

Lewis & Clark College

Portland, Oregon

Year Seven Self-Evaluation Report

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness

August 2025

PREPARED FOR

THE NORTHWEST COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Table of Contents

Contents

Standard One – Student Success and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness	5
Institutional Overview	5
Preface.....	6
Institutional changes since last report.....	6
Response to Outstanding Recommendations	7
Standard 1.A. Institutional Mission.....	8
Our Mission	8
Our Values.....	8
Standard 1.B.1. Ongoing, Systematic Evaluation and Planning	10
Institutional-Level Planning.....	11
College of Arts & Sciences.....	16
Graduate School of Education and Counseling Planning.....	19
Law School Planning.....	21
Standard 1.B.2 Meaningful Goals, Objectives, and Indicators.....	23
Institutional Overview.....	23
College of Arts & Sciences.....	25
Graduate School.....	27
Law School.....	29
Standard 1.B.3 - Inclusive Planning Process.....	31
College of Arts & Sciences.....	33
Graduate School.....	35
Law School.....	36
Standard 1.B.4 - Monitoring Internal and External Environments	37
College of Arts & Sciences.....	38
Graduate School.....	41
Law School.....	42
Standard 1.C.1 - Program Content and Rigor.....	44
College of Arts & Sciences.....	44
Graduate School.....	46
Law School.....	47

Lewis & Clark College

Standard 1.C.2 – Evidence of admissions and graduation requirements widely published and easily accessible.....	48
College of Arts & Sciences.....	48
Graduate School.....	50
Law School.....	50
Standard 1.C.3 - Expected Program and Degree Learning Outcomes are Identified and Published	52
College of Arts & Sciences.....	52
Graduate School.....	52
Law School.....	53
Standard 1.C.4 - Admission and completion requirements clearly defined, published	54
College of Arts & Sciences.....	54
Graduate School.....	54
Law School.....	55
Standard 1.C.5 - Effective System of Assessment to Evaluate the Quality of Learning in Programs.....	56
College of Arts & Sciences.....	56
Graduate School.....	63
Law School.....	67
Standard 1.C.6 - Effective Assessment of General Education Curriculum and Institutional Learning Outcomes.....	68
Overview of Lewis & Clark General Education Program.....	69
Standard 1.C.7 - Results of assessment efforts Used to Inform Planning and Practice and for Continuous Improvement.....	72
College of Arts & Sciences.....	72
Graduate School.....	80
Law School.....	80
Standard 1.C.8 - Transfer Credit and Credit for Prior Learning is Accepted According to Clearly Defined, Widely Published Policies.....	81
College of Arts & Sciences.....	82
Graduate School.....	83
Law School.....	83
Standard 1.C.9 - Graduate Programs are Consistent with Mission and Differ From Undergrad Programs	84
Graduate School.....	85

Lewis & Clark College

Law School.....	85
Standard 1.D.1 - Student Potential to Benefit/Succeed	87
Institutional Overview	87
College of Arts & Sciences.....	87
Graduate School.....	88
Law School.....	89
Standard 1.D.2 - Student Achievement Indicators are Disaggregated, Compared	91
College of Arts & Sciences.....	91
Graduate School.....	94
Law School.....	94
Standard 1.D.3 - Student Achievement Indicators (Benchmarked and Published)	96
College of Arts & Sciences.....	96
Graduate School.....	97
Law School.....	97
Standard 1.D.4 - Transparent Student Achievement Indicators	98
Institutional Overview	98
College of Arts & Sciences.....	99
Graduate School.....	102
Law School.....	102
Conclusion	103
Addendum	107
Response to Findings.....	107
Distance Education Addendum.....	107
Finding.....	107
Institutional Response.....	107

Standard One – Student Success and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Institutional Overview

Lewis & Clark, a premier institution of higher education located in Portland, Oregon, is made up of three schools: the undergraduate College of Arts & Sciences, the Graduate School of Education and Counseling and the Law School. The undergraduate college enrolls approximately 2,100 students and, through its liberal arts education model, offers an enriching, career-accelerating education grounded in real world issues through 28 majors and 34 minors.

The Graduate School of Education and Counseling provides programs for educators and mental health professionals who want to engage communities and transform people's lives. It is home to two departments and offers nine accredited degree programs, including MAT, EdS, and MEd degrees. The Graduate School offers state-of-the-art low- and no-cost mental health services through their Community Counseling Center, including specialized care such as problem gambling services.

Lewis & Clark Law School, Portland's only law school, is recognized for its expertise in many specialty areas of law as well as its scholarship and practical experiences. The school enrolls more than 600 students in its part-time and full-time programs, and its LLM and MSJ degrees attract many international students. In addition, the law school operates clinics that provide individuals and small businesses in Oregon with legal support, such as their Small Business Legal Clinic and the Low-Income Tax Clinic.

All three schools are known for rigorous academics, experiential learning, strong community engagement, and a commitment to equipping students with the knowledge and skills to advance their careers, promote justice, and address urgent societal challenges facing our communities and the world.

Lewis & Clark is structured with a "strong dean" model. Each of the three schools is managed by a dean who reports directly to the president. Lewis & Clark does not have a provost. Under the direction of the president, and with oversight by the Board of Trustees, each school develops and manages its own budget, makes recommendations about tuition and fee rates, and retains its revenue (subject to established requirements to support the central administration of the institution). The faculties of each school have their own bylaws and processes and, working with their respective dean, set their own policies regarding academic matters. Each of the deans is a member of the president's Executive Council, which meets weekly and helps to assure that the institution as a whole, as well as each of the three schools, operate in an efficient and complementary manner. The sum of the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Accordingly, throughout this report, you will read about processes to evaluate institutional effectiveness at a broad institutional level and for each of the three schools.

Lewis & Clark College

Preface

Institutional changes since last report

Since our [Year Six: Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review](#) was submitted last year, the College has continued moving forward with our strategic planning processes. Revisions to the [Mission Statement](#) are complete and were adopted by the Board of Trustees at their October, 2024 meeting. The previous Core Themes serve as the underlying values of a Lewis & Clark Education and inform our strategic planning process and goals. We also continue to keep engagement with the community at the forefront of our planning and educational activities to ensure transparency and broad participation.

At the school level, Alicia Ouellette began her tenure as Dean of the Law School in January, 2025. Ouellette, who recently completed a nine-year tenure as president and dean of Albany Law School in Albany, New York, replaced Jennifer Johnson. Johnson had served as dean of Lewis & Clark Law School since 2014 and stepped down in August 2024. John Parry, associate dean of faculty, served as interim dean from August through December, 2024.

In March, the Law School successfully hosted its ABA reaccreditation site visit, and is awaiting findings from the Council on Legal Education. The Law School is currently engaging in a strategic planning process that started in April 2025. The new strategic plan is scheduled to be completed and presented to the Board at their December 2025 meeting.

Scott Fletcher, who served as Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Counseling since 2008 stepped down from his deanship this summer. Succeeding Fletcher is Andrew Saultz, who previously served as interim dean at Pacific University's College of Education. His tenure began on August 4, 2025.

Finally, the newly formed [Staff Council](#) completed its first full year of service. The Council held eight open meetings (four each semester) in order to disseminate information, discuss issues of importance to staff, and help build community and camaraderie with staff across all three schools and the Common Services.

Lewis & Clark College

Response to Outstanding Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Fall 2018 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability - Develop and implement an assessment plan for the new General Education curriculum that aligns with Core Themes and program goals (Standards 2.C.9, 2.C.10, 4.A.1, and 4.B.2). Continued as Needs Improvement (and revised to Recommendation 1: Fall 2021 Mid-Cycle Review)

In their [Mid-Cycle Evaluation report](#), the evaluation team noted that we had made progress in creating the [framework](#) for our assessment of the General Education curriculum and that we had begun to implement said plan, but that we had yet to use the data collected in our decision-making processes. We are happy to share that as of this writing, we've completed assessment of all Gen Ed components both individually and collectively and over the last 18 months have spent considerable time reviewing and discussing findings. We are now well poised not only to continue assessment of General Education, but also to make appropriate adjustments to the curriculum and the assessment process to ensure that we stay abreast of the impacts of the program and changing needs of students. Standards [1.C.6](#) and [1.C.7](#) cover what we have accomplished thus far in terms of assessment and discussion as well as how we have used the data to inform decision making.

Lewis & Clark College

Standard 1.A. Institutional Mission

The institution's mission statement defines its broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement.

Our Mission

Lewis & Clark is a premier private higher education institution offering an exceptional education in an inclusive environment. By fostering critical thinking, innovation, creativity, civic engagement, and leadership, both inside and outside of the classroom, we prepare our students for lifelong success in a connected, rapidly evolving world. Our educational programs include meaningful engagement with research and scholarship and equip students with the knowledge and skills to advance their careers, promote justice, and address urgent societal challenges facing our communities and the world.

Our Values

- We believe in the power of higher education as both an individual benefit and a public good.
- We strive to be a driver of socioeconomic mobility, improving opportunities for economic and social advancement, through individualized educational programs that support students from enrollment through graduation, and beyond.
- We are guided by a commitment to diversity, equity, sustainability, global-mindedness, and the pursuit of a more just society.

The above [mission statement and accompanying values](#), adopted by resolution of the Board of Trustees in October, 2024 speaks to our commitment to prepare students for success in a rapidly changing world. To understand how we arrived here, it is important to review the previous mission statement and Core Themes to which it was tied.

Previous Mission Statement

The mission of Lewis & Clark College is to know the traditions of the liberal arts, to test their boundaries through ongoing exploration, and to hand on to successive generations the tools and discoveries of this quest. By these means the College pursues the aims of all liberal learning: to seek knowledge for its own sake and to prepare for civic leadership.

The College carries out this mission through undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences and postgraduate programs in the closely related professions of education, counseling, and law. The College mounts these programs as both separately valid and mutually supportive enterprises. In all its endeavors it seeks to be a community of

Lewis & Clark College

scholars who are alive to inquiry, open to diversity, and disciplined to work in an interdependent world.

Previous Core Themes

- Be a community of scholars vigorously engaged in learning, teaching, research and creative inquiry
- Be a community that integrates theory and practice within the overall educational experience.
- Be a community that commits itself to diversity and sustainability as dimensions of a just society.
- Be a community that cultivates leadership and engagement in a complex and interdependent world.

Adopted in 1997, this mission statement was designed to achieve two purposes. The first was to place Lewis & Clark within the long classical tradition that holds liberal education to be the fundamental preparation for society's future leaders. The second was to affirm that Lewis & Clark's two professional schools belong within the scope of that same tradition, and out of this intellectual affinity to seek to develop a special academic community of scholars and practitioners.

The language of the (previous) mission statement draws on a rhetoric of idealism and inspiration. It speaks of education in terms of quest, exploration, and endeavor that continue across generations; of learning and scholarship as worthy ends in themselves as well as the foundation of leadership; and of discipline, diversity, and community as enduring educational values that will shape a connected and interdependent global society.

In our 2018 Year-Seven Self-Evaluation report, we noted that

The recent development of the new [at that time] strategic plan and the upcoming start of a new accreditation cycle, the college will be revisiting both the mission and core themes, with attention on developing a new set of more appropriate indicators and identifying data needs. Between now and its next NWCCU report, the college expects to craft a revised mission statement and core themes that align with the strategic plan and use this plan as a guide toward measuring progress on meeting the plan goals.

Further, we noted that "the sense of mission implied by this statement looks toward future horizons through a wide-angle lens rather than focusing on clearly defined markers in the foreground" and that "mission accomplished" is a concept that fits awkwardly with this vision."

Lewis & Clark College

Thus, when we revisited the mission statement in conjunction with planned strategic initiative discussions over the last two years, we recognized the need to shift the language such that we could measure our aspirations against tangible results. We also recognized the importance of expressing the institutional mission in terms that better align with the current academic environment and speak to the aspirations of our potential students. The new mission statement speaks to specific skills (“critical thinking, innovation, creativity, civic engagement, and leadership”) necessary “for lifelong success in a connected, rapidly evolving world.”

The new mission statement continues to honor the liberal arts as a fundamental preparation for the future while also recognizing the importance of experiential learning and our commitment to social justice. It also speaks to the strengths and focus of all three schools, thus creating a singular institutional statement of mission, values, and goals.

Although Core Themes are not necessarily an articulated requirement of the 2020 Standards to which we are currently responding, the Core Themes Lewis & Clark had developed prior to our 2018 Self Evaluation Study still reflect our values and goals as an institution. These core themes (Community of Scholars, Integration of Theory and Practice, Commitment to Diversity and Sustainability, and Cultivation of Leadership and Engagement) helped inform the language of the current mission statement and are expressed as underlying values.

The references in the previous mission statement to “the traditions of the liberal arts,” “ongoing exploration,” and “discoveries of this quest,” coupled with the core themes are conveyed in the new mission statement via more conventional terms such as critical thinking, innovation, creativity, civic engagement, and leadership - acknowledging that this occurs both inside and outside the classroom. Success for today’s graduates of higher education requires both theoretical knowledge and practical skills. We wanted a mission statement that captured the spirit of a Lewis & Clark education while also helping our students and alumni articulate professional values.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.A.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">● L&C Mission Statement● Year Six: Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review

Standard 1.B.1. Ongoing, Systematic Evaluation and Planning

The institution demonstrates a continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness, including student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an

Lewis & Clark College

ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement.

Lewis & Clark assesses institutional effectiveness at both the micro and macro level starting with stated learning outcomes for individual courses, moving through program assessment, school-level outcomes, and to overall institutional key performance indicators. Our unique structure allows us to tailor our student learning and achievement assessments—and resource allocation—in each of the three schools.

The priorities within the previous and current strategic plans continue to inform and guide the work of the College, generally, and of each of the three schools, specifically. At the center is the unwavering commitment to working to support and strengthen learning, teaching, research, and creative inquiry. Academic planning, program development, and resource allocation are all informed by this commitment. The processes and data take several forms and may vary between the three schools, but the outcome and intention is the same: ongoing analysis and improvement.

Institutional-Level Planning

The Board of Trustees is responsible for “determ[in]g and “review[in]g periodically the purpose, mission, and priorities of the College and its schools” and for “ensur[in]g the educational quality of the institution and its academic programs,” among other duties. (See Article I, Section C of the [Restated Bylaws of Lewis & Clark College](#)). The board performs much of this work through its standing committees. The responsibilities of the standing committee are delineated in the [Standing Rules of the Board](#), which were comprehensively reviewed and rewritten in 2024.

Most relevant to this report, the duties of the Academic Affairs Committee include (among other things): ensuring that the institution’s academic, experiential learning, and research programs match and support its institutional mission; monitoring enrollment; monitoring the quality and accreditation of academic programs; monitoring student retention rates, graduation rates, and other appropriate metrics of student success; reviewing proposals to establish new degrees and providing advice regarding proposals for adding, modifying, or discontinuing academic programs and establishing academic affiliations with outside institutions; and making recommendations concerning policy matters relating to the academic affairs of the institution, including institutional policies regarding faculty and the protection of academic freedom.” Similarly, the duties of the Campus Life Committee include: monitoring programs and initiatives that complement academic programs by promoting student engagement and enriching the quality of student life beyond the classroom; monitoring programs and initiatives related to student health and wellbeing, including for athletics, overseas, summer and college outdoor programs; monitoring student retention rates, graduation

Lewis & Clark College

rates, overall satisfaction, and other appropriate metrics of student wellness and success.

Through regular meetings of these committees, as well as meetings of the full board, the Lewis & Clark Board of Trustees is continuously involved in assessing institutional effectiveness. Board members receive regular updates regarding metrics such as enrollment, student retention, job placement, Bar exam passage, and similar matters. The deans of all three schools attend all meetings of the Board's Academic Affairs Committee and answer questions about such matters. Summary information is also provided on at least an annual basis. (See, e.g., [FY2024 Annual Year-End Report](#)). Recently, in May 2025, the Academic Affairs Committee was updated regarding accreditation processes and standards, including the status of NWCCU accreditation, and reviewed and discussed [materials](#) regarding the importance of a board's role in accreditation processes.

In addition to ongoing assessment of institutional progress, the Board is also deeply engaged in strategic planning and monitoring. "Exploring for the Global Good" (the previous strategic plan) was written with the intention to more fully reflect the current state of institutional priority and focus at that time, while still closely aligning with the spirit of the priorities from the previous plan (The Journey Forward) as articulated in the Exploring for the Global Good Vision:

Lewis & Clark will be a national leader in higher education with programs that prepare students for meaningful careers, civic engagement, and lifelong discovery. Together we seek a just and sustainable society here in Portland and around the world.

The plan, [approved by the Board](#) in October 2017, included six objectives, for which the College developed a clear methodology for implementation, monitoring and assessment. The six objectives were:

1. Complete a comprehensive campaign for scholarships and other needs.
2. Attract, enroll, and graduate students who will succeed at Lewis & Clark.
3. Offer programs that provide opportunities for developing academic and personal interests and civic awareness.
4. Develop and maintain campus infrastructure and facilities appropriate for a selective, nationally competitive college.
5. Strengthen our diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts.
6. Recognize and reward our stellar faculty and staff.

Lewis & Clark College

Perhaps most importantly, the plan affirmed and reinvigorated our vision, purpose, and values, and made clear our aspiration to fully realize our potential to be a leading liberal arts college with a national and international reputation and two superb professional schools with reputations that enhance the whole. The Board of Trustees regularly monitored progress on these institutional strategic goals:

- A year after adoption of the Exploring for the Global Good strategic plan, the Board of Trustees was provided a comprehensive progress report. This [self-assessment “report card”](#) included a grade of red (“meaningful progress was not made in 2018-19”), yellow (“meaningful progress was made in 2018-19, but more needs to be done to be ‘on track’”), or green (“goal has been accomplished or is on track to be accomplished in the expected timeframe”) for each of the 23 specific items in the strategic plan. This report was also presented at faculty meetings and shared with key campus stakeholders. A shorter public version of this report was posted to the L&C Website¹.
- In October 2020, the board was again provided a report after the second year of implementation of the Strategic Plan. [This report](#) was provided in summary form, largely due to the pressing nature of the ongoing COVID crisis at the time. President Wiewel presented the report at the Board’s October 2020 meeting, describing key accomplishments and challenges for the six goals and 23 objectives of the plan in AY 2019-20.
- [In February 2021](#), the Board took a bit of a step back and reexamined the overall direction and focus provided in the Strategic Plan, particularly in light of the impacts of COVID. This meeting included a [presentation](#) from an expert at EAB regarding sector trends, contextual data benchmarking, and strategic differentiation. The Board was asked to consider whether the “niche” and strategic direction of the institution, as laid out in the Strategic Plan, continues to be right. This process reconfirmed the Board’s commitment to the current Strategic Plan, with a particular focus on new programs and initiatives that are squarely within the liberal arts tradition and also distinctive and attractive to students.
- The board again reviewed and discussed progress on the Strategic Plan at its October 2021 meeting. At this meeting, the board was updated on progress on each of the six strategic plan goals. Highlights that were discussed included:
 - Implementation of our initial Strategic Enrollment Management initiatives, such as the [four-year BA/MSL in environmental law](#), a

¹ The public progress reports for “Exploring for the Global Good” were removed from the website when the plan was concluded. [This PDF](#) is an example for the Committee’s reference. New progress reports will be posted as we assess the current strategic initiatives.

Lewis & Clark College

strengthened [five-year BA/MAT pathway](#), the [six year BA/JD program](#), and the expanded [Speech and Debate team](#).

- New undergraduate minors in [entrepreneurial leadership and innovation](#), [health studies](#), and [data science](#).
 - Launch of the [Center for Community and Global Health](#), offering pre-health and pre-med advising, coursework, internship experiences, and other collaborations and activities.
 - Implementation of new online programs at the Law School in [environmental, natural resources and energy law](#) and [animal law](#).
 - Launch or expansion of Graduate School programs in [Art Therapy](#) and [Student Affairs Administration](#).
 - Strong enrollment results in fall 2021.
 - Refinancing the College's existing debt and the securing of additional funding to support infrastructure investments, embarking on a \$17 million student center renovation, and securing City of Portland land use approval in a new zoning category.
 - Improved diversity of faculty and staff, with the percentage of faculty who identify as BIPOC increasing from 16.4% in fall 2017 to 23.1% in fall 2021, and staff who identify as BIPOC increasing from 13.2% to 15.1%.
 - Remaining on target to exceed the philanthropic campaign's goal of raising \$155 million by 2024.
- [In February 2023](#) the Board met for a two-day retreat focused on understanding the College's [competitive environment](#) and strategic opportunities, brainstorming about the College's distinctive strengths, development of common themes, and developing a strategic vision that lays the groundwork for a new strategic plan. This meeting was the beginning of the transition into the development of new strategic initiatives and goals, building on the accomplishments from the previous planning work and implementation.

