

Institutional Assessment Report

Academic Year 2017

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 47. 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 some consistently noted areas for improvement, such as learning outcomes that are too broad, insufficient data reporting, or incomplete analysis of results and conclusions.

The co-curricular programs have suspended individual unit assessment in favor of a new system to assess five domains of the co-curricular experience across multiple units. In AY2017, units representing Domain A (Life Skills) collaborated to identify measures across units and begin collecting evidence. The measures include student reflections, artifacts and presentations scored by staff and peers, performance evaluations, advisor ratings, focus groups and surveys, among others. After analyzing the evidence from these measures, a work group will turn the results back to the units for identification of action steps to strengthen student learning.

With a new Core Curriculum finalized and scheduled for implementation in fall 2018, efforts to assess the former knowledge areas and institutional learning outcomes were phased out in 2017-18. Specific learning outcomes have been articulated for the new core, and an assessment plan will be phased in with implementation.

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 (80%) 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 2017

The annual Institutional Assessment Report (IAR) brings together evidence from different sources that address the same guiding question: How well does evidence of 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 2017, a total of 78 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. Most programs without AY2017 reports have formally requested time off (“hiatus”) to revise their assessment approaches.

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. Several years ago, 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 “good practice” components linked.

Table 1. Academic year 2016-17 Programs with ‘Good Practice’ Components

| ACADEMIC PROGRAMS | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Program | College | Program Assessment Leader | Best Practice |
| English Major | Arts and Sciences | Amy Blair | Learning outcomes |
| MSCS Computer Science Major | Arts and Sciences | Dennis Brylow | Learning outcomes, measures, evidence |
| Spanish Major | Arts and Sciences | Todd Hernandez | Speaking Rubric, Writing Rubric |
| Spanish Masters | Arts and Sciences | Todd Hernandez | Rubric |
| Human Resources Masters | Business Administration | Gary Adams | Learning outcomes, measures |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Marketing Major | Business Administration | William Barrett | Learning outcomes, action steps |
| Communication Masters | Communication | Sarah Feldner | Reflection, action steps, rubric |
| Digital Media Major | Communication | Amanda Keeler | Reflection |
| Journalism Major | Communication | Ana Garner | Evidence, reflection, action steps |
| Teacher Certification Elementary Major | Education | Karen Evans | Reflection |
| Computer Engineering Major | Engineering | Susan Schneider | Rubrics, evidence |
| Electrical and Computer Engineering PhD | Engineering | James Richie | Rubrics |
| Physician Assistant Studies Masters | Health Sciences | David Delwiche | Measures |
| Nursing Major | Nursing | Jill Guttormson | Action steps |
| Nursing Masters | Nursing | Christine Schindler | Learning outcomes |

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 has promoted this practice in the Colleges. In AY2017, the number of programs with mapping increased to 47. 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) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Accounting Major | Kevin Rich |
| Biological Sciences Major | Tony Gamble |
| Clinical Mental Health Counseling Masters | Alan Burkard |
| Communication Studies Major | Scott D’Urso |
| Digital Media Major | Amanda Keeler |
| English Major | Amy Blair |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| German Major | John Pustejovsky |
| MSCS Mathematics for Elementary School Teachers Major | Marta Magiera |
| Nursing Major | Jill Guttormson |
| Theatre Arts Major | Connie Petersen |

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, formal evaluation of professional skills, 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 AY2017 Assessment Reports

DIRECT MEASURES

Number of Programs Using This Type of Direct Measure for One or More Learning Outcome

| | Undergraduate Programs | Graduate Programs |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Locally Developed Exam/Test/Quiz | 20 | 16 |
| Pre- and Post- Measure of Subject Area Knowledge | 1 | |
| Essay Question on Exam | 8 | 9 |
| Portfolio | 1 | 3 |
| Case Studies | 5 | 5 |
| Standardized Instrument | 5 | 10 |
| Oral Presentation or Exhibition | 10 | 19 |
| Written Assignment | 25 | 17 |
| In-Class Discussion | 4 | 5 |
| Final Project | 14 | 6 |
| Research Paper/Project | 11 | 14 |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------|---|----|
| Thesis/Dissertation | | 13 |
| Simulations | 2 | 3 |
| Formal Evaluation of Professional Skills | 5 | 14 |
| Other | 6 | 4 |
| Student Self-Assessment | 1 | 2 |

