SLO each year. This qualitative data offers a glimpse of how our students are learning and demonstrating the SLOs outside of the classroom.
2. Quantitative data taken from department and program assessment reports related to each ISLO. These data cover multiple years so that we can look for patterns and changes over time. At this point, our numbers are generally good. We see more students scoring in the Exemplary and Proficient categories in 200 and 300 level courses than we do in 100 and 200 level courses. Remember that these comparisons occur within a given year, so we are not looking at the trajectory of student cohorts.

Qualitative Data

Co-curricular activities provide opportunities for Gustavus students to practice and demonstrate skills related to developing strategies to solve complex problems. Below are selected examples from Student Life and co-curricular assessment reports:

- Assessment data for the Gustie Greeters (student orientation group leaders) indicate that Gustie Greeters practice skills related to conflict management and problem solving while Greeters and then transfer their problem-solving abilities, particularly around DEI (Student Life Assessment, Campus Activities, 2018-2019).

- Assessment data for the Campus Activities Board indicated that students developed problem-solving skills as they executed events and that Student Organization leaders developed those skills as they planned events and managed budgets (Student Life Assessment, Campus Activities, 2018-2019).
- Assessment data for the Community Engagement Office demonstrated that working with community partners provided opportunities for students to learn problem-solving. The percentage of students who disagreed with the statement "My experiences at Gustavus have enabled me to plan or help implement an initiative that improves the community" and "My Gustavus education has given me the knowledge and professional skills that I need to address community issues." Declined from pre-test in the Fall to post-test in the Spring (4% and 8% respectively) (Student Life Assessment, Community Engagement, 2018-2019)
- Assessment data for the Academic Support Center indicates that students on academic probation who were required to meet with ASC staff gained important knowledge and confidence that will enable them more proactively to access academic resources (again, the development of problem-solving strategies). More students indicated that they had a plan for returning to good academic standing and that they intended to or had availed themselves of offices and resources on campus (Student Life Assessment, Academic Support Center, 2021-2022).
- Assessment related to Residential Life also demonstrates opportunities for learning. The Fall and Spring satisfaction survey ask students, for example, if they are able to prioritize academic and social success. Interestingly, 63.04% of students agreed or strongly agreed in the Fall while 50% of student agreed or strongly agreed in the Spring. Most responses on questions related to strategy fell from Fall to Spring. The College might want to consider if this reflects a different set of student responses (and a lower response rate in the Spring), students coming to a more honest assessment of their capabilities over the course of the academic year, or a need for some kind of intervention programming that extends beyond Residential Life (or all three).
- Assessment related to implementing career plans (something for which we want all student to have a strategy) also indicates learning. In Spring 2022 (at the time of graduation) 62.6% of students reported being situated (with a 86.6% response rate). The Career Development Center will continue to follow-up with the class. (Student Life Assessment, Career Development, 2021-2022).

Qualitative Data (see next page)

ISLOs 2018-2019						
	Exemplary %	Proficient %	Emerging %	Not Demonstrated %	Exemplary +Proficient	Emerging + Not Demonstrated
Field All (n=1122)	15.06%	53.30%	22.19%	9.45%	68.36%	31.64%
Communication All (n=560)	15.36%	51.96%	29.64%	3.04%	67.32%	32.68%
Analyze All (n=321)	21.50%	45.48%	31.46%	1.56%	66.98%	33.02%
Strategy All (n=872)	13.30%	49.89%	25.46%	11.35%	63.19%	36.81%
Field Lower (n=841)	10.23%	52.32%	25.80%	11.65%	62.54%	37.46%
Communication Lower (n=399)	16.54%	51.38%	28.07%	4.01%	67.92%	32.08%
Analyze Lower (n=256)	20.31%	41.02%	37.11%	1.56%	61.33%	38.67%
Strategy Lower (n=779)	11.30%	48.65%	27.60%	12.45%	59.95%	40.05%
Field Upper (n=281)	29.54%	56.23%	11.39%	2.85%	85.77%	14.23%
Communication Upper (n=161)	12.42%	53.42%	33.54%	0.62%	65.84%	34.16%
Analyze Upper (n=65)	26.15%	63.08%	9.23%	1.54%	89.23%	10.77%
Strategy Upper (n=93)	30.11%	60.22%	7.53%	2.15%	90.32%	9.68%
Field Change	19.31%	3.91%	-14.41%	-8.81%	23.22%	-23.22%
Communication Change	-4.12%	2.04%	5.47%	-3.39%	-2.08%	2.08%
Analyze Change	5.84%	22.06%	-27.88%	-0.02%	27.90%	-27.90%
Strategy Change	18.81%	11.56%	-20.07%	-10.30%	30.37%	-30.37%