Implementation of the strategic plan was led by the Executive Council, which consists of the president, the three academic deans, and the vice presidents. The Executive Council helps to set priorities, monitors progress on institutional goals, and supports and advises the president, while the members of the Executive Council also lead their respective units and advance and monitor progress on institutional goals within their units. The Executive Council generally meets weekly, with agendas set by the president, in consultation with the other members.

In fall 2023, following this initial work by the Board of Trustees, the Executive Council engaged in an institution-wide SWOT analysis and [EAB presented to and led a broad conversation with the board](#) regarding the state of the higher education sector and best

Lewis & Clark College

practices in dynamic strategy planning. This formally kicked off the campus-wide planning process that followed, with key steps then including:

- In December 2023, a group of faculty and staff participated in a workshop facilitated by EAB to address the question, “Why would a student choose us over competitors?”
- In January 2024, a group of faculty and staff participated in a presentation and exercise, led by EAB, on how the best practices of futurists can be applied to strategic planning.
- In March 2024, the College hosted a Big Ideas Workshop with faculty and staff. This kicked off proposals for new initiatives or for the enhancement of existing activities, with a focus on potentially transformative ideas that will resonate with donors and advance the key themes identified in the strategic planning process.
- In April 2024, the College held an in-person Strategic Plan Big Ideas and Initiatives Workshop, facilitated by EAB, for faculty and staff who had begun formulating new plans or thinking about the enhancement of existing activities. This was an opportunity to work on translating ideas into strategic proposals.
- From June to October 2024, the Executive Council completed an initial review and assessment of Big Ideas proposals and used them to inform a first draft of the strategic imperatives that was shared with faculty and staff and the Board of Trustees. Community feedback and discussion events were used to help revise the document prior to review and adoption by the Board.

The October, 2024 Board of Trustees meeting marked the culmination of this first phase of strategic planning, with approval of the above [new institutional mission statement](#) and [three strategic imperatives](#) to guide our work going forward. These imperatives serve as the guiding principles of more detailed planning work, led by the [Strategic Initiatives Advisory Council](#), and of our next philanthropic campaign.

The Strategic Initiatives Advisory Council concluded its work at the end of the 2024-2025 academic year. Through extensive discussion and an inclusive, iterative process involving faculty, staff, students, and external partners, they crafted a set of recommendations designed to activate the full potential of the L&C Advantage and position Lewis & Clark for leadership and success. An [executive summary](#) and the [full report](#) outlining these recommendations are available to L&C community members on the L&C Website (and attached as PDFs in this report); an [overview of the process and recommendations](#) is available to the public. By fall 2025, the Executive Council will have identified the highest priority strategic initiatives to move forward in the 2025-26 academic year. The work of implementing these priorities will be led by a newly constituted Strategic Initiatives Committee, led by faculty, to coordinate this work

Lewis & Clark College

across the institution, working with established faculty shared governance structures. Each initiative will have identified timelines, goals and milestones that are developed in consultation with relevant faculty and institutional leadership. Annual reporting to the board will continue to be an important element of oversight and accountability.

Regarding resource allocation: The College regularly evaluates available resources primarily through two recurring and ongoing processes. The annual budget development process is the primary venue for ensuring that available resources are aligned with priorities and objectives. As discussed in other sections of this report and 2.e.1 and 2.E.2 of the [2024 PRFR](#), each of the schools has similar but separate processes for developing both operating and capital improvement budgets that align resources and priorities. At an institutional level, an amount is budgeted annually for a Strategic Initiative Fund (SIF) that, along with an endowment that provides funding for Presidential priorities, provides financial resources to be directed towards priorities identified in the planning processes. The SIF and President's Fund are often able to provide seed funding to kick start an initiative that may grow to be revenue generating.

Also, annually a set of financial ratios are monitored and reported to the Board's Finance Committee (see [2024](#) and [2025](#) examples). Decisions on resource utilization are made cognizant of these ratios and how the college compares with peer institutions.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) has multiple assessment systems to regularly review quality and effective delivery of our liberal arts curriculum, at the departmental and school level. Assessment and alignment of curriculum takes place through the following three mechanisms.

- External Reviews: Departments in the College of Arts and Sciences undergo decennial reviews in order to engage the faculty of the department/program in “reflection about their history, accomplishments, challenges, and future aspirations, and to provide advice to the department/program and College about how the department/program can be improved. We typically do two to three reviews annually. The review process consists of four components: (1) a departmental or program self-study; (2) a campus visit by a team of disciplinary experts; (3) a written report by the review team; and (4) a response from the department/program to the experts' review. The response must contain a list of proposed changes the department will make, based on the review, and a timeline / narrative describing the path to implementation. The Dean schedules a follow-up meeting (typically six months out) to assess progress of changes. For

Lewis & Clark College

more detail on this process, see the [Guide to Prepare for a Departmental or Program Review](#) (revised June 2024).

- Annual Departmental Planning: The College of Arts and Sciences instituted a process of Annual Departmental Planning (ADP) in Fall of 2024, a regular process, centering departments and programs in curricular planning, that requires Chairs to engage with departmental level data to assess course offerings and staffing levels. The year-long process aims to get departments and programs working more collaboratively with standardized data, with the overarching goal being a balance of curriculum, resources, and workload. For a full description and FAQ, see the [Annual Departmental Planning](#) page.
- General Education: The General Education Steering Committee regularly assesses the first-year CORE course and distribution requirements via an assessment framework that stipulates the goals, principles, and priority list for the new GE. See [1.C.6](#) for a detailed description of the process and [1.C.7](#) for a discussion of results and discussion.

In addition, the CAS underwent an extensive multi-year review of its process for evaluating teaching excellence and assessing individual courses via principles of student engagement and learning, inclusive environment, etc. The process culminated in a new set of guiding principles defining excellent teaching and a completely revised instrument for student evaluations of teaching (SET). Our revised teaching excellence principles now guide faculty review at all levels: developmental review of junior faculty, tenure and promotion review, and triennial (tenured) faculty review. The five principles, which include “foster classroom, laboratory, field, and studio environments that are conducive to student engagement and learning,” “promote student proficiencies in critical inquiry,” and “consider and respond collaboratively to student concerns and needs that impact their academic success,” can be found in our faculty handbook under [Excellence in Teaching in Assessment of Tenure Files \(II.A.5.A\)](#). As a result of developing new principles for teaching excellence, our student evaluation of teaching (SET) instrument (i.e. course evaluation assessment form) was overhauled to achieve two primary goals: mitigate implicit bias and provide useful feedback about and assessment of the teaching excellence principles. Two faculty whose research involves survey design and bias scholarship led the development of the new form over a 18-month period. They developed a preliminary set of open- and close-ended questions, solicited significant feedback from focus groups, and ran increasingly large pilot programs. In Spring 2024, a sample of eight faculty used the new form in 15 courses, with 208 students participating. In Spring 2025, over 90% of classes used the new form, with each iteration followed by feedback and revisions made to the format and to particular items. To date, faculty and student experiences have been extremely positive overall. Faculty generally thought these new forms produced more specific, actionable responses and that the new forms would be more useful than the old ones for guiding newer teachers’

Lewis & Clark College

development. The strong majority of students were also either neutral or favored this new form over the old. Students tended to focus on how the new questions felt more specific and fairer to the professor (N>20) and how they appreciated the opportunity to provide richer feedback (and also understood the benefits of doing so both in terms of helping faculty development and for increasing equity in the evaluation process). The new SET is expected to be approved by the faculty this Fall and will be used in all classes for Fall 2025 courses.

Student Life/Co-curricular

Ongoing, systematic evaluation and planning takes place in the Division of Student Life, as well. Some examples include:

- The Office of Campus Living develops and facilitates regular training for students involved with the department in leadership positions. Campus Living then assesses their learning by conducting performance evaluations each semester where the full-time staff members who supervise the students provide feedback to the student leaders. Student leaders also complete a self-assessment once a semester to let the department know how they perceive their performance and the training they received. Campus Living then uses that feedback each year to inform future training and development opportunities.

Additionally, Campus Living authors and administers a survey for all on-campus students each fall then analyzes the data to inform ongoing improvements to policy, process, and physical spaces.

- College Outdoors assesses program impacts through post-trip surveys for every trip. For trips during the semester, each student is asked to complete a trip survey. For New Student Trips (NSTs), all students complete a post-trip evaluation at the end of the trip, and they are encouraged to respond to The Outdoor Orientation Benchmark Survey (TOOBS), which is a national survey. Aspiring student Trip Leaders complete a Skills Checkoff matrix to assess their outdoor leadership skills in 10 core areas.

Trip surveys are reviewed weekly, and used to make program adjustments as needed. NST surveys are reviewed in the Fall, and used to adjust programming for the following year. Trip Leader skills checkoff matrixes are completed on a rolling basis as individual students grow in their leadership skills.

- Decisions regarding services, programs, and events in the Career Center are informed by the data collected from participant surveys via Qualtrics along with formal and informal feedback from program/event leaders that are relevant to the review process. Assessment surveys and follow-ups are sent to all

Lewis & Clark College

participants post-program and/or post-event. Additional qualitative feedback is sought from Peer Advisors in the Career Center. Assessment surveys for career advising are made available after each appointment. The Director and/or Sr. Associate Director review the service, program, or event feedback with the respective office lead in an individual meeting following the completion of a program or event. Services provided throughout the year, e.g. Career Advising, are reviewed on a quarterly basis with the lead. Each service, program, or event undergoes a further review at either a bi-weekly staff meeting or our annual year-end review meeting in May. Adjustments based on that review are made over the summer and incorporated into our semi-annual planning and budget meetings in early August and early January.

Examples from other Student Life offices can be found [here](#).

Graduate School of Education and Counseling Planning

The Graduate School's Quality Assurance System (QAS) plays a central role in leadership and decision-making for the unit. The GSEC dean regularly uses data from the Quality Assurance System for a variety of key organizational functions, including:

Enrollment Management

Credit hour reporting in the QAS is the basis for analyzing and reporting on program performance over time. The system also allows for us to examine more granular data related to yield profiles for each program. Almost everything that follows is based on our ability to apply this data to strategic decision making at the Graduate School.

Budget Projections

Budget projections are rooted in a combination of matriculant forecasting (headcount) and credit hour totals. Per credit tuition rates vary across different types of programming, which makes the QAS essential to increasing the accuracy of forecasts. The system is also used to forecast leaves and withdrawals, and to determine the size of the contingency built into annual budgets. Example: based on the budget shortfall in 2023-24, the director of finance and operations worked with the dean to develop a more complex system to forecast leaves and withdrawals. They were unexpectedly high that year and contributed to the impact of enrollment declines in two Graduate School programs. The budget forecast for 2024-25 was very accurate.

Faculty Search Authorizations and Other Staffing Decisions

Decisions about search authorizations are rooted in the enrollment and budget projections described above. As the QAS shows evidence of sustained enrollment increases, faculty positions are added. Conversely, when enrollment declines over time

Lewis & Clark College

in a program, filling position openings because of retirements or departures may be postponed or eliminated. Example: the dean held open a position (based on a retirement) in the School Psychology Program for 2024-25 based on an unexpected decline in enrollment the previous year. Enrollment rebounded in the current year and will grow again next year. Based on this data, the dean approved a new search and the program was successful in recruiting a new faculty member who will start in 2025-26.

Scholarship Distribution

Scholarship funding is distributed annually, based on the relative credit hour production of our two departments. The QAS allows us to distribute these funds in a fair and equitable manner. Example: when the Graduate School received two significant grants for scholarships (for counseling students) from the Oregon Health Authority, the dean was able to redistribute existing scholarship funds to education programs, expanding the support for students in both areas.

Demographic Analyses

It is critical that we understand the demographic constitution and trends in our programs, and to adjust recruitment, partnership, and outreach efforts accordingly. The QAS provides this information, along with the more detailed analysis of yield profiles (here by demographic category) described above. Example: based on demographic analyses at the program level, the dean was able to differentiate the relative success of various programs in recruiting BIPOC students. The programs that were more successful then led discussions at faculty meetings about some of the recruitment and outreach methods that they used. This has led to increased enrollment of BIPOC students in the last decade.

Reports to the College's Board of Trustees

The dean makes reports to the Academic Affairs Committee and Finance Committee at every meeting of the Lewis & Clark Board of Trustees. The QAS is the foundation for these reports. The board executes its fiduciary responsibilities based on the data in these reports, as well as making strategic planning recommendations to the leadership of the college. Example: the Board of Trustees approved the Graduate School's annual tuition and fee proposal at the February 2025 meeting.

Strategic Planning

The analyses and decision-making mechanisms described above are all central to strategic planning at the Graduate School. The dean leads this process, which involves every faculty and staff member. The results affect virtually every operation at the Graduate School and are monitored, evaluated, and revised on a continuous basis.

Lewis & Clark College

Please see [1.C.5](#) for a description of how the QAS functions in relation to student learning objectives and the use of data for academic program improvement.

Law School Planning

The Law School continually evaluates the effectiveness of our program of legal education, learning outcomes, and assessment methods through multiple mechanisms. Each year, we focus on our academic curriculum as a whole, engage in a plan to balance theoretical and experiential courses, and we review achievement outcomes.

The Law School has created and implemented the assessment plan, executed by the assessment committee, which will evaluate the Law School's five principal learning outcomes on a rolling basis over a period of three years. The plan requires us to collect relevant data, assess achievement of outcomes based on that data, and adjust as necessary our curriculum, teaching pedagogy, methods of course assessments, or the various support services the Law School provides. The plan provides that, every three years, the assessment committee will prepare a comprehensive and comparative report that (1) shows trends in student attainment of competency in our learning outcomes and (2) evaluates the assessment process for the purpose of improving the development and collection of direct measures of competency. Every year, the committee will report on the outcomes evaluated during that year.

In addition, our program of legal education has an ongoing and systematic review through the work of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA), the Curriculum Committee, and subject-matter committees. The methods of evaluation are long-standing elements of our faculty work, including our three-year plan and the oversight of the ADAA in auditing the curriculum. Subject-matter committees (or department committees) and other cohorts of faculty, such as our lawyering and clinical faculty, also evaluate curricular offerings throughout the year, particularly during the building of the three-year plan each fall semester. Taking into account enrollment patterns, trends in particular subject matter areas and relevant pedagogy, and student interest, each committee proposes a three-year plan that the ADAA reviews and incorporates into the institution-wide plan. Anytime an issue affects the curriculum as a whole, the entire faculty may discuss the issue, ultimately tasking specific committees, faculty, and administrative staff to develop proposals or implement new policies. The changes may require adjustments to curriculum, methods of assessment, or the various support services we provide to students. This year, we have begun the process of conducting a curriculum audit to systematically catalogue and analyze the total number of courses offered in our program of legal education, categorizing them by type (core, elective, experiential, foundational), subject area, and level to assess whether the course offerings align with our educational goals and provide adequate breadth and depth of learning opportunities. We will also assess the efficacy of those courses in producing competent and practice-ready lawyers in light of changes in pathways to licensure such

Lewis & Clark College

as the NextGen bar exam and Oregon’s Supervised Practice Portfolio Exam. As part of the process, we will complete curriculum mapping to ensure that all certificate programs align with our curricular goals and learning outcomes.

Numerous assessment methodologies have been employed across specific aspects of our program of legal education. For example, student performance in core classes and performance on core topics in bar exam study (and on bar exam itself when that information is available) has informed a review of our assessment methods across our 1L and doctrinal curriculum. We routinely have faculty colloquia on pedagogy and assessment, including the nature and style of final exams, formative assessment options, and the development of exam questions. Student evaluations across the curriculum and student reflection exercises in experiential courses also inform faculty assessment of our program of legal education.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.B.1

Institutional

- [Restated Bylaws of Lewis & Clark College](#) (see Article I, Section C)
- [Standing Rules of the Board](#)
- [Board Role in Accreditation Process](#) (discussion)
- [Self-Assessment “Report Card”](#) (former strategic plan, year one)
- [Self-Assessment Report](#) (former strategic plan, year two)
- [EAB Presentation](#) (sector trends, contextual benchmarking, strategic differentiation)
- [2023 Board Retreat Summary](#)
- [2023 Board Retreat Presentation](#)
- [EAB Presentation](#) (State of higher education sector, dynamic strategic planning)
- [L&C Strategic Imperatives](#)
- [Strategic Planning Executive Summary](#)
- [Strategic Planning Full Report](#)
- [Year Six: Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review](#)
- Board Finance Committee examples: [2024](#), [2025](#)

College of Arts and Sciences

- [Guide to Prepare for a Departmental or Program Review](#)
- [Annual Departmental Planning](#) Process
- [Excellence in Teaching in Assessment of Tenure Files \(II.A.5.A\)](#)
- [Student Life Strategic Planning examples.](#)

Graduate School of Education and Counseling

- [QAS Functions](#)

Lewis & Clark College

Standard 1.B.2 Meaningful Goals, Objectives, and Indicators

The institution sets and articulates meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators of its goals to define mission fulfillment and to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions.

Institutional Overview

The goals, objectives, and indicators set forth in our recently concluded strategic plan served as a means to define and measure mission fulfillment. We used direct and indirect measures to track progress toward these six goals:

- Strengthen, differentiate and promote the kind of academic experience we offer students.
- Attract, enroll, and graduate students who will succeed at Lewis & Clark.
- Offer programs that provide opportunities for developing academic and personal interests and civic awareness.
- Develop and maintain campus infrastructure and facilities appropriate for a selective, nationally competitive college.
- Strengthen our diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts.
- Recognize and reward our stellar faculty and staff.
- Complete a comprehensive campaign for scholarships and other needs.

Assessment of our progress toward these goals coupled with discussions about how best to further our mission and improve institutional effectiveness led to the new [Strategic Imperatives](#):

- Develop leaders to address global challenges.
- Scale our impact in Portland while increasing learning opportunities.
- Maximize the return on investment of a Lewis & Clark education and prepare students for economic opportunities and purposeful lives of consequence.

As noted previously, the words may have changed, but the values and purpose remain the same: Prepare our students for success in a rapidly changing world through a commitment to fostering critical thinking, innovation, creativity, civic engagement, and leadership, both inside and outside of the classroom.

By identifying three areas of focus and investment for the institution, these imperatives lay the groundwork for us to achieve success. These are the things we must do

Lewis & Clark College

differently or with greater scope and intensity while continuing to do the things we have long done well: in-person teaching, mentoring, research and scholarship, creative endeavors, a global focus with distinctive overseas study programs, professional education, and more.

We will continue to focus on improving key metrics of student success, such as graduation rates, retention rates, social mobility, bar exam passage, career placement, and similar measures of student outcomes and we will continue and expand investments in our physical infrastructure, as guided by the campus facilities plan. And, we will sharpen and better promote our institutional brand. Enhancing our overall reputation will help us better achieve all of our imperatives and objectives, including increased student enrollment and retention, as well as external influence and fundraising.

In order to effectively measure our success, we must look both internally (such as comparing ourselves to an established goal or monitoring change over time) and externally (such as comparisons with peer institutions). Further, we must consider both broad institutional and focused programmatic goals, for it is the success of the three individual schools that helps demonstrate the success of the institution as a whole.

Institution-level KPIs are tied mostly to financial, human, and capital resources and include tracking things such as financial ratios, loan default rates, endowment and spending per student, and progress toward capital projects. Employee engagement and satisfaction plays a role here, as well. Meeting the mission of the institution means that we have set up and maintained the structure, support, and resources to make sure the three schools can achieve the academic and programmatic goals and indicators of success they have set for themselves.

School-level KPIs vary by school and program, but generally include indicators such as retention and graduation rates, licensure/bar passage rates, engagement indicators, and post-graduate employment. Meeting emerging market needs (locally and globally) also matters. As discussed in [1.B.1](#) above, the Board of Trustees is regularly involved in assessing institutional effectiveness, through committee meetings, full-board meetings, and written materials. As noted above, board members receive regular updates about institutional and school-level KPIs and the deans of the three schools attend all meetings of the Board's Academic Affairs Committee and answer questions.

