Institutional Assessment Report
Academic Year 2016
Executive Summary

The annual Institutional Assessment Report (IAR) brings together evidence from different sources that address the same guiding question: How well does student learning match our expectations? The IAR summarizes the University's efforts to: collect and analyze information about student learning in academic programs, the core curriculum and co-curricular areas; draw conclusions about the evidence collected; and translate those conclusions into actions to improve learning. The IAR is the public face of a process that is conducted internally by faculty and staff for the purpose of identifying where improvements can be made.

Academic programs continue to show maturation in their assessment processes. The number of programs with notable "best practice" components expands every year. Curriculum maps, which align learning outcomes to courses, increased to 34. Programs continue to use varied measures to directly examine or observe student knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors. Almost all assessment measures are embedded in course requirements rather than add-ons. Review of assessment reports uncovered occasional areas of needed improvement, such as learning outcomes that are too broad, insufficient data reporting, incomplete reflection, missing curriculum maps or lack of rigor. Twenty-eight programs did not report assessment results for AY 2016. Many of these took the year to re-vamp assessment plans. Others had too few students for a formal report.

Assessment of student learning in the co-curricular areas was suspended in AY2016 with the design of a new framework of learning outcomes in five domains. Co-curricular units created a comprehensive, integrated student experience map to identify activities that provide students with opportunities to acquire learning in each domain. In future years, learning in the domains will be assessed across units.

Assessment in the two designated knowledge areas of "Rhetoric" and "Mathematical Reasoning" revealed opportunities to strengthen curriculum and pedagogy in future years.

Retention and graduation rates, and pass rates on licensure and certification exams, monitor student success in ways that are more understandable to external stakeholders. Marquette students' pass rates exceed national rates on most tests where comparison data exists. The first-year retention rate (89%) and six-year graduation rate (81%) is stable over time and compares favorably to other selective universities, while leaving room for improvement.

Finally, students' self-assessment of their perceived development in cognitive and socio-cultural areas, gathered through the annual Graduating Senior Survey, provides another dimension of learning. Graduating seniors are most likely to credit their Marquette education with increasing their abilities to write, analyze quantitative information, use technology, and access information resources. In the socio-cultural domains, students report growing most in their abilities to assume leadership and responsibility; contribute to a team; articulate personal values; and use reflective thinking.

Institutional Assessment Report
Academic Year 2016

The annual Institutional Assessment Report (IAR) brings together evidence from different sources that address the same guiding question: How well does student learning match our expectations? The IAR summarizes the University's efforts to: collect and analyze information about student learning in academic programs, the core curriculum and co-curricular areas; draw conclusions about the evidence collected; and translate those conclusions into actions to improve learning. The IAR is the public face of a process that is conducted internally by faculty and staff for the purpose of identifying where improvements can be made.

I. Program Assessment

Program assessment is the foundation of assessing learning in academic disciplines. In AY 2016, a total of 90 degree and certificate programs reported results of student learning assessment in the Assessment Reporting Management System (ARMS). These reports may not represent all of the programs' assessment activities for the year.

Programs use varied approaches to assessing student learning and results of those assessments cannot be aggregated across programs. Instead, programs are monitored for their implementation of measures and intended use of results. In AY 2016, the University Assessment Committee created an Assessment Process Rating Guide to provide information to programs undergoing Academic Program Review on the perceived effectiveness of their processes. In addition, program assessment reports are reviewed each November at the annual Peer Review Seminar, where programs with particularly well written assessment reports are recognized. Table 1 lists examples of these programs, with several "best practice" components linked.