INDIRECT MEASURES

| | Undergraduate Programs | Graduate Programs |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Survey | 6 | 7 |
| Benchmarks/Comparison with Peers | 1 | 4 |
| Data Indicators | 1 | 2 |
| Other | 1 | 2 |
| Student Self-Assessment | 2 | 1 |
| Interviews or focus groups | 1 | 1 |

Feedback on the assessment report was provided to each program, using the Assessment Process Rating Guide. Many common strengths were discovered among reports, especially in areas of learning outcomes, measures and evidence collection. Common positive feedback included “very clear and measurable learning outcomes,” “good breakdown of evidence within a rubric,” and “very thorough reflection and identification of program strengths and challenges as revealed by evidence.” Many programs also offered excellent curriculum maps aligning their outcomes with courses or experiences within their program. Areas of improvement were also identified and offered to each program in the feedback process. Table 4 summarizes the most common constructive feedback provided for the AY2017 assessment reports to help programs strengthen their future assessment processes.

Table 4. Most Frequent Feedback Addressing Areas for Improvement on AY 2017 Assessment Reports*

| Types of feedback | Number of instances |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| More detail needed in reflection - what did you learn from your evidence? | 36 |
| Please provide curriculum map/what you have provided is not a curriculum map. | 30 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Lack of information on data collection process/ assessment activities are not sufficiently described. | 27 |
| Website link does not lead to program learning outcomes/No link provided. | 24 |
| Please use a more descriptive and measurable verb than 'demonstrate' or 'understand' | 22 |
| Please consider updating your assessment plan. | 19 |
| Learning outcome(s) are too broad/bundled. | 17 |
| Measures are not diagnostic (grades, test scores). | 16 |
| Action steps did not emerge from reflection or evidence. | 16 |
| Please provide timeline/responsible persons for action steps. | 16 |
| Measures are worded as learning outcomes; measures should identify instruments. | 10 |
| More diagnostic rubric/process is needed. | 9 |
| Is your criteria challenging enough? | 8 |

**Feedback provided by Margaret Duffy*

II. 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. In AY2017, units representing Domain A (Life Skills) collaborated to identify measures across units and begin collecting evidence. The measures include student reflections, artifacts and presentations scored by staff and peers, performance evaluations, advisor ratings, focus groups and surveys, among others. In summer 2018, a work group will analyze the evidence from these measures and draw conclusions about student development in the Life Skills domain. The results will be turned back to the units for identification of action steps to strengthen student learning. Thereafter, evidence from two domains per year will be collected, reviewed, and acted upon.

III. Core Curriculum

With a new Core Curriculum finalized and scheduled for implementation in fall 2018, efforts to assess the former knowledge areas and institutional learning outcomes were phased out in 2017-18. The development of the revised Core began with identifying the learning outcomes that should underpin the new core and every undergraduate student's experience. Course content development then followed from the articulated learning outcomes, thus aligning them more concretely and deliberately with the outcomes. Specific [learning outcomes](#) have been articulated for the new core, and an assessment plan will be phased in with implementation. In the first year of implementation, common assignments from Theology, Philosophy and Rhetoric will be scored by faculty during an annual assessment workshop.

IV. 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 5 shows the past five years of pass rates on certification exams with national or state benchmark comparisons.