Peer (and aspirational) institutions are determined by a number of criteria, such as the institution's size, mission, academic offerings, the population(s) served, selectivity, and resources. Considering resources (endowment, spending per student, etc) plays an important role in helping set tuition, benchmarking compensation for employees, and, for the College of Arts and Sciences in particular, measuring student achievement and

Lewis & Clark College

outcomes². The unique structure of Lewis & Clark (a small, selective liberal arts college with graduate and professional schools) means that there are few institutions as a whole that can serve as peers. Further, both the Graduate School and Law School each have program-level assessments and accreditation processes that guide their work. Therefore, we maintain separate lists of peer institutions for each of the three schools ([CAS](#), [Graduate School](#), [Law School](#)).

Looking Ahead

Each recommendation from the Strategic Imperatives Advisory Committee includes strategies to activate the vision during the next academic year and transformative outcomes that will help us measure our progress. We intentionally did not set out to develop a static, incremental, top-down operational plan that is then episodically revisited. Rather, we adopted an approach that we felt would lead to more effective strategy formation and implementation.

By fall 2025, the College will have identified the highest priority strategic initiatives to move forward in the 2025-26 academic year. The work of implementing these priorities will be led by a newly re-constituted Strategic Initiatives Committee, led by faculty, to coordinate this work across the institution, working with established faculty shared governance structures. Each initiative will have identified timelines, goals and milestones that are developed in consultation with relevant faculty and institutional leadership. Annual reporting to the board will continue to be an important element of oversight and accountability.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

The faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences adopted an [L&C Identity Statement](#) in December 2016 to inform our vision of helping students prepare for satisfying careers, community engagement, and the lifelong work of self-creation. As an institution dedicated to delivering a transformative liberal arts education, our objectives are designed to produce in our graduates an ability to:

- Master modes of critical inquiry through writing; conducting quantitative, qualitative, and scientific analysis; acquiring and evaluating evidence

² We have recently increased the emphasis we place on institutional resources when choosing peers for the College of Arts and Sciences because as we reviewed our progress toward our student achievement goals in comparison to the previous peer and aspirant lists we used, it became apparent that many of our academic peers out-resourced us, but our resource peers were not as academically selective or had lower retention and graduation rates. Thus, which peer/aspirant schools we benchmark against may shift slightly depending on the specific indicator we're measuring.

Lewis & Clark College

- stretch themselves as scholars, researchers, and artists to achieve a high degree of facility in their areas of interest
- gain confidence to range across disciplines both individually and in collaboration
- engage constructively with cultural difference and power
- ground their education in local, global, and historical contexts
- encounter wonder and grappled with experiences that are not about seeking answers
- practice habits of self-care, community, and well-being
- reflect critically on their liberal education and its purpose in the contemporary world

To achieve this, students are required to take two First-Year Seminars (FYS) and an array of courses that satisfy the following [General Education Course Categories](#). The rationale behind each category and the stated learning objectives are posted [online](#) and in the [catalog](#).

Our assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness is grounded on [the College's principles of teaching excellence](#), developed by a faculty taskforce on teaching excellence and approved by vote of the faculty in May 2024. These principles guide all assessments of faculty effectiveness in the classroom and state that excellent teachers:

- Foster classroom, laboratory, field, and studio environments that are conducive to student engagement and learning.
- Promote student proficiencies in critical inquiry, including disciplinary and interdisciplinary argumentation, analysis, research, writing, creative activity.
- Consider and respond collaboratively to student concerns and needs that impact their academic success.
- Actively promote equity and inclusion through pedagogy, curricular choices, and/or mentorship.
- Engage in reflective practices, pedagogical and curricular experimentation and ongoing professional development.

These principles are the primary means by which we assess faculty teaching, being the criteria for second- and fourth-year junior faculty reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and triennial reviews of tenured faculty.

In our assessment of curriculum and staffing, the Annual Departmental Planning (ADP) process has adopted a series of KPIs, both “primary metrics” and “secondary metrics,”

Lewis & Clark College

which are aimed to help departments assess curricular and staffing demand, and thus better serve student academic needs. Primary KPI metrics include Size: declared majors (three-year average), Growth: Enrollment increase (five-year average), Efficiency and Workload Equity: SCH/FTE (three-year average), and Outside teaching: % of SCH taught outside the department. We also provide over a dozen secondary metrics, from average section size to number of advisees per FTE faculty member. Faculty annually receive this data (data for the entire College is available to all faculty), and departments are asked to complete a “qualitative response sheet” to contextualize and respond to these primary and secondary indicators. This process is used to inform modification of curricular offerings and staffing assignments. The [Annual Departmental Planning process](#) mission statement and operational vision is posted on the CAS Dean’s Office webpage.

Student Life

Meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators for the Division of Student Life are informed by [Mission, Vision, and Values](#) of the division. These values (Centering Student Development, Curiosity, Community and Connections, and Community) frame how to engage in the work we do to provide co-curricular education that complements the academic mission of the college and demonstrate our commitment to nurture and challenge students in their holistic development. Additionally, each department within Student Life posts their mission and values on their webpages. They have been summarized for the evaluation committee [here](#).

Graduate School

Strategic Plan

[The Graduate School’s Strategic Plan](#) provides both a statement of goals and priorities, as well as detailed implementation narratives for all academic programs, the Center for Community Engagement, and all administrative offices. Please see below an explanation of this approach (Introduction) and the Graduate School’s statement of Goals and Priorities. The link provided will take you to the full document.

This hybrid strategic/operational plan is designed to operate on two levels. First, it provides a framework for viewing the work of the Graduate School as a whole. Thus, it begins with strategic plan goals and a values framework that includes: guiding principles, qualities of mind and heart that we seek to nurture in all students, and qualities of the Graduate School that advance our mission. These aspects of the strategic plan are applicable across the considerable breadth and variety of programs (degree, licensure, endorsement, certificate, continuing education) offered.

Second, this strategic plan works at the unit level (academic departments/programs, the Center for Community Engagement, and the Graduate School’s administrative offices) to

Lewis & Clark College

describe, in detail, both the context in which the units operate and the goals they have for the next three years.

This strategic plan will be updated on an annual, rolling basis. Each subsequent year, after this initial one, will include an appendix that describes the year's achievements related to the goals of the plan.

Strategic Goals and Priorities

The following eight goals provide the foundation for planning within and across the units that constitute the Graduate School. The list should not be interpreted as a rank ordering – each goal/priority is individually important and they are collectively essential.

1. Support existing program quality, innovation, and sustainable growth to positively impact student learning.
2. Create, implement, and refine new programs that are responsive to the changing landscape in higher education, the professional fields we serve, and the licensure and accreditation bodies to which we are responsible.
3. Expand community engagement and deepen impact related to the Graduate School's social justice mission.
4. Sustain and grow the culture of diversity, equity, access, and inclusion in all areas, including the recruitment of students, faculty, and staff.
5. Expand support for faculty/staff growth, professional development, and well-being.
6. Design and implement policies, technology innovations, and other efforts to increase the effectiveness of administrative support for faculty, staff, students, and alumni.
7. Plan and implement facilities improvements in support of the Graduate School's mission.
8. Expand fundraising efforts in support of scholarships, program development, and capital projects. Participate in the planning and implementation of the next comprehensive campaign at Lewis & Clark.

To summarize in the broadest sense, the kind of education we strive to provide for every student at the Graduate School, across all of our programs are qualities of mind and heart that represent the goals of an education that is dynamic, empowering, and

Lewis & Clark College

the best we have to offer students entering professions that have an extraordinary impact on the growth, well-being, and success of others.

The [qualities of mind and heart](#) that we seek to nurture in all students at the Graduate School are:

- The capacity for critical inquiry in professional practice.
- The capacity to engage deeply with issues of culture, identity, power, and difference.
- The capacity to understand and explore an idea, a professional practice, or a process of inquiry from multiple perspectives.
- The capacity for leadership in a professional field and civic engagement for a just and democratic society.
- The capacity to continue growing and learning as a professional.

These broad learning objectives are then interpreted and implemented in the context of each of the professional disciplines we serve. This entails a regular and rigorous review of state program approval and national accreditation. Please see [this table](#) for information on these accreditation processes and where each of our programs stand in their respective cycle.

Law School

The Law School has adopted and published educational objectives and learning outcomes to achieve [mission](#) fulfillment.

Educational Objectives

Students graduating from Lewis & Clark Law School will learn doctrine, theory, values, professionalism, and practice skills that equip them to participate effectively and constructively in a dynamic legal profession.

To meet this objective, students have the opportunity to:

- Achieve competency in a broad spectrum of doctrinal areas;
- Participate in the development of their individual interests and passions;
- Achieve proficiency in legal analysis and communication, including modern research skills and tools;
- Practice lawyering skills through clinics, skills-focused courses, and externships and other field placements; and

Lewis & Clark College

- Develop a professional identity and independent professional judgment, including an ethical and moral character.

Learning Outcomes

- Graduating students understand and can apply foundational doctrinal and procedural law.
- Graduating students are proficient in the following competencies:
 - Problem-solving skills, including critical thinking, analytical thinking, and evaluating legal rules and policies in our society;
 - Legal research, including using modern research tools and technology; and
 - Effective communication of analysis and ideas to a variety of audiences, both orally and in writing.
- Graduating students have begun cultivating their professional identities and employing reflective practices.
- Graduating students have begun developing cross-cultural competence and understanding their role in promoting a fair and equitable legal system.
- Graduating students are able to render independent and informed judgments, understanding the professional and ethical responsibilities lawyers have to all stakeholders of the legal system.

The Law School Assessment Committee measures how well and to what degree students achieve these goals and objectives. In addition, the Law School regularly measures its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and peer institutions with respect to [academic quality of the incoming class](#), [first-time bar passage](#), [ultimate bar passage](#), and [job placement](#). The outcomes on these measures are widely distributed, discussed, analyzed, and used to determine strategic priorities.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.B.2
<p>Institutional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● L&C Strategic Imperatives● Peer Institutions<ul style="list-style-type: none">● College of Arts and Sciences● Graduate School● Law School <p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Identity Statement

Lewis & Clark College

- [General Education Course Categories](#)
- [General Education Learning Objectives](#)
- [Principles of Teaching Excellence](#)
- [Annual Departmental Planning process](#)
- [Student Life Mission, Vision, and Values](#)
 - [Student Life Department Mission and Values](#) (summary)

Graduate School of Education and Counseling

- [Graduate School Strategic Plan](#)
- [Qualities of Mind and Heart](#)
- [Program Accreditation Process and Timeline](#)

Law School

- [Mission and Values](#)
- Assessment of Goals and Objectives
 - [Academic quality of the incoming class](#)
 - [First-time bar passage](#)
 - [Ultimate bar passage](#)
 - [Job placement](#)

Standard 1.B.3 - Inclusive Planning Process

The institution provides evidence that its planning process is inclusive and offers opportunities for comment by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Lewis & Clark College values collaboration and strives to include the campus community in the planning process. This was the case in the formulation of the previous two strategic plans and continues with our current strategic planning process, as detailed on the [strategic planning webpage](#) and as explained in [1.B.1](#), above. It has been particularly important to have faculty take the leading role in developing and leading our strategic initiatives. The 2024-25 Strategic Imperatives Advisory Council was co-chaired by three faculty members--a professor of music, a professor of geology, and a professor of environmental and natural resources law.

By fall 2025, the College will have identified the highest priority strategic initiatives to move forward in the 2025-26 academic year. The work of implementing these priorities will be led by a newly-constituted Strategic Initiatives Committee to coordinate this work across the institution, working with established faculty shared governance structures. Each initiative will have identified timelines, goals and milestones that are developed in consultation with relevant faculty and institutional leadership. Annual

Lewis & Clark College

reporting to the board will continue to be an important element of oversight and accountability. The strategic initiatives committee that will lead this work in 2025-26 will be similarly faculty-led.

Lewis & Clark has a tradition of seeking community input on important institutional issues such as the campus climate, master planning work, the refinement of the mission statement and values, and even the replacement of the college mascot. Each of the schools is inclusive in their program planning processes, as well, through committee meetings and the distribution of results to key constituents, which are then discussed and become part of the next planning cycle.

Institutional planning generally occurs at the Executive Council level, with input from constituents throughout the campus community. Performance is assessed via comparison with regional and national peers as well as our performance over time. The current and most recent strategic plans are good examples of this process in action.

As noted above, rather than create a new static plan that might “sit on a shelf” with only periodic review, the new strategic initiatives and accompanying recommendations from the Strategic Initiatives Advisory Committee exemplify an approach that has built a significant degree of campus consensus around the importance of our imperatives (a significant accomplishment in and of itself).

The three agreed- upon Strategic Imperatives form the foundation of [The L&C Advantage](#):

1. Invest in programs that develop leaders to address global challenges.
2. Scale our impact in Portland and the region, while increasing learning opportunities.
3. Maximize the return on investment of a Lewis & Clark education, while preparing students for economic opportunity and purposeful lives of consequence.

Our inclusive planning processes have efficiently and effectively moved us forward toward our continued strategic planning work. The next phase, developing strategic initiatives to make these three imperatives a reality, will kick off with the 2025-26 academic year and will continue to strategically consider L&C’s current resources and future needs.

Several committees exist on campus to ensure that resources are allocated appropriately based on assessed needs and are in line with the mission of the college. Each of the three schools has a faculty-led budget committee that participates in budget development and refinement. In addition, the College of Arts and Sciences budget is managed by a committee of budget managers who are responsible for constituent

Lewis & Clark College

elements of the CAS budget (i.e., academics, student life, admissions, etc.), with advice from both the faculty Budget Advisory Committee and (beginning in the coming academic year, from a newly formed Strategic Advisory Council on the College of Arts and Science Budget, which is comprised of both faculty and staff. The IT Governance Committee is an institutional committee focused on assessing and prioritizing IT resource allocation. Needs assessment and resource allocation decisions relate to operational funding, capital infrastructure and IT resources.

The college fully funds its depreciation and uses these funds for ongoing capital improvement, deferred maintenance and information technology needs. Each Dean and VP seeks input from employees in their division and submits a compiled list of capital project requests. Requested capital projects are evaluated in relation to strategic priorities as well as health and safety needs and reviewed with the AVPs for Facilities and Information Technology for their input. Prioritization and selection of projects for recommendation is completed collectively by the Deans and VPs. The annual capital budget is approved by the Board of Trustees.

To prioritize and allocate resources for operating budget purposes, the college uses a modified Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budgeting model. Each of the three schools and common services (administrative support) has a separate budgeting process. Based upon estimated available resources, each school develops a budget commensurate with targets set by the Board of Trustees. It is generally expected that budgets will support a 2% net tuition revenue margin though alternative targets are possibly dependent upon a variety of factors. Certain budgetary assumptions and priorities are set at the institutional level with the individual schools making resource decisions based on the priorities and needs of their individual schools, but which align with the overall mission of the institution.

For CAS and common services where there are multiple Deans and VPs with areas of responsibility, budgetary decisions are made by a Budget Managers Committee. As resources become challenged, the college has strived to find efficiencies that preserve the overall student experience including academics, support services, and student life.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

In the College of Arts and Sciences, the larger community of faculty, staff, and students play crucial roles in multiple planning processes.

At the start of each academic year, the College of Arts and Sciences holds a Fall Retreat, with all faculty and staff invited to attend the day-long event. Typically, faculty and staff have designed and helped run the conference-like workshops on everything from

Lewis & Clark College

“effective teaching strategies” and “constructing an inclusive syllabus” and “helping disengaged students connect” (all topics from the 2024 retreat).

The faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences meet monthly during the academic year, a meeting that is prepared and run by the Clerk of the Faculty, an elected position. As per our handbook ([III.D.4.IV.1](#)), any voting member of the Faculty can submit an item for inclusion on the agenda, and a faculty member serves as parliamentarian. All faculty committees are asked to provide written and oral reports, covering issues such as budget, enrollment, student success, curriculum. Non-faculty administrators and staff are invited to all faculty meetings.

Faculty and students serve as voting members on all standing governance committees (except Committee on Promotion and Tenure, which is only tenured faculty members). These committees meet regularly during the school year to focus on issues such as budget, curriculum, student success, and technology.

In addition, the College has created several planning task forces, including a task force on teaching excellence which was composed of faculty, staff, and students. Their work culminated in the adoption of new [principles of teaching excellence](#), used for all teaching assessment processes, and new instruments for Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET). [The Annual Department Planning process](#) is widely inclusive, “centering departments and programs in curricular planning,” distributing all campus data to all faculty, and supported by the Dean of the College and a faculty steering committee

Other processes, such as decennial departmental review processes, include faculty, staff, and students at multiple stages of the process, from development of the self-study and meeting times with the visiting external experts, to coordination of a departmental response. The elected Faculty Council and Curriculum Committee receive all copies of review documents and advise the Dean at each stage of the process.

In addition, the elected Faculty Council makes recommendations to the Dean on regular annual processes from sabbatical applications and capital project recommendations to tenure-track hiring requests.

Student Life/Co-Curricular

The Division of Student Affairs engages in collaborative and inclusive planning processes that incorporate feedback from students, staff, and leadership across all levels. Departmental, divisional, and institutional assessment data are routinely reviewed by multiple stakeholders to guide informed decision-making, ensure strategic allocation of resources, and foster continuous improvement in institutional effectiveness.

The Vice President and Associate Vice Presidents within the division meet weekly to plan for immediate, mid-term, and long-term needs, ensuring that short term actions

Lewis & Clark College

align with institutional goals. Department Directors convene monthly to share updates, collaborate on strategy, and communicate evolving priorities. In addition, the VP and student life AVPs, Deans, and Directors participate in three structured annual planning meetings to review, align, and plan strategic priorities. All division employees are also brought together approximately four times per year for division-wide planning sessions, professional development, and team-building, fostering a shared sense of purpose and direction.

To further broaden engagement, monthly topic-based planning meetings are held with invitations extended to relevant stakeholders from across the college. Divisional committees—such as the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Advisory Committee and the Professional Development Committee—are convened at the discretion of the Vice President to provide targeted recommendations and ensure ongoing responsiveness to campus and staff needs.

Student input is actively incorporated through several key mechanisms. The Vice President of Student Life meets monthly with a Student Advisory Council to discuss priorities and receive input on key divisional initiatives. Additionally, divisional and departmental plans are presented to the Lewis & Clark Associated Student Body (ASB) Cabinet and Senate, which meet weekly during the academic year, creating regular opportunities for student feedback.

At the departmental level, individual units conduct their own planning processes, incorporating input from relevant stakeholders and aligning with both divisional and institutional priorities. These coordinated efforts ensure that planning across the Division of Student Affairs remains inclusive, data-informed, strategically resourced, and focused on enhancing student experience and institutional effectiveness.

See [this document](#) for Student Life departmental examples of inclusive planning processes.

Graduate School

Internal and external stakeholder groups, including students, faculty, alumni, employers, and community members play an essential role in our accreditation processes. Their active involvement not only ensures transparency but also significantly contributes to accreditation efforts. We collect, analyze, report, and share data from these constituents:

- Faculty: participate in self-study committees, program reports, defining and measuring SLOs aligned to standards, ensure the quality of curriculum and instruction, and use data to revise program assessments, as needed. Adjunct

Lewis & Clark College

faculty also participate in surveys to understand their experience and offer feedback to programs.

- Staff: collect, analyze, and provide data to faculty for the accreditation process, create and update systems that support data collection, prepare accreditation documentation and support site visit coordination.
- Students: respond to our program and/or GSEC-wide surveys aligned to our accreditors' standards. These include current student surveys (providing feedback on their educational experiences) and exit surveys. Programs also include students on program advisory committees and as interviewees during accreditor site visits.
- Alumni: participate in programs advisory committees, serve as mentors and supervisors for our current students, respond to our GSEC-wide Alumni Survey aligned to our accreditors' standards, serve as panel participants for GSEC recruiting events, and are interviewed during accreditor site visits.
- Employers: participate in surveys, serve as members of our program advisory committees, and participate in our educator job fair.
- Mentors: evaluate candidates in their field placements using valid and reliable rubrics, participate in mentor trainings aligned to accreditor standards, and participate in continuing education opportunities at our Center for Community Engagement (these programs also include participant evaluations).
- Supervisors: evaluate candidates in their field/clinical placement using valid and reliable rubrics, participate in mentor trainings aligned to accreditor standards, and participate in continuing education opportunities at our Center for Community Engagement (these programs also include participant evaluations).