Table 1. Academic year 2015-16 Programs with 'Best Practice' Components

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS			
Program	**College**	**Program Assessment Leader**	**Best Practice**
Operation and Supply Chain Management	Business Administration	Bharatendu Srivastava	Reflection on evidence
Marketing Major	Business Administration	Steve Lysonski	Learning outcomes, methods and measures, reflection on evidence, action steps
Clinical Mental Health Counseling Masters	Education	Alan Burkard	Curriculum map, learning outcomes, reflection on evidence, action steps
Clinical Laboratory Science Major	Health Sciences	April Harkins	Methods and measures, rubrics, benchmark data, reflection
Physician Assistant Studies Masters	Health Sciences	Mary Jo Wiemiller	Learning outcomes, methods and measures, reflection on evidence, action steps

Political Science Major	Arts & Sciences	Lowell Barrington	Methods and measures, reflection on evidence
Anthropology Major	Arts & Sciences	Sameena Mulla	Action steps
Advertising Major	Communication	Joyce Wolburg	Learning outcomes, rubrics
Public Relations Major	Communication	Gee Ekachai	Rubrics
Biomedical Sciences Major	Health Sciences	Kevin Siebenlist & Autumn Hollenkamp	Reflection on evidence, action steps, follow up on action steps
Nursing Masters	Nursing	Christine Shaw	Rubrics
Nursing PhD	Nursing	Margaret Bull	Rubrics, reflection on evidence
Healthcare Technologies Management Masters	Engineering	Jay Goldberg	Rubrics
Accounting Major	Business Administration	Michael Akers	Learning outcomes, rubrics, reflection on evidence, action steps
Information Technology Major	Business Administration	Terence Ow	Learning outcomes, methods and measures
English Major	Arts & Sciences	Amy Blair	Reflection on evidence, action steps

A curriculum map is a matrix that shows where in the program's curriculum each learning outcome will be addressed. Developing a curriculum map helps program faculty coordinate their instruction so that there are no gaps or unnecessary redundancies in a coherent curriculum. As a follow-up to the Higher Learning Commission's recommendation to increase the alignment of courses to program learning outcomes, the University Assessment Committee promoted this practice in the Colleges. In AY2016, the number of programs with mapping increased to 34. Table 2 lists examples of good practice curriculum maps, with links to those maps.

Table 2. Selected "Good Practice" Curriculum Maps

Program	**Program Assessment Leader (PAL)**
Anthropology Major	Sameena Mulla
Biological Sciences Major	Tony Gamble
English Major	Amy Blair
German Major	John Pustejovsky
MSCS Math for Elementary School Teachers Major	Marta Magiera
Accounting Major	Kevin Rich
Real Estate Major	Mark Eppli
Executive MBA	John Cotton
Digital Media Major	Amanda Keeler
School Counseling (or) Clinical Mental Health Masters	Alan Burkard
Biomedical Engineering Major	Taly Gilat-Schmit
Nursing Major	Jill Guttormson

Most programs measured multiple learning outcomes and used multiple measures. Direct measures examine or observe student knowledge, skills, attitudes or behaviors. The most frequently used direct measures in undergraduate programs are written assignments, locally developed exams, tests or quizzes, and final projects (Table 3). Commonly used direct measures in graduate programs include oral presentations or exhibitions, locally-developed exams, tests or quizzes, written assignments, research papers/projects, and thesis/dissertations.

Indirect measures evaluate perceived learning and may be used to supplement direct measures. Surveys are commonly used indirect measures.

Table 3. Types of Measures Reported in AY2016 Assessment Reports

DIRECT MEASURES

	Undergraduate Programs	Graduate Programs
Locally Developed Exam/Test/Quiz	19	16
Pre- and Post- Measure of Subject Area Knowledge	1	
Essay Question on Exam	9	9
Portfolio	1	3
Case Studies	4	4
Standardized Instrument	7	8
Oral Presentation or Exhibition	8	18
Written Assignment	23	13
In-Class Discussion	5	5
Final Project	15	5
Research Paper/Project	9	12
Thesis/Dissertation		12
Simulations	1	3
Formal Evaluation of Professional Skills	6	11
Other	6	3
Student Self-Assessment	2	2

INDIRECT MEASURES

	Undergraduate Programs	Graduate Programs
Survey	6	7
Benchmarks/Comparison with Peers	2	3
Data Indicators	1	
Other	3	

During Peer Review, program assessment leaders meet for roundtable discussions on assessment within their programs. Table 4 summarizes the most frequent feedback provided for their AY 2016 assessment reports.