	Exemplary %	Proficient %	Emerging %	Not Demonstrated %	Exemplary +Proficient	Emerging + Not Demonstrated
			ISLOs 2019-2020			
Field All (n=1122)	37.70%	42.87%	13.19%	6.24%	80.57%	19.43%
Communication All (n=725)	40.69%	43.17%	11.31%	11.31%	83.86%	22.62%
Analyze All (n=406)	38.42%	46.80%	10.34%	4.43%	85.22%	14.78%
Strategy All (n=606)	42.57%	41.91%	11.72%	3.80%	84.49%	15.51%
Field Lower (n=702)	40.31%	35.19%	16.52%	7.98%	75.50%	24.50%
Communication Lower (n=424)	45.56%	35.51%	12.62%	5.37%	81.07%	17.99%
Analyze Lower (n=190)	36.84%	44.74%	8.95%	9.47%	81.58%	18.42%
Strategy Lower (n=441)	42.86%	41.04%	11.34%	4.76%	83.90%	16.10%
Field High (n=420)	33.33%	55.71%	7.62%	3.33%	89.05%	10.95%
Communication High (n=297)	32.32%	54.21%	9.43%	4.04%	86.53%	13.47%
Analyze High (n=216)	39.81%	48.61%	11.57%	0.00%	88.43%	11.57%
Strategy High (n=165)	41.82%	44.24%	12.73%	1.21%	86.06%	13.94%
Field Change	-6.98%	20.53%	-8.91%	-4.64%	13.55%	-13.55%
Communication Change	-13.24%	18.69%	-3.19%	-1.33%	5.46%	-4.52%
Analyze Change	2.97%	3.87%	2.63%	-9.47%	6.85%	-6.85%
Strategy Change	-1.04%	3.20%	1.39%	-3.55%	2.16%	-2.16%

	Exemplary %	Proficient %	Emerging %	Not Demonstrated %	Exemplary +Proficient	Emerging + Not Demonstrated
ISLOs 2020-2021						
Field All (n=1202)	34.36%	38.35%	20.80%	6.49%	72.71%	27.29%
Communication All (n=718)	27.30%	46.10%	23.68%	2.92%	73.40%	26.60%
Analyze All (n=892)	34.08%	38.34%	23.43%	4.15%	72.42%	27.58%
Strategy All (n=441)	27.66%	43.99%	26.76%	1.59%	71.66%	28.34%
Field Lower (n=1076)	33.09%	38.29%	21.84%	6.78%	71.38%	28.62%
Communication Lower (n=607)	22.08%	48.60%	26.69%	2.64%	70.68%	29.32%
Analyze Lower (n=819)	31.62%	39.68%	24.42%	4.27%	71.31%	28.69%
Strategy Lower (n=366)	24.04%	43.99%	30.05%	1.91%	68.03%	31.97%
Field High (n=126)	45.24%	38.89%	11.90%	3.97%	84.13%	15.87%
Communication High (n=111)	55.86%	32.43%	7.21%	4.50%	88.29%	11.71%
Analyze High (n=73)	61.64%	23.29%	12.33%	2.74%	84.93%	15.07%
Strategy High (n=75)	45.33%	44.00%	10.67%	0.00%	89.33%	10.67%
Field Change	12.15%	0.60%	-9.94%	-2.82%	12.75%	-12.75%
Communication Change	33.78%	-16.17%	-19.48%	1.87%	17.61%	-17.61%
Analyze Change	30.02%	-16.39%	-12.09%	-1.53%	13.63%	-13.63%
Strategy Change	21.29%	0.01%	-19.39%	-1.91%	21.30%	-21.30%

	Exemplary %	Proficient %	Emerging %	Not Demonstrated %	Exemplary +Proficient	Emerging + Not Demonstrated
			ISLOs 2021-2022			
Field All (n=1021)	30.26%	36.34%	26.74%	6.66%	66.60%	33.40%
Communication All (n=825)	38.30%	33.21%	23.15%	5.33%	71.52%	28.48%
Analyze All (n=1249)	36.35%	36.43%	22.02%	5.20%	72.78%	27.22%
Strategy All (n=553)	33.45%	36.34%	22.06%	7.78%	69.79%	29.84%
Field Lower (n=707)	25.18%	36.21%	31.82%	6.79%	61.39%	38.61%
Communication Lower (n=433)	25.40%	34.64%	32.10%	7.85%	60.05%	39.95%
Analyze Lower (n=703)	27.03%	37.98%	28.59%	6.40%	65.01%	34.99%
Strategy Lower (n=383)	28.72%	36.55%	26.11%	8.62%	65.27%	34.73%
Field High (n=314)	41.72%	36.62%	15.29%	6.37%	78.34%	21.66%
Communication High (n=392)	52.55%	31.63%	13.27%	2.55%	84.18%	15.82%
Analyze High (n=546)	48.35%	34.43%	13.55%	3.66%	82.78%	17.22%
Strategy High (n=170)	44.12%	37.06%	12.94%	5.88%	81.18%	18.82%
Field Change	16.54%	0.41%	-16.54%	-0.42%	16.96%	-16.96%
Communication Change	27.15%	-3.01%	-18.84%	-5.30%	24.14%	-24.14%
Analyze Change	21.32%	-3.55%	-15.04%	-2.74%	17.78%	-17.78%
Strategy Change	15.40%	0.51%	-13.17%	-2.73%	15.90%	-15.90%