Law School

The Law School values collaboration and includes its community within its planning processes.

The Law faculty meets monthly during the academic year to address and vote on issues such as the budget, academic program, faculty staffing, resource allocation, and student related issues. Two student representatives participate in all faculty meetings. Non-faculty administrators and staff are invited to faculty meetings as appropriate to ensure planning includes operational considerations and/or to provide faculty with operational information to inform their planning decisions. In addition, the faculty typically conducts a retreat in the late summer to discuss planning issues.

Specific faculty committees meet regularly during the school year to focus on issues

Lewis & Clark College

such as admissions, budget, curriculum, diversity, and employment.

At an administrative level, the dean and all associate and assistant deans meet weekly to ensure collaborative planning based upon shared information.

In addition to the regular and ongoing planning processes, the Law School launched a collaborative and inclusive strategic planning process in the Spring 2025. A Strategic Planning Leadership Council comprising the Dean, key administrators, staff, and faculty members is leading the planning process. The process will engage students, alumni, employers and additional stakeholders through focus groups, surveys, public meetings, and a strategic planning retreat. A working group on resources has been formed to ensure the plan is funded to ensure effectiveness. An implementation plan will be developed to monitor achievement of the plan's stated goal and achievement of institutional effectiveness.

At each of these levels, the law school seeks to develop plans, ensure that those plans are consistent with its mission and values, and monitor their implementation.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.B.3
Institutional <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Strategic Planning Timeline and Process● The L&C Advantage
College of Arts and Sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Faculty Handbook- Meetings of the Faculty (III.D.IVE.1)● Principles of Teaching Excellence● Annual Department Planning Process● Student Life Inclusive Planning (department examples)

Standard 1.B.4 - Monitoring Internal and External Environments

The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it considers such findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement of its goals.

Lewis & Clark College routinely conducts both internal and external reviews to evaluate programs and services, to assess whether goals and intended outcomes have been met, and to evaluate patterns, trends, and expectations. Data trends are documented and

Lewis & Clark College

used in planning and budgeting to sustain and advance academic values and quality. The processes by which that data has been collected, shared, and used have become more systematic and incorporate expertise from EAB, AGB, HCRC and others to help us monitor and understand the external environment and potential pressures. For instance, EAB's [State of the Sector annual report](#) provides the Board of Trustees with information about patterns and trends in the higher education sector that assists the board and campus assess our strategic position, opportunities and challenges, and make revisions and investments as necessary.

Internal data collection is designed to ensure that a variety of voices are heard and multiple perspectives are considered. For example, we recently administered a campus climate survey (to faculty, staff, and students in all three schools and the Common Services) to help us better understand each person's experience on campus and to help monitor student access and success.

Faculty have a primary role in the evaluation of educational programs and services. The Executive Council and Board of Trustees are responsible for decisions regarding the distribution of resources, capital investments, and the setting of institution priorities, although they do so in the context of well-established and mature shared governance processes that provide for significant campus consultation and input.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

Within the College of Arts and Sciences, the monitoring and assessment of curriculum and student learning vis-a-vis internal and external environments is undertaken via several processes, most intensively through the decennial department/program review. As described in the College of Arts & Sciences [Guide to Preparing a Department or Program Review](#), the review process consists of four components: (a) a departmental or program self-study; (b) a campus visit by a team of disciplinary experts; (c) a written report by the review team; and (d) a response from the department/program to the experts' review. Following the departmental response, the Dean, in consultation with the department, creates an implementation plan and schedule for proposed changes that emerge from the review.

Academic Department and program reviews are intended to give departments and programs an opportunity to consider in a comprehensive way the present nature and future development of their curricula and related issues of staffing. These reviews (which include both internal and external assessments) are intended to give the academic unit the opportunity to assess its own views of the nature and purposes of its programs; to consider perceptions of the program provided by peers from other institutions; and, in conjunction with administrative offices, to develop the academic

Lewis & Clark College

unit's goals, the schedule for implementing any curricular changes, and the process by which the College can assess the success of the academic unit in meeting its goals. Reviews also are intended to give the College of Arts and Sciences an understanding of the academic unit's strengths and its needs.

In a typical year, we conduct three reviews. Alongside departmental faculty and student participation at every stage of the process, the Curriculum Committee and Faculty Council are integral bodies to review and consult on the self-study, the campus visit, and the experts' response report. Any changes that result from the review would be undertaken through regular governance processes, most typically through curricular changes that are proposed to and reviewed by the Curriculum Committee.

The General Education program has been reviewed more frequently (about every three years) in response to [recommendations for assessment](#) approved by the faculty in Spring 2020. The General Education Steering Committee (GESC), in conjunction with both Institutional Research and the Curriculum Committee (CC), is primarily responsible for the regular assessment of the General Education curriculum with regard to student learning outcomes and other measures of the health and effectiveness of the curriculum. At the individual course level, the Director of General Education sends a faculty survey at the end of each semester to each instructor teaching a course that serves general education, asking a series of questions that assess each learning outcome for that course. The GESC is responsible for reviewing the syllabi for individual sections of First-Year Seminars to ensure that they meet the stated criteria for Words and Numbers, respectively. If changes to these criteria are deemed necessary by GESC, they shall propose such changes to the Curriculum Committee. Responding to information about assessment, course availability, and other measures of health and well-being of our Distribution Requirements, GESC can propose changes as needed to the CC regarding individual requirements. If GESC determines that the learning outcomes for General Education can best be met by altering the criteria or substance of a certain Distribution Requirement, they are tasked with making such proposals to the CC.

In addition to the decennial department/program-level and General Education review and assessment processes described above, the College of Arts and Sciences engages in further review and planning protocols, at all levels of College governance, in order to ensure fulfillment of mission and alignment of resources, processes that align departmental goals and performance to outcomes. Resource allocation planning is directed through monthly meetings of the CAS Budget Managers, overseen by the Dean of the College, and including VP level members from Finance and Admissions, as well as faculty and staff representation. This body helps guide annual budget preparation and discusses larger resource priorities as they impact mission and other strategic goals.

In Fall 2024, the College instituted a system of Annual Departmental Planning (ADP) which requires departments and programs to use a series of data that measure

Lewis & Clark College

enrollment trends, market comparisons, and over two dozen metrics to inform annual scheduling and staffing levels. The Dean meets monthly with Department Chairs and Program Directors, as well as in annual 'data summits' and ADP workshops. This process has been the primary means of supporting individual departments and programs in the data-informed review of departmental resources, and has a mechanism for building inter-departmental collaborations on course planning and curriculum development. All curriculum changes emerging from ADP are routed through our governance processes, typically the Curriculum Committee, and any staffing changes are overseen by the Dean's Office in consultation with the Faculty Council. For a full description and FAQ, see the [Annual Departmental Planning](#) page.

Assessment of our non-academic programs takes place through a variety of processes. Watzek library creates [five-year strategic plans](#) that include mission-vision-values, as well as a series of program plans and strategic initiatives. [The most recent strategic plan, 2020-2025](#), is concluding this year, and the strategic planning process is underway to develop the next 2025-2030 plan. produces its [annual reports](#) through the collection of data through user surveys and strategic planning sessions. These reports include discussion of space utilization, electronic book usage, research services, and other elements of the library's contributions to faculty research and student learning. [Annual statistics](#) include standard metrics about the physical collections as well as the total number of volumes and titles added annually, as well as figures on circulation of materials, internally, via interlibrary loan, or in consortial borrowing. The library also measures online activity including statistics on website visits, full-text article accesses, online database searches, and electronic book views. The library also collects statistics regarding information services such as reference queries, instruction sessions, and research consultations, all activities that inform our annual resource planning. The library surveys space utilization in the library during selected times during the academic year to gauge student need for different types of study spaces. Further, the library administration reviews qualitative and quantitative factors annually when evaluating and planning for specialized services including Special Collections and Archives, Digital Initiatives, and Visual Resources.

In addition, the Dean of the College conducts an annual review of the Center for Academic Advising, the Office of Overseas and Off-Campus Programs, the Office of Student Accessibility, the Writing Center, and the Symbolic and Quantitative Reasoning Center (SQRC). Each unit director submits a report to the Dean of the College. The Dean, after reviewing the report, meets with each director and writes an annual assessment of the unit and its director.

Student Life

Within the Division of Student Life, staff regularly monitor communications and messages from Student Affairs professional organizations and communities (e.g. NASPA,

Lewis & Clark College

Oregon Senior Student Affairs Officers) and higher education publications (e.g., Chronicle of Higher Education) to keep abreast of emerging trends.

Several dedicated committees within Student Life identify and respond to a number of patterns, goals, and mission-driven programming: professional development committee, belonging committee, staff engagement committee, DEI advisory committee to the VPSL, emergency student fund committee, and student advisory committee. Student Life has active members in the Committee on Student Success which is charged with analyzing current conditions around retention, compiling data and information from relevant areas across campus, and formulating approaches to improve retention and success of CAS students.

The Division conducted a [SWOT analysis](#) in the spring of 2023. In January of 2024, the group met to discuss the results and to identify the high-impact and controllable factors on which we could focus our efforts.

Examples of the internal and external monitoring the departments within the Student Life Division conduct can be found [here](#).

Graduate School

The Graduate School uses a multi-faceted approach to monitor both its internal operations and the external higher education environment.

Internal Monitoring

- Ongoing Data Analysis: Graduate School continually monitors internal information such as:
 - Recruitment
 - Enrollment
 - Student learning outcomes
 - Retention
 - Student satisfaction
 - Finances
- Graduate School Research and Assessment Office:
 - Ongoing monitoring of key institutional data points.
 - Customized reports as requested or needed for specific information.
 - Student learning outcomes are regularly assessed.

Lewis & Clark College

- Administrative units monitor progress on internal goals through benchmark achievement.
- Graduate School Financial and Operations Office: Cyclical financial reports keep Graduate School informed about our budget adherence and the overall institutional budget.
- Data Analytics Software: Efficiently utilizing multiple software platforms (BLUE course evaluations, Watermark Taskstream assessment folios, SLATE for admissions, and Salesforce for placements, partnerships, and community engagement that allow the dean, chairs, faculty, staff and senior administrators to quickly understand:
 - Current performance and trends in both Graduate School and their programs across various metrics
 - Future performance and trends in both Graduate School and their programs across various metrics

External Monitoring

- Participation in Professional Conferences: Graduate School faculty and staff engage with the broader higher education landscape through attendance at professional conferences.
- Professional Organizations and Associations: Graduate School faculty and staff regularly interact with a variety of professional organizations
- Links with Other Institutions: Graduate School maintains formal and informal links with other institutions within Oregon and the region.
- Surveys and Consultants: Graduate School engages with external organizations (multiple accreditors, State agencies, etc.) and consultants to understand and monitor the environment in which it operates.

By combining these internal and external monitoring methods, Graduate School aims to gain a clear understanding of its performance and position within the evolving higher education landscape, informing its planning and decision-making processes.

Law School

The Law School's dean, associate and assistant deans, and faculty committees each monitor internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. For example, the admissions dean works together with the admissions committee to closely track and analyze national, regional, and law school data about the current and future applicant pools to define recruitment and scholarship

Lewis & Clark College

strategies and ensure success with stated goals. The academic dean and the curriculum committee closely monitor technological advancements, shifts in legal practice, emerging pedagogies, and evolving societal needs to identify emerging trends and patterns. The curriculum committee makes changes and additions according to its findings. For example, the Law School has added training in AI both through a stand-alone class and in required research classes to respond to emerging trends in law practice.

In addition to receiving programmatic and curricular input from the Law School Dean and its Associate and Assistant Deans, the Animal Law and Environmental Law programs also each have a dedicated Dean and Program Director, who regularly review and assess new developments within these two focused subject matters. This includes monitoring subject-specific and general advanced degree program offerings at other institutions, both in the U.S. and beyond, to help it stay at the forefront of pedagogical developments, meet the demands of interested students, prepare candidates for careers in the field, and advance this burgeoning area of advocacy and legal practice.

To this end, the Animal Law Program offers the most animal law courses of any institution in the U.S., including a recently developed Emerging Topics in Animal Law course dedicated to exploring current issues in the field. In addition, the Animal Law Program has since developed two new degree offerings: the Animal Law MSL (2022) and the Animal Law SJD (2023), the latter of which represents the Law School's very first doctoral-level degree offering. Also of note is that the Animal Law Program has recently begun to offer two of its advanced degrees via a fully online, asynchronous modality: the Animal Law LLM (2021) and the Animal Law MSL (2022).

The Environmental Law Program offers an extensive curriculum dedicated to environmental, natural resources, and energy law fields. The Environmental Law Program recently began to offer two of its advanced degrees via a fully online, asynchronous modality: the Environmental Law LLM (2019) and the Environmental Law MSL (2020). Both degrees continue to be offered in person as well.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.B.4

Institutional

- [State of the Sector Annual Report \(EAB\)](#)

College of Arts and Sciences

- [Preparing a Department for Program Review](#)
- [Faculty Recommendations for Assessment](#) (Spring 2020)
- [Annual Departmental Planning](#)
- [Library Strategic Plan](#) and [Summary](#)
- [Library Annual Reports](#)

Lewis & Clark College

- [Library Annual Statistics](#)
- [Student Life SWOT Analysis](#)
- [Student Life Internal and External Monitoring](#) (department examples)

Standard 1.C.1 - Program Content and Rigor

The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

Lewis & Clark carries out its mission through undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences and postgraduate programs in the closely related professions of education, counseling, and law. Lewis & Clark mounts these programs as both separately valid and mutually supportive enterprises. Although the language of the mission statement has recently changed, L&C's program content and rigor have not. The institution continues to pursue the aims of all liberal learning: to seek knowledge for its own sake and to prepare for civic leadership. In all its endeavors it seeks to be a community of scholars who are alive to inquiry, open to diversity, and disciplined to work in an interdependent world.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

The College of Arts and Sciences offers degrees and academic programs tied to its mission to foster critical thinking, innovation, creativity, civic engagement, and leadership; degrees and programs that include meaningful engagement with research and scholarship, and that equip students with the knowledge and skills to advance their careers and contribute to their communities. The undergraduate curriculum embodies the best of the liberal arts, with classes in the Mathematical and Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Fine Art and Humanities, and interdisciplinary programs such as Environmental Studies and Health Studies. Students choose from among [28 majors and 34 minors](#), with a curriculum that is structured so that roughly one-third of credits are in the major, one-third are in electives, and one-third are in General Education. The major provides an opportunity to study a subject in depth and master the modes of thought and analysis necessary to advance that study. Electives enable the student to try out and develop new interests. The General Education curriculum supports and enhances the other elements and provides the general foundations for liberal learning. Its courses expand students' perspectives and essential skills, helping them become educated and thoughtful contributors to society.

Lewis & Clark College

Lewis & Clark College considers the following elements to be essential to a liberal arts education:

- Mastery of the fundamental techniques of intellectual inquiry: effective writing and speaking, active reading, and critical and imaginative thinking.
- Exposure to the major assumptions, knowledge, and approaches in the fine arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences.
- Critical understanding of important contemporary and historical issues using modes of thought that are evaluative as well as descriptive and analytic, and that consider the relationship between thought and action.
- Awareness of international and cross-cultural issues and gender relations.
- Application of theory and knowledge developed in the liberal arts to the search for informed, thoughtful, and responsible solutions to important human problems.

The curriculum is built around these essentials, and the members of the faculty and the administration place their skills, resources, and services in support of these goals. See [current CAS catalog](#) for an overview of the role of the mission and values in our curriculum.

For General Education, learning outcomes and program assessment arise from the [L&C Identity Statement](#), which informs our vision of helping students prepare for satisfying careers, community engagement, and the lifelong work of self-creation. Our general education program is assessed regularly, via our General Education Steering Committee (GESC), via eight principles arising from the Identity Statement, including the mastery of modes of critical inquiry; the grounding of their education in local, global, and historical contexts; and critical reflection on their liberal education and its purpose in the contemporary world. The rationale behind each category of General Education and the stated learning objectives are posted [online](#) and in the [catalog](#).

For each departmental program, faculty in those programs have developed an overview of the major, the curriculum, and the opportunities around research, study abroad, and post-graduation employment. Each department also includes a set of learning outcomes, developed and assessed through the review of student evaluations of teaching (SET), Annual Departmental Planning processes, as well as decennial reviews. Departmental overviews, learning objectives, and other material for individual programs can be found on [academic department pages](#). For examples of departmental overviews, see [Rhetoric and Media Studies](#) and [Philosophy](#). For examples of learning outcomes, see [History](#) and [Biology](#).

The most intensive form of regular review or program content and rigor is the decennial

Lewis & Clark College

review, undertaken by each department/program in order to engage the faculty of the department/ program in “reflection about their history, accomplishments, challenges, and future aspirations, and to provide advice to the department/program and College about how the department/ program can be improved. The review process consists of four components: (1) a departmental or program self-study; (2) a campus visit by a team of disciplinary experts; (3) a written report by the review team; and (4) a response from the department/program to the experts’ review. We typically do two to three reviews annually. For more detail on this process, see the [Guide to Prepare for a Departmental or Program Review](#).

Annual program review takes place through our [Annual Departmental Planning \(ADP\)](#) process, which requires departments to reflect on their course offerings and learning objectives via the three interdependent elements of curriculum, resources, and workload. More on the ADP process can be found [here](#).

Our assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness is grounded on [the college’s principles of teaching excellence](#), developed by a faculty taskforce on teaching excellence and approved by vote of the faculty in May 2024. These principles align with our mission and values, as well as with our [L&C Identity Statement](#), and guide all assessments of faculty effectiveness in the classroom. Our principles state that excellent teachers:

- Foster classroom, laboratory, field, and studio environments that are conducive to student engagement and learning.
- Promote student proficiencies in critical inquiry, including disciplinary and interdisciplinary argumentation, analysis, research, writing, creative activity.
- Consider and respond collaboratively to student concerns and needs that impact their academic success.
- Actively promote equity and inclusion through pedagogy, curricular choices, and/or mentorship.
- Engage in reflective practices, pedagogical and curricular experimentation, and ongoing professional development.

These principles are the primary means by which we assess faculty teaching, being the criteria for second- and fourth-year junior faculty reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and triennial reviews of tenured faculty.

Graduate School

The content and rigor of all Graduate School programs are consistent with the mission of the college and the graduate school and adhere to the standards set forth through state licensure and national accreditation standards in their respective fields. A table

Lewis & Clark College

showing the accreditation status and reporting cycle can be found [here](#). All programmatic accreditation reports are available upon request; see [2025 CAEP](#) and [2021 COAMFTE](#) as examples.

Law School

The law school ensures students have the appropriate rigor in their courses by having high academic standards with clear expectations, utilizing diverse modes of assessment, and providing a wide variety of experiential opportunities. Rigor is promoted by the formative and summative assessment widely used by Law School faculty. Faculty combine academic credentials with practical experience, regularly update course materials to reflect current law, and use active learning pedagogies rather than pure lecture. They provide meaningful feedback on student work and are accessible for mentoring. Law faculty continue to rely on traditional assessment methods, such as final exams, but rarely in isolation. In a recent survey, full-time faculty were asked to describe the ways in which they integrated formative and summative assessment into their courses and how they use the assessment to inform and adjust their teaching methods and course content. Commonly used modes are weekly meetings, regular student self-assessments, structured reflection memos, and individual conferences. In-class modes include in-class problems, interactive quizzes and live polling, and group presentation. These methods provide immediate feedback and allow faculty to gauge student understanding, often in real time, enabling professors to challenge students while also facilitating learning.

Beyond traditional modes of assessment, the Law School uses diverse assessment approaches connected to articulable learning outcomes like oral arguments, client counseling simulations, appellate briefs, trial practice simulations, and capstone projects. Further, the Law School provides substantial clinical offerings (including clinics in environmental advocacy, victims' rights, international wildlife law, animal law, criminal justice reform, small business, and tax), externship placements in diverse fields and settings, moot court competitions, and simulation courses. Students work on actual cases under supervision, participate in law journals, and engage in pro bono work that connects classroom learning to practice. All of these experiential and clinical opportunities provide rigor while also yielding assessments on work that mirrors real legal practice. The school maintains rigorous academic standards with clear expectations for advancement and graduation. Bar passage rates, employment outcomes, and employer feedback demonstrate that graduates are practice ready.