Table 4. Most Frequent Feedback on AY 2016 Assessment Reports*

Types of Feedback	Number of Instances
Please provide curriculum map with next year's report.	27
Program has a clear and organized Assessment process; yields valuable information about student learning.	20
As a result of assessment, program reflected a focused plan to address and implement information from this year's report.	11
Description of learning outcome is too broad.	11
The document you submitted as a curriculum map is not actually a curriculum map.	7
Assessment yielded useable data, but reflection could use more detail about the trends revealed in the data.	7
May consider diversifying types of measures.	5
Detailed data not provided for measures.	3
Many/most students "exceed" expectations; consider increasing rigor	3

Note: **Bold** indicates best practice; *Italics* indicate concerns or areas for growth.

**Feedback provided by Devonna Jackson and comments from the table discussions at the Peer Review Seminar on November 11, 2016.*

Twenty-eight programs did not report assessment results for AY 2016. Of these, 8 formally requested time off to revise their assessment approaches (Table 5).

Table 5. Programs without Assessment Reports for Academic Year 2015-16

College	Program
Arts and Sciences	● Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematical Economics Major (H) ● Peace Studies Major (H) ● Physiological Science Major ● Philosophy Social and Applied Specialization Masters ● Classics Major (H) ● German Major (H) ● History Major ● Public Service Masters (H) ● Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Major (H) ● Spanish Masters (H) ● Chemistry Masters ● Philosophy Major ● Philosophy PhD ● MSCS Bioinformatics Masters ● MSCS Computing Master's ● Chemistry PhD
Business Administration	• Entrepreneurship Major ● Leadership Studies Masters (H) ● Graduate Certificate in Leadership Studies ● Graduate Certificate in Sports Leadership ● Business Administration Executive Masters
Education	● EDPL Educational Policy and Leadership PhD
Engineering	● Construction Engineering Major ● Mechanical Engineering Masters ● Mechanical Engineering PhD ● Biomedical Engineering Major
Graduate school	● Transfusion Medicine/Blood Centers Masters ● Interdisciplinary PhD

(H) = Approved Hiatus for AY2016

Co-Curricular Learning Outcomes

In AY 2016, the co-curricular programs suspended individual unit assessment in favor of designing a new system to assess the outcomes of the co-curricular experience across multiple units. Participating units designed a framework of learning outcomes centered around five domains. Each unit then listed the main activities engaging students with these domains, including level and number of students involved and length of participation. From this comprehensive experience map, a subcommittee of student affairs and academic support staff undertook an iterative process to extract a smaller, representative set of activities to address student development in each domain. Their work continued through AY2017, and will culminate with the identification of assessment measures across units. Implementation in at least one domain will commence with the Fall 2017 semester.

Knowledge Area Assessment

The University Core of Common Studies assessment system includes an assessment of nine knowledge areas, assessed on a four-year rotating cycle. In AY 2016, Rhetoric and Mathematical Reasoning were assessed.

Rhetoric:

The knowledge area of Rhetoric was assessed in the 2015-16 academic year through the first-year English (FYE) program and the COMM 1110 Course . Students in the FYE program were assessed across the programs introductory courses: ENGL 1001 (academic literacies) and ENGL 1002 (public literacies). The data was comprised from a random sample of final assignments across Units 1-4 within each course where students were ranked proficient, competent, or developing on rubric scales. Approximately 20-25% of students are sampled per unit. The COMM 1110 course used persuasive writing assignments to assess the use of rhetorical strategies across three identified learning outcomes. In Spring, FYE focus groups were conducted with faculty to review and assess data from the 2015-16 academic year.

Results showed that across assignments in each course a majority (77% to 89%) of students were ranked either proficient (P) or competent (C) in any assessed unit category. In COMM 1110, the majority of students either met or exceed rubric qualifications for the persuasive writing assignments used in that course. Although students showed success across the assignments assessed, the sections of the rubric where students showed less proficiency suggest that the current ENGL 1001 curriculum may need to increase concentration on fundamental aspects of writing such as the development of ideas and arguments; this will help better prepare students for later courses. In response, The FYE program instituted a pilot curriculum program for ENGL 1001 in the spring of 2016.