Table 5. Pass Rates on Certification Exams

| Program, Name of Test | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| 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) | 74% | 55% | 74% | 55% | 71% | 55% | 61% | 54% | | |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 95 | n/a | 113 | n/a | 135 | n/a | 164 | n/a | | |
| Graduate (first-time test-takers) | 65% | 69% (WI) | 46% | 73% (WI) | 52% | 66% (WI) | 57% | 67% (WI) | | |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 17 | n/a | 13 | n/a | 23 | n/a | 21 | n/a | | |
| Program, Name of Test | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
| Finance, Certified Financial Analyst Exam | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l |
| Level 1 | 65% | 38% | 76% | 43% | 67% | 42% | 70% | 43% | 62% | 43% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 17 | n/a | 17 | n/a | 12 | n/a | 10 | n/a | 13 | n/a |
| Program, Name of Test | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
| 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% | 98% (WI) | 100% | 99% (WI) | 97% | 97% (WI) |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 113 | n/a | 108 | n/a | 119 | n/a | 138 | n/a | 86 | 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 |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 6 | n/a | 5 | n/a | 7 | n/a | 3 | n/a | 7 | n/a |
| Community Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling, National Certification Exam | 96% | 84% | 100% | 84% | 100% | 89% | 100% | 89% | 100% | 92% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 27 | n/a | 15 | n/a | 18 | n/a | 22 | n/a | 23 | n/a |

| Program, Name of Test | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----|
| Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Board of Certification Exam | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | Mu | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | |
| | 100% | 84% | 92% | 86% | 100% | 79% | 87% | 80% | 100% | 80% | |
| | <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | | 13 | n/a | 13 | n/a | 14 | n/a | 15 | n/a | 11 |
| Physical Therapy, NPTE National Licensure Exam (first-time test-takers) | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | |
| | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | Mu | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | |
| | 93% | 91% | 98% | 93% | 98% | 93% | 97% | 94% | 100% | 94% | |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | | 61 | n/a | 59 | n/a | 59 | n/a | 62 | n/a | 61 | n/a |
| Athletic Training, National Athletic Trainers' Association (first-time test-takers) | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | |
| | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | |
| | 100% | 75% | 100% | 86% | 100% | 83% | 100% | 86% | 100% | 87% | |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | | 11 | n/a | 10 | n/a | 11 | n/a | 11 | n/a | 8 | n/a |
| Physician Assistant Studies, National Certification Exam (first-time test-takers) | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | |
| | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | |
| | 100% | 94% | 100% | 96% | 100% | 95% | 100% | 96% | 100% | 97% | |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | | 48 | n/a | 48 | n/a | 48 | n/a | 54 | n/a | 53 | n/a |
| Speech-Language Pathology, Praxis Exam (first-time test-takers) *** | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | |
| | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | |
| | 100% | 90% | 100% | 90% | 100% | 84% | 100% | 81% | 100% | 82% | |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | | 32 | n/a | 25 | n/a | 25 | n/a | 30 | n/a | 39 | n/a |

| Program, Name of Test | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------------|------------|------|-------|------|-------|
| | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l | Mu | Nat'l | MU | Nat'l |
| Nursing | | | | | | | | | | |
| NCLEX-RN (all first-time test takers) | 92% | 90% | 82% | 82% | 81% | 85% | 82% | 88% | 92% | 90% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 133 | n/a | 122 | n/a | 158 | n/a | 169 | n/a | 159 | 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% | 85% (ANCC) | *92% | *84% (ANCC) | 100% (ANCC) | 77% (ANCC) | 94% | 80% | 100% | 77% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 26 | n/a | *26 | n/a | 24 (ANCC) | n/a | 19 | n/a | 22 | n/a |
| ANCC – Adult Acute Care NP Certification Exam (** Adult Gerontology Acute Care NP Certification Exam) | **100% | **87% (ANCC) | **82% | **85% (ANCC) | 86% | 86% (ANCC) | 94% | 88% | 94% | 82% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | **16 | n/a | **17 | n/a | **21 | n/a | 17 | n/a | 16 | 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 | 91% | 89% (PNCB) | 100% | 88% (PNCB) | 100% (PNCB) | 85% (PNCB) | 78% | 85% | 100% | 87% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 11 | n/a | 13 | n/a | 13 | n/a | 9 | n/a | 14 | n/a |
| PNCB Pediatric Acute Care NP Certification Exam | 75% | 84% | 88% | 86% | 83% | 74% | 83% | 71% | 90% | 77% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 4 | n/a | 8 | n/a | 6 | n/a | 6 | n/a | 10 | n/a |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|---------|------|-----|
| ANCC – Adult Gerontology Clinical Nurse Specialist (AGCNS-BC) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 100% | 79% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 0 | n/a | 0 | n/a | 0 | n/a | 0 | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| American Midwifery Certification Board (AMCB) Nurse Midwifery Certification Exam | 88% | 88% | 100% | 92% | 43% | 95% | 100% | unknown | 78% | 93% |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 8 | n/a | 7 | n/a | 7 | n/a | 7 | n/a | 9 | n/a |
| Commission on Nurse Certification (CNC) Clinical Nurse Leader Certification Exam | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 100% | 62% | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| <i>Number of MU students participating</i> | 0 | n/a | 0 | n/a | 2 | n/a | 0 | n/a | 0 | 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 6 displays the results from the AY 2017 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 6: 2017 Graduating Senior Survey