Both the ABA and the Law School require that students adhere to policies and professional conduct. Students must meet a specified GPA to continue in school. Many of the certificates require that a student meet a certain grade in the required courses to attain the certificates. The Dean of Students ensures that students are meeting the graduation requirements, and the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs oversees the

Lewis & Clark College

award of a certificate.

LLM, MSJ, and SJD candidates take the same courses as JD students, and therefore programs leading to these degrees adhere to the same rigorous standards. Learning outcomes are commensurate with the subject area and degree. With the exception of MSJ candidates, whose degree track does not equip them with the credentials necessary to practice law, the learning outcomes for advanced degree students mirror those for JD students.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.1

College of Arts and Sciences

- [Academic Programs](#)
- [CAS Catalog](#)
- [Identity Statement](#)
- [General Education Learning Objectives](#)
- [Academic Department Pages](#)
- [Guide to Prepare for a Departmental or Program Review](#)
- [Annual Departmental Planning \(ADP\) Process](#)
- [Principles of Teaching Excellence](#)

Graduate School of Education and Counseling

- [Accreditation Status and Reporting Cycle](#)
- [2025 CAEP](#)- Program Accreditation Example
- [2021 COAMFTE](#)- Program Accreditation Example

Standard 1.C.2 – Evidence of admissions and graduation requirements widely published and easily accessible.

The institution awards credit, degrees, certificates, or credentials for programs that are based upon student learning and learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning.

Regular review of majors/degree programs and the courses contained within ensure that courses in our programs reflect the appropriate breadth and depth of the field and are offered in a sequence to meet stated learning outcomes. Since our last accreditation visit, particular emphasis has been placed on increased experiential learning opportunities and co-curricular activities and events that allow for the synthesis of learning.

College of Arts & Sciences

Lewis & Clark College

Academic

The College of Arts and Sciences offers an education rooted in the breadth and depth of the liberal arts, with its [General Education program](#) ensuring that students are broadly trained in the modes of critical inquiry and can reflect deeply on the role they can play in the world. The General Education program has learning outcomes and program assessment that arise from the CAS [Identity Statement](#), a set of principles that inform our vision of helping students prepare for satisfying careers, community engagement, and the lifelong work of self-creation. Our general education program is assessed regularly, via our General Education Steering Committee (GESC), via eight principles arising from the [Identity Statement](#), including the mastery of modes of critical inquiry; the grounding of their education in local, global, and historical contexts; and critical reflection on their liberal education and its purpose in the contemporary world. The rationale behind each category of General Education and the stated learning objectives are posted [online](#) and in the [catalog](#). The catalog also contains the [most recent set of classes](#) that satisfy each category within the General Education curriculum. Any changes in these courses and objectives are the responsibility of the Curriculum Committee.

A student's academic major provides the means to study a subject in depth and master the modes of thought and analysis necessary to advance that study. The undergraduate curriculum is composed of majors that embody the best of the liberal arts, with classes in the Mathematical and Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Fine Arts and Humanities, and interdisciplinary programs such as Environmental Studies and Health Studies. Students choose from among [28 majors and 34 minors](#), with each department/program's curriculum and learning outcomes aligning with our [overall institutional mission and values](#), as well as with the [essential elements that underlie our liberal arts education](#).

Each department's faculty has developed the curriculum and set of learning outcomes for their program. These are all available on [departmental academic webpages](#), such as this example of the [Art department's curriculum and learning objectives](#). Regular assessment of this curriculum and these learning objectives take place through a number of mechanisms, most thoroughly through [the decennial program review process](#), as well as annually through [Annual Departmental Planning](#). In both these processes, faculty and students play central roles in the assessment of curriculum, student learning, and learning outcomes. In [decennial reviews](#), external experts are provided a substantial self-study, prepared by the department, and asked to address "evidence of program quality," which includes curriculum and learning environment, student learning and success, and faculty strengths and contributions. They also assess "evidence of program viability and sustainability," alongside "future goals and planning for improvement." During the campus visit, external experts receive the self-study document at least a month before their visit, and then typically spend two days meeting with faculty, students, and administration. Their written report is designed to provide

Lewis & Clark College

“their assessment and recommendations,” containing both “recommendations for the department/program (regarding curriculum, operating procedures, etc.) and the administration (regarding resources available to the department, etc.). Following the departmental response to the external reviewers’ report, the Dean consults with the department to develop a schedule and plan for any changes that will arise from the review. The Curriculum Committee is responsible for reviewing and approving these changes.

Graduate School

The stated learning outcomes of Graduate School programs synthesize both the qualities of mind and heart that we seek to nurture in all Graduate School students and are offered with the breadth and depth of content expected at the graduate level. Expected learning outcomes include:

- The capacity for critical inquiry in professional practice.
- The capacity to engage deeply with issues of culture, identity, power, and difference.
- The capacity to understand and explore an idea, a professional practice, or a process of inquiry from multiple perspectives.
- The capacity for leadership in a professional field and civic engagement for a just and democratic society.
- The capacity to continue growing and learning as a professional.

See [GSEC Learning Outcomes- Qualities of Mind](#) for details about each Learning Outcome.

Law School

Programs at the Law School, including our experiential and clinical work, courses, certificates and awards stem from a thoughtful curriculum based on clearly-stated learning outcomes and objectives. Curricular pathways require a synthesis of learning and attempt to integrate doctrine, theory, skills, and legal ethics, while simultaneously providing opportunities for students to acquire the skills necessary to be a competent and ethical member of the legal profession.

These programs map learning across diverse legal domains while incorporating interdisciplinary elements that connect law to relevant legal fields like business, intellectual property, environmental and energy resources, animal law, advocacy, and technology. The construction of the certificate program, requires each certificate to have adequate depth of knowledge in a certain area, and may require a writing

Lewis & Clark College

requirement and at least one experiential course. The depth and sequencing of learning requires careful curriculum architecture that progresses systematically from foundational concepts to advanced applications. Sequences of courses within an area of concentration require prerequisite courses that serve as scaffolding for specialized courses. For example, students might be required to take the Survey of IP Law course along with a course on patents before they can take specialized courses like IP Contract Drafting or Patent Litigation. The structure aids students in gaining knowledge incrementally, moving from theoretical foundations to practical applications. This progression is strengthened through intensive experiences. For example, a student in business might take various tax courses and then strengthen the knowledge with experiential learning like participating on the tax moot court, working in the low-income taxpayer clinic, or doing a deep dive into an individual research project that demands original analysis. All pathways of course sequencing require students to demonstrate mastery of nuanced concepts and competence in applying those concepts in a practical setting.

Breadth of programming is enhanced by exposing students to practice contexts, ensuring they develop a well-rounded understanding of their specialized area within the broader legal landscape. Documentation of achieved outcomes through varied assessment methods, including portfolios, peer evaluations, and detailed rubrics, provides concrete evidence of the program's educational effectiveness. For example, Clinical faculty are required to complete a form annually that asks specifically what each clinic is doing to meet the ABA requirements that experiential learning synthesize learning by combining theory, doctrine, skills, legal ethics, and professional identity formation. As a cohort, the clinical faculty routinely discusses ways and means of improving the student experience scaffolded by the framework of accreditation requirements. As further oversight, the responses are reviewed by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for compliance with the standards.

The certificate programs require students to demonstrate their ability to integrate knowledge across multiple courses and domains within a legal field or area. All certificate programs have been carefully crafted by faculty experts who understand what students will need in that field. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs oversees the certificate programs generally, but individual faculty members will counsel students in a legal area of interest.

Further, our assessment committee annually evaluates at least one of our school's five learning outcomes on a rolling basis each year, with a full report on all five learning outcomes provided every three years.

Lewis & Clark College

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.2

Institutional

- [Mission and Values](#)

College of Arts and Sciences

- [General Education program](#)
- [Identity Statement](#)
- [General Education Learning Objectives](#)
- [General Education- current courses](#)
- [Academic Programs](#)
- [Essential Elements of L&C Liberal Arts Education](#)
- [Departmental Academic Webpages](#)
- [Decennial Program Review Process](#)
- [Annual Departmental Planning](#)

Graduate School of Education and Counseling

- [GSEC Learning Outcomes- Qualities of Mind](#)

Standard 1.C.3 - Expected Program and Degree Learning Outcomes are Identified and Published

The institution identifies and publishes expected program and degree learning outcomes for all degrees, certificates, and credentials. Information on expected student learning outcomes for all courses is provided to enrolled students.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

The College of Arts and Sciences provides information on overall [program expectations](#), [degree requirements](#), and [student learning outcomes](#) in the college catalog. Program-related learning outcomes are posted on individual departmental websites, which can be easily located from the [undergraduate academics main page](#) or by searching for the department. Each individual departmental/program website provides information on major/minor requirements, faculty and staff, resources, and learning outcomes for the major. Learning outcomes are found in the right navigation bar under “For Current Students.” An example of learning outcomes from the Chemistry department are available [here](#).

Graduate School

Lewis & Clark College

The Graduate School Catalog provides links to courses and program expectations for each academic program at <https://graduate.lclark.edu/academics/courses/>. Additionally, goals and objectives for each course are to appear in the syllabus that is distributed to students at the start of the course. [Syllabus guidelines](#) ensure that all faculty know the appropriate components to include in their syllabi.

Program-level learning outcomes are listed on each program’s webpage, which can be reached via the [Academics link](#) on the Graduate School website. Some examples include: [Art Therapy, Marriage, Couple, & Family Therapy, Professional Mental Health Counseling, Leadership Studies](#), and [Elementary Education](#).

Law School

The Law School identifies and publishes our [mission statement and our overall learning outcomes](#) on our school’s website. All other student requirements and responsibilities, including those for graduation, credit hours, the kinds of courses, and specific graduation requirements for all degree programs, are transparently provided on the school website and in the [What’s What Student Handbook](#). For certificates available to JD students, students can see certificate requirements on the [school website](#), and a checklist that can be obtained from the Registrar, the Associate Dean of Students, or the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs. Further, faculty advisors can help students understand the requirements of each certificate. Each certificate has learning outcomes created by the faculty specializing in that legal field. We are in the process of updating the learning outcomes for certificates, and those will be published in the upcoming academic year after we complete our curriculum audit and curriculum mapping work. Students can see a detailed description of every course in our Course Catalogue, including the areas of law covered, whether the course is experiential, and the forms of assessment. Although we have not required that all learning objectives for an individual course be published in the Course Description, all professors are required to formulate learning objectives for every course and inform students of those objectives when the course begins. We ask faculty to use the school’s Learning Outcomes as the framework from which individual course learning objectives are derived. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs ensures that all courses provide learning objectives to students. (See question 1.C.4 for more information on accessibility of graduation requirements.)

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.3
College of Arts and Sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Program Expectations● Degree Requirements● Student Learning Outcomes
Graduate School of Education and Counseling

Lewis & Clark College

- [Courses and Program Expectations](#)
- [Syllabus Guidelines](#)
- [Program Learning Outcomes](#) (click on specific program)

Law School

- [Mission Statement and Learning outcomes](#)
- [What's What Student Handbook](#)
- [Certificate Requirements](#)

Standard 1.C.4 - Admission and completion requirements clearly defined, published

The institution's admission and completion or graduation requirements are clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible to students and the public.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

The evaluation process of applications to Lewis & Clark College of Arts and Sciences is a holistic one, requiring that each file is read thoroughly and provides evidence that the student shows promise for success at the College. Rigor of coursework, grades earned, quality of writing, and letters of recommendation are especially important in the process. Information about admission requirements, deadlines, and the review process are clearly posted on the “apply” section of the [admissions website](#).

Information on academic programs and courses, including degree and program completion requirements, expected learning outcomes, required course sequences, and projected timelines to completion based on normal student progress and the frequency of course offerings are clearly printed in the catalog and also summarized online: <https://college.lclark.edu/academics/>.

Graduate School

Graduate School Admissions: [Admission requirements](#) for each program are outlined on our website. All graduate programs have a required curriculum that students must complete. The [catalog](#) is a basic guide to Lewis & Clark Graduate School of Education and Counseling. It provides admission and graduation requirements, program and course descriptions, policies and procedures, and other information related to study in the graduate school.

The Graduate School catalog also outlines the [grading policies](#), requirements for [maintaining satisfactory academic progress, as well as standards for academic](#)

Lewis & Clark College

[performance and professional conduct](#). Upon matriculation, students receive department handbooks outlining performance and professional standards for their respective program.

The [Degree Candidacy](#) section of the catalog defines the evaluation approach and criteria for students to be considered for graduation. Students must apply for graduation, after which a final audit is conducted to ensure all requirements are met.

Law School

Application information for the degree programs offered by the Law School is clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible to prospective students and the public via this webpage: <https://law.lclark.edu/offices/admissions/>

In addition, consumer information related to Admission is available on this webpage: <https://law.lclark.edu/about/aba-required-disclosures/>

Graduation requirements - The graduation requirements for each degree program offered by the Law School are noted in the [What's What](#), the Law School's student handbook. The handbook is available online for students and the public. Detailed degree requirements for JD students based on the students' start year are available on the [Graduation Requirements](#) page. The degree requirements for the LLM, MSL, and SJD programs are noted on the specific program pages:

- [Doctor of Juridical Science in Animal Law](#)
- [Master of Laws in Environmental, Natural Resources, and Energy Law \(LLM\)](#)
- [Master of Laws in Animal Law \(LLM\)](#)
- [Master of Studies in Environmental, Natural Resources, and Energy Law \(MSL\)](#)
- [Master of Studies in Animal Law \(MSL\)](#)

The graduation requirement pages define the requirements for each program as well as provide specific courses that satisfy each requirement.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.4
College of Arts and Sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Admission Requirements● Graduation Requirements
Graduate School of Education and Counseling <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Admission Requirements

Lewis & Clark College

- [Catalog \(GSEC\)](#)
- [Grading Policies](#)
- [Academic Performance and Professional Conduct](#)
- [Degree Candidacy](#)

Law School

- [Admissions Requirements](#)
- [ABA Required Disclosures](#)- Admission-related consumer information
- [Graduation Requirements](#)

Standard 1.C.5 - Effective System of Assessment to Evaluate the Quality of Learning in Programs

The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs.

Lewis & Clark College routinely conducts both internal and external reviews to evaluate programs and services and assess whether goals and intended outcomes have been met. These reviews take several forms; faculty have a primary role in the evaluation of educational programs and services.

As stated in the Faculty Handbook and Bylaws: Under authority delegated by the Board of Trustees, each of the three faculties of the College, operating under approved bylaws, determines the curriculum for the degrees it offers, admits students to degree candidacy, and recommends students for receipt of the degrees for which they have qualified.

Faculty, in consultation with members within their departments, have the authority to design their curricula. The Curriculum Committee, of which both the dean and the Registrar are ex officio members, ultimately must approve the curricula. Faculty take full responsibility for fostering and assessing student achievement of clearly defined learning outcomes that are in their course syllabi.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

The College's [Faculty Handbook III.D.5.Art.5.sec.6](#) confirms that the Curriculum Committee (CC), a representative body of elected faculty members, has "primary responsibility for the curriculum of the College of Arts & Sciences." They meet regularly

Lewis & Clark College

throughout the academic year to “review all aspects of the educational program of the College; review and approve proposal for earned degrees to be offered and the requirements for them, review and approve proposals for the establishment or elimination of departmental, interdisciplinary, and general education programs in the College; review and approve all departmental, general educational, and interdisciplinary courses offered by the College; and formulate and review other academic policies and procedures.”

The College of Arts and Sciences conducts regular internal and external reviews in order to review quality and effective delivery of our curriculum, and to assess the fulfillment of our [overall learning objectives for a liberal arts education](#). The undergraduate college has multiple assessment processes to review quality and effectiveness of learning in its programs.

Most extensively, the [decennial external review process](#) engages the faculty of the department/program in “reflection about their history, accomplishments, challenges, and future aspirations, and to provide advice to the department/program and College about how the department/program can be improved. An essential part of that review is assessing “how well students are learning what you wish them to learn and how well you are preparing them for life after L&C.” Departments are asked to provide data supporting their “strengths and challenges in student satisfaction, student learning, and post-L&C endeavors.” The decennial review process consists of four components: (1) a departmental or program self-study; (2) a campus visit by a team of disciplinary experts; (3) a written report by the review team; and (4) a response from the department/program to the experts’ review. More detail on this process can be found in the [Guide to Prepare for a Departmental or Program Review](#) (revised June 2024). Examples from two recent reviews (World Languages and Literatures and Music) can be found [here](#).

The undergraduate college’s assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness is grounded in [the CAS’s principles of teaching excellence](#), developed by a series of taskforces on teaching excellence. These principles were approved by vote of the faculty in May 2024. These principles guide all assessments of faculty effectiveness in the classroom. Our principles state that excellent teachers:

- Foster classroom, laboratory, field, and studio environments that are conducive to student engagement and learning.
- Promote student proficiencies in critical inquiry, including disciplinary and interdisciplinary argumentation, analysis, research, writing, creative activity.
- Consider and respond collaboratively to student concerns and needs that impact their academic success.

Lewis & Clark College

- Actively promote equity and inclusion through pedagogy, curricular choices, and/or mentorship.
- Engage in reflective practices, pedagogical and curricular experimentation, and ongoing professional development.

These principles are the primary means by which we assess faculty teaching, being the criteria for second- and fourth-year junior faculty reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and triennial reviews of tenured faculty.

In addition, these task forces developed a new instrument for student evaluation of teaching (SET) (i.e. course evaluation assessment form) with the goal of better mitigating implicit bias and providing more useful feedback about and assessment of the teaching excellence and student learning. Two faculty whose research involves survey design and bias scholarship led the development of the new form over a 18-month period. In an extensive pilot program in Spring 2025, faculty and student experiences have been extremely positive overall. Faculty feedback overwhelmingly found these new forms producing more specific, actionable responses as a whole and that the new forms were more useful than the old ones for guiding newer teachers' development. The strong majority of students were also either neutral or favored this new form over the old. Students tended to focus on how the new questions felt more specific and fairer to the professor (N>20) and how they appreciated the opportunity to provide richer feedback (and also understood the benefits of doing so both in terms of helping faculty development and for increasing equity in the evaluation process). The new SET is expected to be approved by the faculty this Fall and will be used in all classes for Fall 2025 courses.

Over the course of this accreditation cycle, Lewis & Clark College redesigned its governance structure around General Education to foreground the assessment process and encourage responsive, informed revisions. Previously, there was no faculty body dedicated to overseeing the assessment of the curriculum: The Curriculum Committee oversaw all curriculum, with committee members elected for two-year terms with representation across the curricular divisions; the first-year core program had a director (appointed by the Dean of the College) and an advisory committee of elected faculty members drawn from different curricular divisions (two-year terms), independent of other governing parties.

In 2015-17 the Curriculum Committee (CC) formed a [subcommittee on general education](#) to lead the faculty through curricular reform. Starting in 2017-18, that general education subcommittee expanded to include appointed faculty members beyond the CC; its purview evolved to holding sessions with the greater faculty to determine the criteria and learning objectives for each individual requirement. By May 2019, those recommendations were brought forward to the entire faculty for ratification. This was

Lewis & Clark College

the state of our governance when the accreditors visited campus at the end of the last cycle.

Lewis & Clark responded to the accreditors' suggestions (mentioned also in the Mid-Cycle Evaluation) for an institution-wide accreditation steering committee by instituting the following changes:

- Elected positions on all standing committees, including CC, are for three-year terms, rather than two, to strengthen continuity in tackling long-term tasks.
- Instead of a director of the first-year core program, we now have a Director of General Education, whose charge encompasses the two-course core curriculum, but has been expanded to include oversight and operational responsibility for the entire General Education Program. Primary among the new responsibilities are monitoring and assessment of all distribution requirements, and overall supervision of the General Education curriculum.
- Recognizing that the volume of work before the Curriculum Committee was too much to also robustly handle assessment, particularly with regard to general education, the General Education Subcommittee has been constituted as a separate committee (GESC) whose members include the Director of General Education and three faculty-members elected across the curricular divisions for three-year terms³.
- The Curriculum Committee has a representative who attends GESC as a liaison to the CC on matters of assessment.
- A staff member from Institutional Research attends the GESC meetings to assist with assessment and matters related to accreditation; the Director of the First-Year-Experience attends the GESC meetings to ensure synchronization with matters related to New Student Orientation and co-curricular experiences. Both serve as ex-officio members of GESC.