The complete report can be accessed at:

http://www.marquette.edu/english/first-year/documents/FYE-Rhetoric_Assessment_Report-2016.pdf

Mathematical Reasoning

The knowledge area of Mathematical Reasoning was assessed in the 2015-16 academic year using the largest sections of Core courses in mathematics: MATH 1390—Finite Mathematics, MATH 1400—Elements of Calculus, MATH 1450—Calculus, MATH 1700—Modern Elementary Statistics. Three learning objectives

within this knowledge area were assessed within the four courses listed above, and students were ranked using a three-point scale of proficient, competent, or developing. When assessing the three learning objectives, results showed that most students either met or exceeded expectations on rubrics across all four Core courses. However, results revealed that data on areas where students had trouble varied across the Core classes. This suggests that having different rubrics for each class may be impacting the ability to effectively rate student performance across a uniform set of learning objectives. In response, it was proposed that the instructors from each course meet to construct a joint rubric that allows for cohesion amongst the design of test questions and incorporation of Core objectives.

[continue below]

Standardized Licensure and Certification Exam Results

Standardized licensure and certification exams offer the opportunity to monitor student achievement of learning outcomes and benchmark results against external data. Table 6 shows the past five years of pass rates on certification exams with national or state benchmark comparisons.

Table 6. Pass Rates on Certification Exams

Program, Name of Test	**2011-12**		**2012-13**		**2013-14**		**2014-15**		**2015-2016**	
Accounting, Certified Public Account Exam	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**
Undergraduate (first-time test-takers)	68%	54%	74%	55%	74%	55%	71%	55%	61%	54%
Number of MU students participating	96	n/a	95	n/a	113	n/a	135	n/a	164	n/a
Graduate (first-time test-takers)	59%	65% (WI)	65%	69% (WI)	46%	73% (WI)	52%	66% (WI)	57%	67% (WI)
Number of MU students participating	14	n/a	17	n/a	13	n/a	23	n/a	21	n/a
Program, Name of Test	**2011-12**		**2012-13**		**2013-14**		**2014-15**		**2015-2016**	
Finance, Certified Financial Analyst Exam	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**
Level 1	75%	38%	65%	38%	76%	43%	67%	42%	70%	43%
Number of MU students participating	16	n/a	17	n/a	17	n/a	12	n/a	10	n/a
Program, Name of Test	**2011-12**		**2012-13**		**2013-14**		**2014-15**		**2015-2016**	
Education	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**
Undergraduate – Praxis II Content Area Knowledge Test	100%	100% (WI)	100%	100% (WI)	100%	100% (WI)	100%	98% (WI)	100%	99% (WI)
Number of MU students participating	99	n/a	113	n/a	108	n/a	119	n/a	138	n/a
School Counseling – Praxis II School Counseling and Guidance Exam	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a
Number of MU students participating	8	n/a	6	n/a	5	n/a	7	n/a	3	n/a
Community Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling, National Certification Exam	96%	83%	96%	84%	100%	84%	100%	89%	100%	89%
Number of MU students participating	24	n/a	27	n/a	15	n/a	18	n/a	22	n/a

Program, Name of Test	**2011-12**		**2012-13**		**2013-14**		**2014-15**		**2015-16**	
Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Board of Certification Exam	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**Mu**	**Nat'l**
	100%	77%	100%	84%	92%	86%	100%	79%	87%	80%
Number of MU students participating	15	n/a	13	n/a	13	n/a	14	n/a	15	n/a
Physical Therapy, PES National Licensure Exam (first-time test-takers)	**2011-12**		**2012-13**		**2013-14**		**2014-15**		**2015-16**	
	MU	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**Mu**	**Nat'l**
	93%	90%	93%	91%	98%	93%	98%	93%	97%	94%
Number of MU students participating	61	n/a	61	n/a	59	n/a	59	n/a	62	n/a
Athletic Training, National Athletic Trainers' Association (first-time test-takers)	**2011-12**		**2012-13**		**2013-14**		**2014-15**		**2015-16**	
	MU	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**
	92%	81%	100%	75%	100%	86%	100%	83%	100%	86%
Number of MU students participating	12	n/a	11	n/a	10	n/a	11	n/a	11	n/a
Physician Assistant Studies, National Certification Exam (first-time test-takers)	**2011-12**		**2012-13**		**2013-14**		**2014-15**		**2015-16**	
	MU	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**
	100%	93%	100%	94%	100%	96%	100%	95%	100%	96%
Number of MU students participating	47	n/a	48	n/a	48	n/a	48	n/a	54	n/a
Speech-Language Pathology, Praxis Exam (first-time test-takers) ***	**2011-12**		**2012-13**		**2013-14**		**2014-15**		**2015-16**	
	MU	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**	**MU**	**Nat'l**
	100%	86%	100%	90%	100%	90%	100%	84%	100%	n/a
Number of MU students participating	21	n/a	32	n/a	25	n/a	25	n/a	30	n/a