| How much did your Marquette education contribute to your ability to: (n=923) | A great deal | Somewhat | A little | Not at all |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------|----------|------------|
| Write clearly and logically | 51% | 40% | 8% | 1% |
| Analyze quantitative information | 57% | 36% | 6% | 2% |
| Appropriately use the technology and tools of your field | 56% | 34% | 7% | 2% |
| Locate, evaluate and effectively use research and information resources | 54% | 36% | 8% | 1% |
| Give effective oral presentations | 50% | 38% | 10% | 2% |
| Use knowledge from the social sciences to understand individual and social behavior | 46% | 40% | 12% | 3% |
| Use scientific inquiry to understand problems and evaluate information | 50% | 33% | 15% | 3% |
| Appreciate the value of history in understanding the past and present | 34% | 39% | 21% | 5% |
| Interpret works of literature | 31% | 38% | 25% | 7% |
| Appreciate great works of art, music and drama | 26% | 31% | 27% | 16% |
| Identify your career goals | 55% | 30% | 11% | 4% |

| Compared to when you entered Marquette, how much have you grown in your ability to: (n=912) | A great deal | Somewhat | A little | Not at all |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------|----------|------------|
| Assume leadership responsibilities in your professional and community life | 68% | 27% | 4% | 1% |
| Take responsibility for your own behavior | 74% | 21% | 4% | 1% |
| Contribute effectively to a group or team | 63% | 32% | 4% | 1% |
| Build relationships with individuals across different cultures | 57% | 29% | 13% | 2% |
| Articulate your personal values and beliefs | 63% | 29% | 6% | 2% |
| Recognize injustice in society | 63% | 27% | 7% | 2% |
| Understand the value of community involvement and contributing to the greater good | 63% | 28% | 7% | 2% |
| Serve the community of which you are apart | 54% | 31% | 13% | 2% |
| Exhibit compassion toward others in your actions | 62% | 30% | 6% | 2% |
| Use reflective thinking to expand self-knowledge, growth and maturity | 60% | 30% | 8% | 1% |
| Recognize the advantages and challenges of a diverse society | 65% | 26% | 7% | 2% |
| Engage in behaviors that promote health and wellness | 52% | 32% | 12% | 4% |

V. 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, 89% 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 7: Fall to subsequent fall retention rates of cohorts

| | 2012 to 2013 | 2013 to 2014 | 2014 to 2015 | 2015 to 2016 | 2016 to 2017 |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Percent retained | 91% | 89% | 90% | 89% | 89% |
| Initial cohort | 1,927 | 1,989 | 1,989 | 1,872 | 2,002 |
| Number retained | 1,748 | 1,763 | 1,790 | 1,663 | 1,787 |

Table 8: 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% |
| 2011 | 2,056 | 59.0% | 79.0% | 80.2% |

The 2017 Undergraduate Post-Graduation Outcomes Survey reports that six months following graduation, 58% are employed full time; 23% 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; 7% 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 38% will have graduated with another degree.