This revised governance structure has allowed us to more effectively conduct and monitor the assessment process. General Education may have its own steering committee, but evaluation of the suitability of individual courses for general education rests with the Curriculum Committee (CC). When a faculty member proposes that a course fulfill a general education requirement, that request is screened twice by an elected faculty, once through a sub-committee and then again by the full CC.

While the CC is the elected body overseeing the curriculum, the larger faculty ultimately makes changes to the curriculum, voting on proposals that CC has vetted. For example, a German minor was created, responding to the needs for students from a variety of

³ We expand on General Education Assessment in Standard 1.C.6

Lewis & Clark College

situations (e.g., unable to study abroad [a necessity for delivering adequate coursework for the major], not having enough room to accommodate a second major, or a transfer student who found German late); research also showed that adding a German minor put no strains on our existing curriculum while putting us in parity with many peer institutions. Similarly, the Theatre department examined student enrollments, student feedback on departmental assessments, and larger disciplinary trends to retire a major concentration in Theatre Literature/History and instead to create a new concentration in Arts for Community. This new concentration draws upon a recent faculty hire's expertise in performance studies and accords with a growing field of applied theatre (i.e., performance practices used to intervene in larger social settings). Moreover, the Arts for Community concentration is poised to develop in concert with the new Strategic Initiatives. In both of these cases—the German minor and the new Theatre concentration—the CC consulted with programs to revise their proposals, and the full faculty were informed of the stakes before voting.

The annual CAS Faculty Retreat at the start of the academic year is another example of a program designed to support continuous improvement in supporting student learning. For the past two years, we have shifted from a keynote speaker model to a crowd-sourced afternoon of small group discussions and workshops. With support from our elected Faculty Council, we select a theme and invite faculty input on particular offerings. Then, we solicit faculty and staff volunteers to lead discussions, workshops, panel presentations, and open houses/tours. Our goal has been to not only provide information faculty can use but also to promote connections amongst faculty with shared interests. A list of offerings are available for [Fall 2023](#) and [Fall 2024](#).

The theme for the fall 2025 retreat is “What do our students need now?” We envision that this event will be an opportunity for faculty to discuss ideas for curricular innovations inspired by the [Strategic Initiatives](#). In the afternoon, the faculty will also be presented with a draft for revisions to our general education proposed jointly by CC/GESC; this blueprint was developed in summer 2025 after these elected committees reviewed cumulative assessment data and the NWCCU accreditation reports from 2018 and 2021. We propose over the course of the 2026 academic year that GESC will lead faculty in smaller discussions to refine any proposed changes, with the goal of the CC formally drafting recommendations and presenting them to the full faculty for a vote by April 2026.

In response to *Recommendation 1: Fall 2018 Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability*, the faculty of Lewis & Clark College approved a [guiding framework](#) for assessing the effectiveness of our new general education program beginning in 2019. Since then, the Director of General Education, the Subcommittee on Curricular Assessment of the Curriculum Committee (SCA), the General Education Steering Committee (GESC), and Institutional Research (IR) Staff have been iteratively working to design an assessment plan that meets the needs of our faculty, students, and accreditors. We feel that to

Lewis & Clark College

meet our obligations to these diverse stakeholders, we must assess *both* the specific learning outcomes for individual categories of general education courses (First-Year Seminars and distribution requirements) *and* the broader “Stated Learning Goals of a Lewis & Clark Education” that emerged from our 2016 Identity Statement.

The [2021 Mid-Cycle report](#) outlined the changes that had been implemented since the 2018 site visit and in standard [1.C.6](#) of this EIE report we further describe the work completed to more systematically assess the General Education program.

Since that time, we have also created and staffed a [First-Year Experience](#) (FYE) office, which helps students acclimate and find success inside and outside the classroom. The First-Year Experience (FYE) office conducts assessments of all incoming students at the conclusion of New Student Orientation (NSO) to evaluate the program's effectiveness and inform improvements for future iterations. At the end of the fall semester, the same cohort is reassessed to measure the impact of the New Student Peer Mentor (NSPM) program and to determine whether students have achieved specific learning objectives, such as navigating Portland’s public transportation system.

Incoming students participate in a national [new student survey](#) (through [HEDS](#)- the Higher Education Data Sharing consortium) that allows us to compare our students’ expectations and experiences with those of our peers. After the fall semester, we administer a follow-up new student survey (home grown) to track changes in various measured scales, enabling the FYE team to evaluate the effectiveness of initiatives and adjust strategies accordingly. Additionally, the First-Year Experience (FYE) office actively monitors the institution's first-to-second-year retention rates and analyzes student departure data to identify trends and areas for improvement.

Student Life/Co-Curricular

Regular assessment occurs in programs offered through the Division of Student Life, as well. In spring, 2023 the division conducted a [SWOT analysis](#), which showed that quality of staff and resiliency are major strengths of the division, resource limitations and a culture of staff overextending were weaknesses, creating more leadership opportunities within the division to impact practice and culture was an opportunity, and major threats were urban costs of living and pay equity. Divisional deans and directors placed items identified during the SWOT analysis in a matrix that assisted in determining locus of control and near- and long-term impact possibilities, allowing for strategic planning and partnerships.

Departmental programmatic examples include the following:

- International Students & Scholars (ISS) staff conduct personal interviews with each new international student and TCK (Third Culture Kid, or Global Nomad)

Lewis & Clark College

during the last month of their first semester and midway through their third semester. Topics assessed include the students' academic performance, residential experience, social integration, health and safety, and their awareness of areas needing change, improvement, or support. The data collected guide ISS planning of both future orientation sessions as well as other mid-year informational programs and trainings. Based on the interview data, we have adjusted orientation sessions on student accounts/finances and student employment. We also initiated a series of listening sessions focused on belonging, which led to enhanced programming.

- The Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement (IME) office assesses student learning and achievement after each educational event to determine whether learning goals were met. After a reasonable amount of time, the IME Director and program lead will go over assessment results to reflect and discuss program successes and growth opportunities in order to adequately plan for future programming.
- Health Promotion and Wellness assess program goals focused on skill-building, behavior change, and health literacy, to evaluate the impact of its educational programs on student learning. These are measured through participant surveys and reflective feedback. Assessment results help determine whether learning outcomes are met and guide continuous improvements.
- Center for Social Change and Community Involvement (CSCCI) completes yearly assessment reports that use a combination of qualitative and quantitative data to determine successes, improvements and goals for the following academic year. CSCCI annually collects event numbers broken down by type of program (Service, Workshop/Dialogue, Outreach, and Other). We track the number of engagements, number of service hours per event, per semester and per year, which we compare each year to compile patterns and shifts. In addition, participant feedback is collected after each event. We also use self-assessment to determine student learning outcomes for student leaders in CSCCI.
- The Career Center assesses our departments' learning outcomes at different points in time based on the timing of specific programs and services designed to achieve these goals. We use various forms of feedback to assess the Career Center's programs and services, including a post-appointment survey.

Career Center staff are asked to identify 1-3 primary learning outcomes for each event or program. Programs promoting internship and experiential learning experiences are assessed at the midpoint and conclusion of each student's experience in the program; other programs are assessed at the conclusion. We also administer the College of Arts and Science's annual first destination report and to assess students' career interests.

Lewis & Clark College

- The Student Counseling Center administers a post-utilization survey to invite students who have used the SCC to provide feedback on a number of dimensions related to the goals and learning outcomes identified in the course of therapy. We use these to inform individual clinician and overall agency improvements.

Additionally, the Graduate clinical training program (Doctoral Practicum and Master's Internship) includes assessment of student progress toward their academic/clinical training goals, site visits, supervisory feedback from trainees, and trainee feedback regarding their overall training experience. We review these each semester as a training team, and outcomes inform improvements to the clinical training program. We have not been assessing learning from educational outreach programs or paraprofessional training.

Graduate School

In an ongoing effort to develop our QAS, we have adopted new technologies for data management and assessment reporting (e.g. Blue/Explorance for course evaluations, Slate for admissions, Salesforce for Partnerships and Clinical Placements, TaskStream for program key assessment data and licensure completion audits, Raiser's Edge for alumni and continuing education data). As we have moved our data collection and reporting to cloud-hosted enterprise data systems, our QAS has provided our professional community with improved capacity to examine assessment data in real time, with improved analytics at both the unit and program level. These functioning data collection and reporting tools enable us to provide oversight of programs and unit operations consistent with the CAEP standards and TSPC rules. We are also better able to use our skills and time to produce more meaningful analyses and reports.

As we have rolled out these systems, we have done the hard work of mapping fields and tables, selecting trigger criteria, and advocating with our central IT office to ensure functioning data integration with Colleague (our SIS). These data integrations have improved reliability by ensuring that a datum is reportable in many contexts, but stored in only one location in the appropriate system of record.

Reporting Improvements

One of the payoffs of our investments in systems and infrastructure over the years has been the freeing up of Research and Assessment staff time for development of improved analyses and reports. A few examples are discussed below.

Licensure Exam Scores

Beginning in 2013, in collaboration with our Elementary program faculty, we began revising our analyses to present the data in terms that spoke directly to our faculty's

Lewis & Clark College

interests. From 2013 through 2015, we devised and refined an analysis that focused on mean high score, high score pass rate, number of repeaters (candidates who took an exam multiple times), and average number of attempts amongst our repeaters. Because faculty wanted to be able to trace the impact of program changes and the unique dynamics of each cohort upon licensure outcomes, and because candidates take their exams across a wide timespan, we also regrouped the analysis by admissions cohort rather than exam year. The result has been a report that more clearly presents licensure outcomes for each cohort ([see example](#)). In more recent years, we have developed another iteration of the licensure exam pass rates report that breaks each admissions cohort out by exam year, to facilitate comparison to national benchmarks (see examples for both the [initial](#) and [advanced](#) program licensure exam pass rates).

Longitudinal Yield Reporting

Since we first gained the ability to schedule reports drawn from SIS data in 2012, our admissions office has delivered a weekly admissions update to program directors throughout the admissions season. For many years, this was a pipeline report, showing total applicants at each admissions stage in the current cycle. The primary purpose of this report was to guide faculty recruitment efforts for the current incoming cohort. The dean eventually requested that this report be reworked as a yield analysis, showing remaining applicants at each admissions stage as a percentage of total applications received. He also requested a longitudinal version of this report to allow programs to reflect upon changes in recruitment strategies and admissions climates over time. For these reports to be possible, several hurdles needed to be overcome. These included a need for new infrastructure and reconciliation of the discrepancies between net deposits, as recorded in the admissions module of our SIS, and the matriculants numbers our faculty had long been accustomed to. In early 2019, the necessary preliminary work was completed and the new longitudinal yield analysis was distributed to the dean and program directors. In the course of refreshing the yield data, we also built in the capacity to apply demographic filters to the analysis, which will be helpful in examining trends in our diversity recruitment.

Annual Demographics

Since 2012, we have provided annual demographic reports to program directors, detailing five years of program enrollment by race/ethnicity, gender, and age band. Because of the large amount of detail in these reports, faculty had trouble using the tabular data. In 2018, we rolled out a new visualization of these data, designed to help faculty see and evaluate change over time. We hope to see the new visualization pay off in more detailed reckonings with program demographics in program planning, as documented in the program annual reports.

Lewis & Clark College

Evolution of Individual Enterprise Data Systems

TaskStream:

The adoption and implementation of TaskStream electronic portfolio software has provided an effective foundation for collecting and analyzing key assessment data within and across programs. In fall of 2011, the Graduate School secured a Strategic Initiative Fund grant from the President's office to evaluate ePortfolio/Assessment system vendors. After an initial review, program directors were briefed in December 2011 on the trade-offs of three potential systems. TaskStream was selected in 2012 based on our detailed vetting. In spring 2012, program directors were briefed on the details of implementation and offered the chance to participate in the summer 2012 pilot phase. Additional programs began using TaskStream during 2013-14, and by 2015-16, most programs were using the system. All licensure programs were using TaskStream for their assessment data collection and licensing audits by 2016-17. Evaluators (faculty), using rubrics tied to the applicable standards, then assess each candidate's acquisition of the required knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The Office of Research and Assessment also uses TaskStream as a data repository and analysis tool. TaskStream has enabled upload of program assessment artifacts into [folios](#) that have been organized according to the applicable standards.

Course Evaluations:

Beginning just after our last NCATE site visit, we also piloted a faculty-research based course evaluation form and vetted an electronic submission process with a number of vendors. Specifically, our pilot process consisted of:

- 2012 Fall: Pilot of new questionnaire, administered on paper.
- 2013 Spring: After reviewing the results of the pilot, a revised questionnaire was developed by Research and Assessment and participating faculty.
- 2013 Summer: Pilot of online course evaluations, using the new questionnaire, with two different vendors.
- 2013 Fall, 2014 Spring: Explorance is selected as our vendor. The old questionnaire was administered on paper while the system was built.
- 2014 Summer: Launch of the new system and new questionnaire

Each term, department chairs and the dean also receive report with a departmental average for each question alongside a comparative school-wide average. A frequency table and standard deviation are included for the aggregated department score (see [Course Evaluation Aggregates](#) for examples). The department aggregate report does not include comment responses to open-ended questions; however, both the department

Lewis & Clark College

chair and the dean have access to individual faculty reports, if they wish to access this information.

Placements Data Systems:

Our Strategic Partnerships and Clinical Placements Office (SPCP) has used TaskStream's field placement module since 2013 to monitor and record placements. Although it was a great improvement upon the fragmented departmental Filemaker databases that preceded it, fundamental data structure and data management limitations have prompted us to look for a new system.

Beginning in 2016-17 we began building a systematic placement diagnostic reporting system for all of our education programs, a functionality we did not have with just the TaskStream module alone. Our Research and Assessment and Strategic Partnerships and Clinical Placements Offices had long collaborated on a periodic review of placements data, but it was a laborious, manual exercise in cross-referencing. In a given year, we place approximately 200 candidates in approximately 300 student teaching experiences, internships, and practica. Diagnostic reporting allows us to identify potential problems before they escalate and to efficiently identify and correct anomalies as we move through the phases of each program's placement cycle. Our current placements diagnostics process joins data from TaskStream, Colleague, and a hand-transcribed dataset of mentors' TSPC credentials, to alert us of placement scenarios that need to be addressed [e.g. missing placement records, or questionable matches between mentor credentials and candidates' license or endorsement sought).

With the automation provided by the new system, more staff time can be spent refining reporting. In our current operations, faculty receive course evaluation reports each term displaying the results of the course evaluation questionnaire completed by students at the conclusion of each course. Reports display a response ratio, response count, mean, and standard deviation, as well as a frequency table. Comments to open-ended questions in the survey provide context to the scores and are also included in the report. In 2018 the report was revised upon faculty request to a table format instead of a longer, multi-page graphical format. The response count, mean, and standard deviation are still included in each report, but are displayed in a table versus a bar graph.

As we were developing our diagnostic reporting, it became apparent that the Strategic Partnerships and Clinical Placements Office needed to track and coordinate multiple lines of communication and collaboration between our programs and partners best served through a constituent relationship management (CRM) system. Starting in fall 2017, we began planning and developing a funding model with L&C's central IT office to bring Salesforce on board at the Graduate School as both CRM and system of record for placements. With funding in place, we began implementation in summer 2018. As of

Lewis & Clark College

this writing, the Strategic Partnerships and Clinical Placements Office communications tracking has been implemented in Salesforce and is the system of record for placements. Continued Colleague/Salesforce integrations and improved reporting via SQL are ongoing.

Law School

The Law School has a plan of assessment for our program of legal education. The review of our curriculum as a whole is conducted by faculty and students. Our overall program of legal education is largely evaluated through the work of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA), the Curriculum Committee (which includes two students with full voting rights), and subject matter committees that specialize in particular fields like Environment, Natural Resources, and Energy Committee or the Business Law Committee. The Curriculum Committee reviews and approves new courses, drafts or revises academic policies, and oversees the curriculum as a whole.

The methods of curriculum evaluation are long-standing elements of our faculty work, including our three-year planning and the ADAA's ongoing curriculum planning. Subject-matter committees (or department committees) and other cohorts of faculty, such as our lawyering and clinical faculty, evaluate curricular offerings throughout the year, particularly during the building of the three-year plan each fall semester. Taking into account enrollment patterns, trends in particular subject matter areas and relevant pedagogy, and student interest, each committee proposes a three-year plan that the ADAA reviews and incorporates into the institution-wide plan. The ADAA also presents the plan to the Curriculum Committee for its review and input.

Where faculty, the ADAA, or particular committees have identified necessary adjustments, these are discussed, planned, and implemented by relevant committees or the ADAA. When issues are flagged that cut across our curriculum, such as bar passage rates, the entire faculty may discuss and engage in the issue, ultimately tasking specific committees, faculty, and administrative staff to develop proposals or implement new policies. The changes may require adjustments to curriculum, methods of assessment, or the various support services we provide to students.

Numerous assessment methodologies have been employed across specific aspects of our program of legal education. For example, student performance in core classes and performance on core topics in bar exam study (and on bar exam itself when that information is available) has informed a review of our assessment methods across our 1L and doctrinal curriculum. We have periodically had extensive faculty discussion regarding the value of mid-term exams, the nature and style of final exams, and the development of exam questions that reflect the style of bar questions that the students will likely face. Student evaluations across the curriculum and student reflection exercises in experiential courses also inform faculty assessment of our program of legal

Lewis & Clark College

education. In specific classes, for example, faculty have added more simulation and practical application exercises to their syllabi to respond to student feedback.

The assessment committee, which started meeting this spring, will collect data for the Law School as a whole, and report on how well our courses help students meet our learning outcomes. Student surveys, course evaluations, along with faculty assessment of student learning, will drive any changes to enhance student learning and improve our program of legal education.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.5

Institutional

- [Strategic Initiatives](#)

College of Arts and Sciences

- [Faculty Handbook III.D.5.Art.5.sec.6](#)
- [Learning objectives for a liberal arts education](#)
- [Departmental External Review Process](#)
- [Guide to Prepare for a Departmental or Program Review](#)
 - [Recent examples](#)
- [General Education Steering Committee \(GESC\) Charge](#)
- [Fall 2023](#) and [Fall 2024](#) CAS Faculty Retreat Agendas
- [General Education Assessment Guiding Framework](#)
- [2021 Mid- Cycle report](#)
- [First-Year Experience](#)
- [Student Life SWOT Analysis](#)

Graduate School of Education and Counseling

- [Licensure Outcomes](#)
- [Initial Licensure Exam Pass Rate](#)
- [Advanced Licensure Exam Pass Rate](#)
- [Licensure Candidate Folio](#) (examples)
- [Course Evaluation Aggregates](#)

Standard 1.C.6 - Effective Assessment of General Education Curriculum and Institutional Learning Outcomes

Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global

Lewis & Clark College

awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.

Overview of Lewis & Clark General Education Program

The [general education](#) program at Lewis & Clark centers our faculty-supported [identity statement](#) (scroll halfway down the page), and is designed to spark students' curiosity, encourage them to take intellectual chances, and push them to participate thoughtfully and passionately in a diverse and interdependent world. The [curriculum](#) is flexible in that students are required to take courses that meet specific distribution requirements, but they can choose from a wide variety of courses that do so. Upon graduation we would like our students to have:

- Mastered modes of critical inquiry through writing; conducting quantitative, qualitative, and scientific analysis; acquiring and evaluating evidence
- Stretched themselves as scholars, researchers, and artists to achieve a high degree of facility in their areas of interest
- Gained confidence to range across disciplines both individually and in collaboration
- Engaged constructively with cultural difference and power
- Grounded their education in local, global, and historical contexts
- Encountered wonder and grappled with experiences that are not about seeking answers
- Practiced habits of self-care, community, and well-being
- Reflected critically on their liberal education and its purpose in the contemporary world

To achieve this, students are required to take two First-Year Seminars (FYS) and an array of courses that satisfy the following [General Education Course Categories](#):

- Bibliographic Research and Writing (BRW)
- Creative Arts (CA)
- Culture, Power, and Identity (CPI)
- Global Perspectives (GP)
- Historical Perspectives (HP)
- Natural Sciences (NS)

Lewis & Clark College

- Physical Education and Well-Being (PE/WB)
- World Languages.