Program, Name of Test	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
Nursing	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	Mu	Nat'l
NCLEX-RN (all first-time test takers)	84%	88%	92%	90%	82%	82%	81%	85%	82%	88%
Number of MU students participating	133	n/a	133	n/a	122	n/a	158	n/a	169	n/a
American Nurses Credentialing Center (ANCC) – Adult Primary Care NP Certification Exam (*Adult Gerontology Primary Care NP Certification Exam) or American Academy of Nurse Practitioners Certification Program (AANPCP) Adult Primary Care NP Certification Exam	100%	91% (ANCC)	100%	85% (ANCC)	*92%	*84% (ANCC)	100% (ANCC) 100% (AANCP)	81% (ANCC) 83% (AANCP)	95% (ANCC)	80% (ANCC)
Number of MU students participating	14	n/a	26	n/a	26	n/a	*25 (ANCC) 5 (AANCP)	n/a n/a	20 (ANCC)	n/a
ANCC – Adult Acute Care NP Certification Exam (** Adult Gerontology Acute Care NP Certification Exam)	95%	92% (ANCC)	100%	87% (ANCC)	**82%	**85% (ANCC)	**87%	**84% (ANCC)	94%	87%
Number of MU students participating	12	n/a	16	n/a	17	n/a	**23	n/a	17	n/a
ANCC – Pediatric Primary Care NP Certification Exam or Pediatric Nursing Certification Board (PNCB) Pediatric Primary Care NP Certification Exam or ANCC Pediatric CNS Certification Exam	100%	90% (PNCB)	86%	91% (PNCB)	91%	89% (PNCB)	100%	88% (PNCB)	78% (PNCB)	91% (PNCB)
Number of MU students participating	15	n/a	7	n/a	11	n/a	13	n/a	9	n/a
PNCB Pediatric Acute Care NP Certification Exam	80%	81%	75%	84%	88%	86%	83%	74%	83%	71%
Number of MU students participating	5	n/a	4	n/a	8	n/a	6	n/a	6	n/a

ANCC Gerontology NP Certification Exam or AANPCP Gerontology NP Certification Exam	100%	96% (ANCC)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of MU students participating	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
American Midwifery Certification Board (AMCB) Nurse Midwifery Certification Exam	88%	88%	88%	88%	100%	92%	100%	92%	100%	95%
Number of MU students participating	8	n/a	8	n/a	7	n/a	7	n/a	7	n/a
Commission on Nurse Certification (CNC) Clinical Nurse Leader Certification Exam	n/a	75%	100%	75%	100%	92%	n/a	65%	67%	n/a
Number of MU students participating	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	n/a

* **In 2013-14, the ANCC exams for both the Adult Primary Care NP and the Adult Acute Care NP were changed to incorporate more gerontology (older adult) content and the names of the certification exam were changed to reflect this. So the new name of the ANCC primary care NP exam is (*) Adult Gerontology Primary Care NP Certification Exam, and the ANCC acute care NP exam is now (*) Adult Gerontology Acute Care NP Certification Exam. All the (*) students listed in 2013-14 took the (*)exams, whereas students in prior years took the former (unasterisked) exam.