The rationale behind each category and the stated learning objectives are posted [online](#) and in the [catalog](#).

As outlined in our [2021 Mid-Cycle Review](#) (Recommendations 1 and 4) the current iteration of our General Education curriculum was launched in the Fall of 2020 along with the newly developed assessment plan. Assessment of the General Education program includes evaluation of both the categorical learning outcomes individually *and* the broader impacts of the program as a whole. The faculty voted on an assessment [framework](#) and goals of the assessment process. The faculty mandate stipulated that responsibility for assessment in GE is to be shared between the Curriculum Committee's Subcommittee on Curricular Assessment, and the General Education Steering Committee (GESC).

In June of 2020, the Director of General Education, along with all members of GESC, a Curriculum Committee representative, and two representatives from the Institutional Research office attended AAC&U's weeklong summer Institute on General Education and Assessment (IGEA). There, they developed an assessment plan for the First Year Seminars (Words and Numbers) and an [action plan](#) to guide the assessment development process⁴. The action plan included the establishment of a General Education Assessment Fellows (GEAF) program. The goals of the GEAF program were to: (i) have direct instructor input into the development of assessment protocols, (ii) have a pool of faculty available to pilot new assessment protocols in their respective sections, and (iii) have GEAF fellows provide reflections about their experiences with the new assessment tools.

The result was a [GE Assessment Rubric](#) that was calibrated to and operationalized based on the [First-Year Seminar Learning Outcomes](#)⁴. Our pilot assessment for the First-Year Seminars took place at the end of Spring 2021⁵. Results were used to fine tune the assessment tool and to inform development of assessments for the other areas of the General Education curriculum which were rolled out starting in Fall 2021.

⁴ This was an interactive process. For brevity, we are just listing key milestones here.

⁵ Initially, assessments were administered twice a semester (at the mid term and at the end). After reviewing and discussing results, however, we determined that minimal insight was to be gained from the mid-semester assessments because the learning outcomes are designed to reflect the culmination of coursework; not many would have been met halfway through the course.

Lewis & Clark College

Examples of summaries

- [Fall 2022 FYS assessment](#)
- [Spring 2023 FYS midterm assessment](#)

Based on these experiences, we held an Assessment Planning Retreat in 2023 to develop equivalent rubrics for the remaining components of the curriculum and launched data collection in the following academic year. (Rubrics are in the file “Gen Ed Rubrics” uploaded into the NWCCU Box Folder).

Having followed the more aggressive timeline from our [proposed options](#) laid out in 2021, we now have summaries for each of the components of the General Education curriculum. Please see Standard [1.C.7](#) for details on how we have used and implemented data from these assessments. (Rubric summaries are in the file “Gen Ed Rubric Summaries” uploaded into the NWCCU Box Folder).

This next academic year, we will continue to follow this timeline to administer additional assessments in each area while also discussing next steps and any needed refinement to the assessment process. Taking time to step back and review is especially important as the Curriculum Committee and others evaluate the current General Education requirements in light of the recently launched [strategic plan](#).

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.6

College of Arts and Sciences

- [General Education Program Overview](#)
- [Identity Statement](#) (scroll halfway down the page)
- [General Education Curriculum](#)
- [General Education Course Categories](#)
- [General Education Learning Objectives](#)
- [2021 Mid-Cycle Review](#)
- [General Education Assessment Framework](#)
- [General Education Action Plan](#)
- [GE Assessment Rubric](#)
- [First-Year Seminar Learning Outcomes](#)
- Examples of summaries
 - [Fall 2022 FYS Assessment](#)
 - [Spring 2023 FYS Midterm Assessment](#)
- Additional Gen Ed Rubrics and Rubric Summaries have been loaded to Box
- [Assessment Timeline Options](#)
- [L&C Strategic Plan](#)

Standard 1.C.7 - Results of assessment efforts Used to Inform Planning and Practice and for Continuous Improvement

The institution uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes.

College of Arts & Sciences

General Education

To close the feedback loop and inform General Education curricular planning, we have established a [framework](#) to engage and guide the L&C community in reflecting on the results of our assessment process. That framework includes reviewing assessments from both the individual categorical assessments and the curriculum as a whole as well as actively seeking out different stakeholders in multiple fashions and settings.

Using the data- General Education Categorical Outcomes:

- Reports to the faculty highlighting results of assessment processes and the status of assessment in GE
 - [GESC Report- Accreditation Overview \(Nov 2022\)](#)
 - [Gen Ed Assessment Progress Report \(Feb 2024\)](#)
 - And [others](#) that included information about assessment, but assessment was not the main focus of the report.
- Townhalls and workshops organized around GE Components and assessment methods
 - [GESC presentation slides \(Dec 2023\)](#)
 - [Copy of GE Assessment Overview- Jan 2024](#)
- An assessment workshop for faculty to discuss findings from assessment
 - [May 2024 Assessment Workshop Notes](#)
 - Overall, the quantitative results of the general education assessment rubrics indicate that students demonstrate satisfactory or higher achievement of learning outcomes for General Education Courses.
 - In particular, faculty found the “what worked, what didn’t” section of each course assessment particularly helpful as it gave them ideas for how to tweak course assignments, discussions and/or materials based on what others had already tried and found worked.

Lewis & Clark College

- One area faculty noted for improvement was helping students better understand and articulate how what they learned in the class translates to real-world settings.
- Stakeholder Conversations (Fall 2024) with faculty and staff related to issues that emerged through both assessment and review of the assessment findings.
 - [BRW Discussion with Library Staff](#)
 - [College Success Course - Integration with CORE discussion with FYE](#)

To assess the broader impacts of the General Education curriculum as a whole, we first [mapped](#) the [Pillars of the General Education curriculum](#) (scroll halfway down the page) to the [High Impact Practices](#) outlined in the National Survey of Student Engagement ([NSSE](#))⁶ and collected supporting evidence via the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement ([FSSE](#)). We used the results of each survey on their own in a variety of ways (comparing first-year students with seniors, comparing seniors over time, and comparing both first-year students and seniors with regional and national peers for NSSE and to better understand the importance and focus instructors place on various high impact practices via FSSE) as well as in conjunction with each other to assess where student and faculty experiences and perceptions align (and where they do not).

At the April 2024 faculty meeting, GESC shared the [results snapshot](#) comparing L&C seniors with seniors at other small liberal arts colleges, [a multi year report](#) comparing results from L&C seniors over time and some [key take-aways](#). Open-ended comments were used to help illustrate findings. In general, we found that average indicator scores for seniors showed general improvement with the implementation of the new General Education Curriculum. Seniors who responded to the survey indicated that their experience at L&C contributed significantly to their growth in key areas of the General Education curriculum (critical thinking, communication skills, collaboration and to a slightly lesser degree analyzing numerical and statistical information and being an informed and active citizen). Less gain was perceived in other key areas (understanding people of other backgrounds, solving complex real-world problems and acquiring work-related knowledge and skills).

Compared with peers at other small liberal arts colleges, L&C graduating seniors were:

- More likely than peers at other small liberal arts colleges (SLACs) to indicate that they:
 - spent more than 10 hours per week on assigned reading

⁶ See the “Assessing Gen Ed for Accreditation” [narrative](#) and [spreadsheet](#) for more detailed information.

Lewis & Clark College

- had discussions with...People with sexual orientations other than [their] own
- participated in a study abroad program (HIP)
- [Their] instructors reviewed and summarized key ideas and concepts
- evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information (quantitative reasoning)
- Less likely to have responded that they:
 - participated in an internship, co-op, field exp., student teach., clinical placement (HIP)
 - talked about career plans with a faculty member
 - had discussions with... People with religious beliefs other than [their] own
 - had discussions with... People with political views other than [their] own
 - [The] institution emphasize[d] encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds

These results are helpful in understanding where the General Education curriculum has succeeded and where, perhaps, it needs more work.

Faculty and staff in the College of Arts and Sciences were invited to join the Steering Committee for a full day workshop in May 2024 to explore a comprehensive review of the results. Participants were split into groups, each with a particular focus⁷, and worked to identify emerging themes, successes, and areas for improvement. In short, participants in the workshop noted that the General Education Curriculum, as a whole, was meeting the goals of the College and students were gaining meaningful experiences. Having the working groups focus on different comparisons within the three data sets was particularly helpful in pinpointing areas in need of improvement related to specific classes, the general education program as a whole, or in the way we, as an institution, approach talking about the general education curriculum and its applicability outside the classroom.

What we learned:

- The group comparing the engagement of first year students with the engagement of seniors was able to confirm that students grow in their time with us and acquire the skills we would expect them to vis a vis the General Education curriculum (and their majors).

⁷ Comparing L&C First Years with L&C Seniors to look for growth over time; comparing L&C Seniors with Seniors at Peer institutions for benchmarking; comparing L&C NSSE and FSSE Responses

Lewis & Clark College

- The group comparing L&C Seniors with their peers at other institutions noted that:
 - Our students participated in (or perceived themselves as participating in) fewer High Impact Practices (HIPs) overall than their peers.
 - Our students reported less exposure to broad political and religious perspectives than did their peers. This coincides with concerns expressed in the recently-administered campus climate survey: some students are not comfortable (or fear) voicing their opinions about politics or religion in the classroom when they oppose the views of the majority and perceive others to feel the same way, thus limiting the breadth of ideas discussed.
- The group comparing L&C's NSSE and FSSE results noted that:
 - There is a disconnect between what faculty think students have learned/gained and what students think they are learning. Although students were gaining in most of the areas the general education curriculum addresses, they were not necessarily "reflecting critically on their liberal education and its purpose in the contemporary world" with success.
 - Further, students seemed to view their time with us as a series of small parts, several highly valued experiences (e.g., a semester studying abroad, a capstone project for a major, a tutoring job in the writing center), but did not recognize their education as a summative whole that has trained them for their next steps.

Thus, we identified two specific areas in need of improvement:

- Providing our students with a broader exposure to different ideologies, especially in regard to political and religious perspectives.
- Helping students recognize how their newly-gained knowledge and experiences translate to meaningful real-life skillsets (which also ties to providing access to more high impact practices).

The College has been working for the last few years to "make healthy, constructive dialogue a part of our identity as an institution, and the foundation of how we relate to each other..." through the [Community Dialogues](#) program. Results from the NSSE-FSSE comparisons and the campus climate survey serve to help us focus our programming in the upcoming school year.

The second challenge - helping students connect their classroom learning with their lives and plans after college - ties to the Strategic Initiatives laid out in the new strategic plan.

Lewis & Clark College

Just as we have shifted the language of the mission statement to express “the institutional mission in terms that better align with the current academic environment and speak to the aspirations of our potential students,” so too must we adjust our language around the purpose and applicability of the general education curriculum. We must do a better job of helping our students understand and articulate how their many experiences - inside and outside the classroom - culminate in a superior and applicable education.

This work has already begun:

A new Director of General Education took the reins during the Spring 2025 semester and began the work of establishing next steps for the General Education curriculum, building upon the 2024 findings. In May of 2025, she held an all-day “gen ed health check” meeting with the General Education Steering Committee and the Curriculum Committee. She reported:

“I asked us to think about our general education program on three levels:

Do we still believe that the **value** motivating a particular requirement is something we want for all of our students? (E.g., Do we still believe that a global perspective is something we want for every L&C student?) Is there a **value** that we think our students need that is not captured within our current curriculum?

Do we think that the value still holds but believe that the **current structure** is not accomplishing that? For example, we value having our students be healthy and mindful, but is it necessary to require two semesters of coursework to fulfill the Physical Health/Well Being requirement? (We decided after discussion it is!)

Do we affirm both the value and the current structure but think the **curriculum** needs changing? For instance, we want students to gain historical perspectives, and we recognize that departmentally-owned courses are the best way that value can be delivered structurally, but do we think the criteria defining eligible courses need to be revised?

“To conduct this examination, we began by reading together the identity statement for what the faculty wanted for all students that they had ratified unanimously in 2015-16. This identity statement served as the blueprint upon which our current general education program is built. We then read the most recent institutional mission statement and the Strategic Initiatives statement to see how the 2015-16 faculty identity statement squared with those and, by extension, how our general education program supported the larger institutional mission. Rereading the faculty’s 2015-16 statement, we were in agreement with its sentiments but were also struck by how, only a decade later, it seemed a time capsule from a different era. While we endorsed all of its values, we agreed that its expression was slightly out of step with the current

Lewis & Clark College

institutional mission statement and strategic planning: those documents speak more explicitly about the institution and its education grounded within a conflicted world; they articulate more concrete outcomes about employment, and the tone suggests that the holistic value of a liberal arts “life of the mind” education cannot be taken unequivocally as a good on its own. In other words, the 2015-16 statement seemed a bit out of touch with the realities of where American society is now, not in the values we wished to impart to our students but in our justification for wanting to do so. Two values not highlighted in the 2015-16 faculty statement that seemed present in the current institutional documents concerned constructively handling conflicts with others of different viewpoints and applying one’s education in a workplace.

“We then went through each requirement to see (1) if we felt that the language and outcomes still fulfilled a value we saw in the overlap between the institution’s mission statement and the faculty’s (slightly outdated) vision, (2) if we thought the current model of delivery (e.g., departmentally owned coursework vs a Core requirement vs something co-curricular but not a credit-bearing course) was working, (3) if we thought current courses were sufficient or foresaw any problems in delivery due to changes in faculty make up (i.e., are there any shortages or any gluts). As we worked through each requirement’s catalog language and offerings, we also reviewed the conclusions drawn from the May 2024 faculty workshop, which we found resonated with our own findings.

“We got through all the distribution requirements and overall were impressed at how well things seemed to be going except for Bibliographic Research and Writing (BRW): for that particular requirement we had questions both at the curricular level (the range of writing expectations among courses was too wide) and the values level (BRW was the only requirement that defined itself in relation to an institutional department [in this case, the library]; the expectations to work on writing, source evaluation, and disciplinary synthesis seemed a bit hefty for a lower-level course outside of a major; with recent changes in technology is “bibliographic research” still a pressing need?). The committee ran out of time to really tackle Core [the first-year seminars]. We plan to continue discussions this year starting with a presentation of our findings to the faculty as part of the annual retreat opening the school year. Within the GESC and CC to develop a revision to BRW to present to the faculty and, with regards to the first-year Core program, to help lead a faculty-wide reconsideration of its value and effectiveness.”

Moving forward, these experiences (and the data we have collected) will shape the trajectory of curricular assessment at Lewis & Clark College. We found that the model in which responsibilities are shared among multiple constituents (GESC, CC, Institutional Research, Dean’s Office) not only made the assessment process sustainable, but also spurred important conversations about protocol, disseminating information, and closing the loop with faculty, students, and other stakeholders. While we anticipate that we will continue to utilize the basic tools and processes we have developed and validated since

Lewis & Clark College

2020, we look forward to adapting these to support and examine the impact of the institution's most recent iteration of [our mission and values](#) and to support the tenure of the incoming Director of General Education. This sustained, but flexible plan will help us assure the highest quality education for our students and will allow us to continue to meet the needs of faculty, staff, and administration.

Academic Overall

The undergraduate college uses multiple means of assessment to inform its programming and to continuously improve student learning outcomes.

The [decennial review](#), our most far-reaching form of review, is undertaken by each department/program in order to engage the faculty of the department/program in "reflection about their history, accomplishments, challenges, and future aspirations, and to provide advice to the department/program and College about how the department/program can be improved. The review process consists of four components: (1) a departmental or program self study; (2) a campus visit by a team of disciplinary experts; (3) a written report by the review team; and (4) a response from the department/program to the experts' review. We typically do two to three reviews annually. For more detail on this process, see the [Guide to Prepare for a Departmental or Program Review](#).

Annual program review takes place through our [Annual Departmental Planning \(ADP\)](#) process, which requires departments to reflect on their course offerings and learning objectives via the three interdependent elements of curriculum, resources, and workload. Details on the ADP process can be found [here](#).

Our assessment of faculty teaching effectiveness is grounded on the College's [principles of teaching excellence](#), developed by a faculty taskforce on teaching excellence and approved by vote of the faculty in May 2024. These principles align with our mission and values, as well as with our L&C Identity Statement, and guide all assessments of faculty effectiveness in the classroom. These principles are the primary means by which we assess faculty teaching, being the criteria for second- and fourth-year junior faculty reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and triennial reviews of tenured faculty. Our principles state that excellent teachers:

- Foster classroom, laboratory, field, and studio environments that are conducive to student engagement and learning.
- Promote student proficiencies in critical inquiry, including disciplinary and interdisciplinary argumentation, analysis, research, writing, creative activity.
- Consider and respond collaboratively to student concerns and needs that impact their academic success.

Lewis & Clark College

- Actively promote equity and inclusion through pedagogy, curricular choices, and/or mentorship.
- Engage in reflective practices, pedagogical and curricular experimentation, and ongoing professional development.

Student Life

The Division of Student Life utilizes results of assessment to inform its programming and to continuously improve student learning outcomes. Some examples include:

- The Office of Community Accountability and Conflict Education primarily manages concern around student conduct and conflict resolution. For students referred to our office because of behavioral concerns, we are able to pull data from our Maxient Conduct System to indicate what kind of policies are being violated, demographic data of who are violating those policies, the assigned consequences of those violations, and who repeats violations of policy (recidivism). Recidivism rates, in particular, help us determine if students are learning lessons about appropriate behavior and responsible citizenship through our processes. This data is collected at the end of fall and spring semesters and shared internally with conduct officers, Campus Living, and other reporting parties to help guide education efforts on particular behavioral issues and to help address equity issues in reporting and resolution.
- Each College Outdoors training program has a debrief afterwards, during which student feedback is included in a document for planning the next iteration of the training. When planning the next semester trips, feedback both from specific trips as well as the program at large is considered for planning future trips.
- Data collected by International Students and Scholars (ISS) guide planning of both future orientation sessions as well as other midyear informational programs and trainings. Based on the interview data, we have adjusted orientation sessions on student accounts/finances and student employment. We also initiated a series of listening sessions focused on belonging. These led to more ISS-led programming focused on belonging.
- Health Promotion and Wellness incorporates participant feedback after each educational workshop or event through surveys and/or in-person input. This feedback is regularly reviewed and used to refine program content, delivery methods, and outreach strategies. Guided by [six foundational tenets](#), the department uses assessment results to ensure programs remain relevant, evidence-based, and aligned with student learning and development goals.
- The Career Center regularly uses information gained from its assessment efforts to design and improve programs and services. Decisions regarding services,

Lewis & Clark College

programs, and events are informed by formal assessment data and informal feedback from relevant program/event leaders. Additional feedback is sought from student Peer Advisors in the Career Center. The Director and/or Sr. Associate Director typically review programs/events in an individual meeting with the program/event leads following the completion of their program and assessment cycle. For ongoing services or programs, reviews are held quarterly. Programs, events, and services are then briefly reviewed with the entire Career Center professional staff at either a bi-weekly staff meeting or at one of our planning/review retreats, which typically occur three times per year: January, May, and August.

Graduate School

Please see examples given in Standard [1.C.5](#); we integrated our response about the assessment process with our response about how assessments are used.

Law School

The Law School, via multiple mechanisms to engage in an evaluation of its program of legal education, learning outcomes, and assessment methods, uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes. The Law School has formalized the assessment process to ensure greater consistency across courses and programs and to be in compliance with the American Bar Association's stringent requirements for measuring an institution's learning outcomes and setting and measuring the success of learning objectives in every course across the curriculum.

Our learning objectives were refined and voted on by the faculty, an assessment committee was established, an assessment plan was formulated, and we began systematizing the crafting and assessment of learning objectives. The committee's charge is to implement the assessment plan, including collecting relevant data, assessing outcomes based on that data, and reporting back to the Dean, ADAA, and the faculty. Data will inform changes in our curriculum. During the fall of 2024, the Assessment Committee evaluated three years of data for the purpose of assessing two of the Law School's five learning outcomes. The plan provides that every three years the assessment committee will prepare a comprehensive and comparative report that (1) shows trends in student attainment of competency in our learning outcomes and (2) evaluates the assessment process for the purpose of improving the development of competencies and collection of those measures.