*** Numbers on the ASHA website do not represent “first time pass rates”. Rather they include all test administrations for a given interval

Students' self-assessment of their perceived development in cognitive and socio-cultural areas provides important evidence of student learning. This information is gathered through the annual Graduating Senior Survey. Table 7 displays the results from the AY 2016 GSS. Graduating seniors are most likely to credit their Marquette education with increasing their abilities to write, analyze quantitative information, use technology, and access information resources. In the socio-cultural domains, students report growing most in their abilities to assume leadership and responsibility; contribute to a team; articulate personal values; and use reflective thinking.

Table 7: 2016 Graduating Senior Survey

How much did your Marquette education contribute to your ability to: (n=800)	A great deal	Somewhat	A little	Not at all
Write clearly and logically	51%	40%	8%	1%
Analyze quantitative information	57%	32%	9%	1%
Appropriately use the technology and tools of your field	55%	34%	10%	2%
Locate, evaluate and effectively use research and information resources	51%	39%	9%	2%
Give effective oral presentations	45%	42%	10%	3%
Use knowledge from the social sciences to understand individual and social behavior	43%	40%	13%	4%
Use scientific inquiry to understand problems and evaluate information	49%	34%	14%	3%
Appreciate the value of history in understanding the past and present	31%	40%	22%	7%
Interpret works of literature	27%	39%	25%	9%
Appreciate great works of art, music and drama	24%	30%	29%	17%
Identify your career goals	53%	32%	11%	4%

Compared to when you entered Marquette, how much have you grown in your ability to: (n=781)	A great deal	Somewhat	A little	Not at all
Assume leadership responsibilities in your professional and community life	72%	23%	4%	1%
Take responsibility for your own behavior	75%	20%	3%	1%
Contribute effectively to a group or team	65%	31%	3%	1%
Build relationships with individuals across different cultures	57%	29%	11%	3%
Articulate your personal values and beliefs	61%	31%	6%	1%
Recognize injustice in society	60%	28%	9%	3%
Understand the value of community involvement and contributing to the greater good	64%	25%	9%	2%
Serve the community of which you are apart	50%	35%	13%	2%
Exhibit compassion toward others in your actions	64%	28%	7%	1%
Use reflective thinking to expand self-knowledge, growth and maturity	64%	28%	6%	2%
Recognize the advantages and challenges of a diverse society	60%	30%	8%	2%
Engage in behaviors that promote health and wellness	51%	34%	11%	4%

Data Indicators of Student Success

Data indicators for retention, graduation, employment and enrollment in further education are also evaluated for evidence of success.

On average, 90% of freshmen are retained and about 80% of an entering cohort graduates within 6 years. These rates compare very favorably to other selective universities.

Table 8: Fall to subsequent fall retention rates of cohorts

	2011 to 2012	2012 to 2013	2013 to 2014	2014 to 2015	2015 to 2016
Percent retained	88%	91%	89%	90%	89%
Initial cohort	2,056	1,927	1,989	1,989	1,872
Number retained	1,809	1,748	1,763	1,790	1,663

Table 9: Graduation rates of entering freshmen cohorts

Cohort	Size	Total Percentage Graduating Within:		
		4 years	5 years	6 years
2003	1,882	59.8%	78.7%	79.9%
2004	1,802	62.0%	79.8%	81.0%
2005	1,775	61.0%	80.2%	81.4%
2006	1,842	59.5%	78.4%	80.2%
2007	1,811	57.3%	76.8%	78.2%
2008	1,950	59.0%	77.4%	79.3%
2009	1,946	53.8%	78.4%	79.7%
2010	1,931	60.1%	78.9%	80.5%

The 2016 Undergraduate Post-Graduation Outcomes Survey reports that six months following graduation, 56% are employed full time; 24% are enrolled in graduate or professional school full-time; 2% are engaged in full-time post-graduation service, such as the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps or the Jesuit Volunteer Corps; 2% are in the activity military; 8% are still seeking employment; and 8% report another activity or are not seeking employment.

Follow-up information from the Student Clearinghouse verifies that after one year, 25% of baccalaureate recipients have enrolled at a four-year college or university. After eight years, about 49% of a given graduation cohort will have pursued additional postsecondary education, and 39% will have graduated with another degree.