With information from the annual reports and the three-year assessment committee report, the Dean, ADAA, and faculty may propose adjustments to our curriculum, teaching pedagogy, methods of course assessments, or the various support services the

Lewis & Clark College

Law School provides. We will also continue to use other data such as bar passage rates, employment outcomes, and employer feedback to assess that graduates leave law school with relevant skills and competencies to be practice-ready, ethical lawyers.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.7

College of Arts and Sciences- General Education

- [Assessment Framework](#)
- Faculty Reports
 - [Accreditation Overview](#)
 - [Assessment Progress Report](#)
 - [Other Reports with Assessment Information](#)
- [May 2024 Assessment Workshop Notes](#)
- Stakeholder Conversations
 - [BRW Discussion with Library Staff](#)
 - [College Success Course - Integration with CORE discussion with FYE](#)
- [Pillars of the General Education Curriculum](#) (scroll halfway down the page)
- [NSSE High Impact Practices](#) (HIPs)
- [Map of NSSE HIPs to Gen Ed Pillars](#)
- [NSSE](#) and [FSSE](#) Surveys
- [NSSE Results Snapshot](#): L&C/Peer Comparison (Seniors)
- [NSSE Multi- Year Report](#): L&C Seniors Over Time
- [Key Take-Aways](#)

College of Arts and Sciences- Overall

- [Decennial Department Review Process](#)
- [Guide to Prepare for a Departmental or Program Review](#)
- [Annual Departmental Planning \(ADP\)](#) Process
- [Principles of Teaching Excellence](#)

Standard 1.C.8 - Transfer Credit and Credit for Prior Learning is Accepted According to Clearly Defined, Widely Published Policies

Transfer credit and credit for prior learning is accepted according to clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible policies that provide adequate safeguards to ensure academic quality. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures

Lewis & Clark College

that such credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic rigor, and quality.

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

Undergraduate students may transfer an unlimited number of credits of coursework toward the BA degree, but the student must complete at least 60 institutional credits, and for each major and minor, a minimum threshold of institutional credit is also required. Transfer courses must be from a regionally accredited institution and the student must have earned a minimum of a C grade in order for the course to transfer. (Pass/Fail coursework may be accepted if the institution requires a C or above to earn a passing grade.) Transfer credit policies and procedures are outlined in the [CAS catalog](#).

Transfer credit for academic programs are submitted to double scrutiny: The Registrar's Office first determines whether coursework is admissible for Lewis & Clark credit, and department chairs evaluate how transfer credits may fulfill major and minor requirements. Decisions for major/minor credits include examination of both institutional catalogues and individual course syllabi to affirm that the transfer courses both satisfy the content of requirements and expect from students a comparable level of work (e.g., amount of reading assigned, page length of assignments, exams).

Examples of Changes Since Last Report

The faculty have authorized some adjustments to our transfer credit policy in response to the varied educational landscape students navigate.

In AY 2018-19, the Curriculum Committee approved a modification to the limitation of transfer credit for students with senior status: while the rule still holds that only 4 credits of transfer coursework may count towards the B.A. once a student achieves senior standing (93 credits), an exception can be made to transfer in up to 6 credits should either a single course be more than 4 credits or the student proposes to transfer in two courses from a school on the quarter system. These limited exceptions maintain our policy's intention that a student's cumulative coursework for the degree be completed at Lewis & Clark but acknowledge the reality that, in some disciplines, a specialized course may be more than 4 credits, or, if a student must use transfer credit from a quarter-system school to fulfill a Lewis & Clark requirement, they will need two quarters' worth of coursework, which likely will combine to more than 4 credits.

In AY 2024-25, the faculty authorized a change to transfer credit policy, accepting coursework earning a C- or CR from an institution for whom C- = Credit/Passing. This change was made, in part, based on feedback about impediments to transfer students'

Lewis & Clark College

smooth transition and timely completion of degrees. This decision was reached after careful vetting by the Curriculum Committee, consultation with Institutional Research and comparison with over 20 other peers institutions. Further details can be found in the Curriculum Committee's [November Faculty Report](#).

Also in AY 2024-25, the Curriculum Committee updated policies for accepting credit from online instruction. We clarified the policy so that [asynchronous](#) courses were allowed, but [self-paced](#) courses are not because it has been determined that the standards for many self-paced courses do not meet those of L&C or other regionally accredited institutions. In particular, there are concerns (industry wide) about the amount of time the student spends completing the course and that answers to the exercises/exams are often available online.

At the same time that L&C has continued to ensure that only appropriately rigorous transfer work is accepted for transfer, we are aware that the process of reviewing and accepting transfer credits as equivalent to L&C offerings is time consuming for all parties and complicated for transfer students. For this reason, the Committee on Student Success has engaged in discussions with others on campus to explore options to serve our transfer students better. The goal is to provide timely, accurate, and clear information to incoming transfer students while maintaining appropriate guardrails to ensure that all students are adequately prepared for their L&C coursework.

Graduate School

The Graduate School catalog maintains a [Transfer of Credit policy](#). Consideration of graduate credit from other institutions is evaluated on an individual basis by program directors. Students may transfer in no more than the equivalent of 10 semester credits for a masters or educational specialist program, and no more than the equivalent of 14 semester credits for a doctoral program. For courses to be considered for transfer, they must be completed in the last 5 years prior to admission and have a minimum grade of B-. Students must submit official transcripts and course descriptions and/or syllabi for transfer credit to be considered.

The Graduate School does not award credit for prior learning.

Law School

Policies related to transfer of credits for the Law School can be found on the "[What's What](#)" [webpage](#). The Law School adheres to the American Bar Association's Standards regarding the acceptance of transfer credit. That is, the courses requested for potential transfer must be completed at a law school approved by the ABA with at least a "C" grade or better and may not be credit for practical experience in an externship or similar program.

Lewis & Clark College

The Environmental Law program accepts some transfer credits, largely following the same criteria as the JD policy. In particular, a student must earn a C or better from an accredited US institution in order to transfer the credit. To earn an environmental law degree from Lewis & Clark, the student must earn at least two-thirds of their credits from L&C with a C or above.

Subject to the approval by its Program Director, the Animal Law program accepts up to eight transfer credits, largely following the same criteria as the JD policy. To count towards the Animal Law LLM degree, eligible courses must have been taken for credit while enrolled in an LLM program approved by the American Bar Association, and the student must have earned a C or better. To count towards the Animal Law MSL degree, eligible courses must have been taken for credit in a graduate-level course at an accredited US institution. In no case may students transfer credits earned at another school for practical experience in an externship or similar program.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.8

College of Arts and Sciences

- [Transfer Credit Policies and Procedures](#) (CAS)
- [Curriculum Committee's Faculty Report](#) outlining recent changes
- Policy Clarification
 - [Asynchronous Courses](#)
 - [Self-paced Courses](#)

Graduate School of Education and Counseling

- [Transfer of Credit Policy](#) (GSEC)

Law School

- [Transfer Credit Policy](#) (LAW)

Standard 1.C.9 - Graduate Programs are Consistent with Mission and Differ From Undergrad Programs

The institution's graduate programs are consistent with its mission, are in keeping with the expectations of its respective disciplines and professions, and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. The graduate programs differ from undergraduate programs by requiring, among other things, greater: depth of study; demands on student intellectual or creative capacities; knowledge of the literature of the field; and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or relevant professional practice.

Lewis & Clark College

Graduate School

Please see standard [1.B.2](#) regarding the mission of the Graduate School and expectations for accreditation and program approval in the professional fields that the Graduate School serves. The standards embedded in all of these review processes require graduate level engagement with the relevant curriculum. This includes the theoretical foundations of the discipline, its history in policy and practice, current research, and multiple models for practice and application. The performance standards and curriculum in each of the Graduate School's programs both emphasizes and requires a commitment to ongoing professional growth. Faculty regularly publish with students and alumni of their programs, as well as making presentations at professional conferences.

Detailed reports on the curriculum of each Graduate School program, along with student-level performance data, is available in each programs' accreditation reports and the evaluations given by accreditors. See [CAEP](#) and [COAMFTE](#) reports examples; additional reports available upon request.

Law School

The education provided at the Law School is consistent with the institution's mission, is in keeping with the expectations of the legal profession, and is described in ways appropriate to convey what is necessary to achieve a Juris Doctorate. The Law School program more than meets the accreditation requirements of the American Bar Association, and its graduates are qualified to sit for any bar examination in the United States. In keeping with the mission of the institution, the Law School's "educational programs, including meaningful engagement with research and scholarship, equip students with the knowledge and skills to advance their careers, promote justice, and address urgent societal challenges facing our communities and the world." Faculty and students alike engage in research and publication in law reviews. Scholarly inquiry also fuels the drafting of documents in both live client situations in our clinics and simulation courses like those offered in our Advocacy Center. Many student-drafted documents are used in court cases. Students who have completed two-thirds of their law school education also make court appearances, and students working as externs embody the institutional theme of integrating theory and practice within the overall educational experience. Further, "by fostering critical thinking, innovation, creativity, civic engagement, and leadership, both inside and outside of the classroom, we prepare our students for lifelong success in a connected, rapidly evolving world." All of our classes and clinics teach and foster critical thinking. In addition, the careers that our students successfully pursue as U.S. Senators, state governors, state and federal judges, law professors, executive directors of non-profit organizations, and attorneys in private and public practice demonstrate that we foster innovation, creativity, civic engagement, and

Lewis & Clark College

leadership. The careers also demonstrate that we prepare our Law School graduates for lifelong success in a connected, dynamic world.

The above also shows that the Law School requires greater depth of study; demands on student intellectual or creative capacities; knowledge of the literature of the field; and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or relevant professional practice. One can see exactly how the Law School differs from the undergraduate institution by accessing the Law School programs, including course descriptions, curriculum planning guides and graduation requirements at the [Law School Academics](#) link on the Law School website.

Animal Law and Environmental Law Masters and Animal Law SJD

LLM, MSL, and SJD candidates largely take the same law coursework that JD students seeking to specialize in animal or environmental law do. These degree programs feature a depth of study, academic rigor, and attention to cultivating practical skills comparable to that of the JD program and well beyond what is developed at the undergraduate level.

Eligibility for LLM and MSL programs require applicants to hold a BA (in any subject) from an accredited institution. In addition, LLM candidates must possess a JD (or the equivalent of the degree if they graduated from a foreign institution). MSL students are not seeking a law degree and will not practice law, thus the JD is not required.

SJD candidates must hold an LLM (in an appropriate subject area) to be eligible for that degree program.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.C.9

Graduate School of Education and Counseling

- Mission
- Expectations for Program Accreditation and Approval
- Program Accreditation Reports
 - [CAEP](#) Example
 - [COAMFTE](#) Example

Law School

- [Curriculum Planning and Graduation Requirements](#)

Lewis & Clark College

Standard 1.D.1 - Student Potential to Benefit/Succeed

Consistent with its mission, the institution recruits and admits students with the potential to benefit from its educational programs. It orients students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information and advice about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

Institutional Overview

Admission to Lewis & Clark is selective and based on criteria that are weighted toward academic qualifications and achievement, but also take account of factors such as experience and leadership. Breadth of experience and diversity of perspectives serve to enrich the educational experience for all students and are at the core of the institution's mission and values.

College of Arts & Sciences

Admissions

Lewis & Clark selects students with strong academic records and promise who seek a challenging liberal arts curriculum characterized by breadth and depth. Successful applicants are individuals who, through their varied talents and interests, will contribute in distinctive ways to the wider communities of which they are a part.

Advising

[The College Advising Center](#) (CAC) supports undergraduate students through proactive outreach and one-on-one meetings. Each L&C student is assigned a CAC advisor prior to matriculation, and this advisor stays assigned to them until graduation. College advisors host webinars for incoming students in the summer about the liberal arts, degree requirements, and the systems and steps involved in course registration. Throughout the academic year, CAC advisors help advisees create graduation plans, navigate academic policies and procedures, respond to academic difficulties, connect with faculty, and access campus resources.

Additionally, all students are assigned a [faculty advisor](#), and are required to meet with their faculty advisor during new student orientation and before registering each semester. Faculty advisors, in collaboration with CAC advisors, provide students with personalized guidance that takes into account a student's degree requirements, academic interests, and co-curricular pursuits. Advisors reach out to students who have not started graduation plans, as well as those who are at risk of not passing courses, not declaring their major in a timely manner, and those who have outstanding graduation

Lewis & Clark College

requirements. The College Advising Center website serves as a resource for students and faculty advisors, and includes up to date information, deadlines, and resources about course registration, major declaration, and academic planning.

Orientation

[First-Year Experience](#) (FYE) supports incoming students (both first-year and transfer students) through on-boarding over the summer and into the academic year to aid in their successful transition to the college. Regular communication is sent, and webinars are hosted over the summer to introduce students to the academic and student support resources available to them and to assist them in working through important processes such as the on-campus housing application and course registration. FYE staff monitor student progress and follow up with those students who may not have completed critical tasks such as activating their college account.

[New Student Orientation](#) (NSO) is hosted the four days prior to the start of the fall semester. During this time incoming students build relationships with each other to help foster a sense of belonging, learn how to navigate the campus, interact with faculty and staff, and engage in service in the Portland community.

The [New Student Peer Mentor](#) (NSPM) program was launched in the summer of 2023 to enhance the student orientation experience. Incoming students are placed in small groups based on their first-year seminar course assignment (transfer students can opt to be in a group with first-years or with fellow transfer students). NSPMs each work with a small group to help guide them through NSO. During the fall semester NSPMs have two one-on-one check-in meetings with their students to see how they are adjusting to college life and direct them to any needed resources. The NSPMs also provide three community programs for their group to help the students continue to build relationships. One of those events takes place in downtown Portland or a surrounding neighborhood, so that students get to experience what the city has to offer and learn how to navigate public transportation. Faculty are invited by the NSPMs to attend these community events to help build connections with students outside of the classroom.

Graduate School

Admissions

Standard admission requirements of the Graduate School include an online application, application fee, resume, and transcripts from each post-secondary institution attended. Additional application requirements vary by program. These requirements may include essays, references, portfolio, documented experience, etc. [Admission requirements](#) for each program and [transfer policies](#) are outlined on the Graduate School website and in the [catalog](#).

Lewis & Clark College

Advising and Orientation

Upon admission to a program, students are assigned an advisor. Advisees are distributed across all faculty members in the program, generally to equalize advising loads and access, sometimes on the basis of a match with a student's particular areas of interest. While it is relatively easy to plan courses each semester based on the cohort models of most programs, students are encouraged to check in with their advisors regularly: to answer questions, to give advice and recommendations, to listen to problems and issues, and to help find ways to assist students in the successful completion of the program.

Developing a program of study with the help of an advisor, monitoring progress in the program, making adjustments as needed, and seeking support and guidance for problems and for charting your course are all key parts of the student-advisor relationship. Faculty work collaboratively to support students in their development and share information with each other relevant to assisting/supporting students in their programs. In addition, all program faculty are involved in reviewing students' academic progress and monitoring their completion of gateways for key transitions (e.g. to the field experience component of a program). After spending time in their programs, students sometimes identify a faculty member who shares a particular interest in common with them. Students are permitted to change advisors to find the best working relationship.

In addition to departmental New Student Orientations (which help introduce new students to their department, the Graduate School and the College), the Graduate School has reorganized the Graduate Admissions Office to provide more non-academic advising support to students throughout their programs. The [Graduate Admissions and Student Support Services Office](#), launching in fall 2025 will: (1) increase the support we provide to help students thrive at the Graduate School and be successful in their academic programs; (2) address needs that go beyond formal academic advising; and (3) support faculty by providing additional advising resources for their students. This [implementation plan](#) describes the enhancements and provides a timeline that will allow us to implement these changes incrementally to make sure we have the bandwidth to meet the need.

Law School

The Law School has a comprehensive three-month orientation process for new JD students, overseen by Law Student Affairs, that begins in early June and concludes at the end of August. During June and July, a Google classroom is used to assign pre-arrival tasks such as reviewing the Student Honor and Conduct Code and providing information to be used to match incoming students to attorney, peer, and faculty mentors.

Lewis & Clark College

Incoming law students are also invited to participate in a week-long Summer Institute (SI) in early August. SI, which is coordinated by the Law School's Director of Inclusion and Academic Excellence, introduces a group of approximately 40 incoming students to how to study/prepare for and participate in law school classes. Participants are also introduced to other aspects of law school, including self-care. Most SI participants are first-generation college students and others who view themselves as more likely to struggle in law school⁸.

There is a two-day intensive orientation program for all new students before the beginning of the fall semester. Incoming students participate in a number of required welcome and introductory sessions. Topics include preparing for and participating in classes, understanding and addressing bias, the importance of community, professionalism, financial well-being, and personal well-being.

The animal law and environmental law programs offer separate orientations for their MSL and LLM students. In addition, international LLMs and MSLS take an introductory course to prepare them to study in the programs.

Additionally, the Law School provides a student-run orientation service during the summer, which assists out of town students to find accommodations and make commuting arrangements. A [New Student FAQ](#) is posted on the Law School website.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.D.1
College of Arts and Sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none">● College Advising Center● Faculty Advisors● First-Year Experience● New Student Orientation● New Student Peer Mentor Program
Graduate School of Education and Counseling <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Admission requirements● Transfer Policies● Catalog (GSEC)● Graduate Admissions and Student Support Services Office
Law School <ul style="list-style-type: none">● New Student FAQ

⁸ Summer Institute is open to incoming law students in all programs. In the invitation, we encourage students who are first generation, have a gap between undergraduate and law school, and those who believe they face other challenges in starting law school to apply.

Lewis & Clark College

Standard 1.D.2 - Student Achievement Indicators are Disaggregated, Compared

Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

Each of the three schools defines and assesses student achievement to ensure that indicators appropriately reflect program goals and degree level and that benchmarks are against appropriate peer institutions.

College of Arts & Sciences

The College of Arts and Sciences relies on standard metrics (such as retention and graduation rates) as well as surveys of engagement and satisfaction to help assess student achievement. [Retention](#) and [graduation](#) rates are published by the [Office of Institutional Research](#) on their website, in reports shared with faculty and staff, and in the October Board Report. Where possible, results for the institution are disaggregated by relevant demographic characteristics and are considered over time in order to track progress toward institutional goals. Currently, the reports are static snapshots; the IR Office is working to develop dashboards to make the data more accessible and to allow for more dynamic segmentation.

In the most recent mid-cycle review, we noted that the College of Arts and Sciences was participating in the Postsecondary Data Partnership (PDP) through the National Student Clearinghouse. We were hopeful that the detailed, disaggregated data (about enrollment, graduation and retention rates, and financial aid) would allow us to do more comparative benchmarking across various demographic populations not available to us through IPEDS and that the PDP dashboards would be widely available to college leadership. Unfortunately, most of our peers chose not to participate in the PDP leaving us with very little helpful information. We ended our partnership with PDP in 2022 and chose to rely on what we could access through IPEDS and similar data bases instead.

Other measures of student achievement include [outcomes data](#) collected by the Career Center via an annual First Destination Survey. The survey is compliant with the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) standards and protocols and is used to monitor First Destination outcomes of L&C graduates over time as well as in comparison to peer and aspirant institutions.

Lewis & Clark College

Leadership development and student health are also important aspects of achievement that reflect the values of a Lewis & Clark education. Offices within the Division of Student Life (sometimes in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning) collect data about these types of achievements and experiences. For example, the Office of Student Engagement utilizes student feedback and observation to assess how students have progressed on their leadership journeys. We are able to see how senior student leaders have become more familiar with processes, engaging with their organization members and understanding the importance of policies and guidelines. Student Engagement also oversees the student leadership development program - Peer Collective Leadership - which provides clear indicators of what a student leader should accomplish (ten workshops over the course of an academic year in a strategically created program of leadership courses) and provides a certification upon completion.

The Health Promotion and Wellness Office administers the [National College Health Assessment](#) (NCHA) about every three years. This national assessment tool asks about student health and wellness behaviors around various health topics, along with questions about campus culture. Regular administration allows us to assess our students over time and compare our students with those at other institutions. When possible, data are disaggregated by various demographic groups to assess the experiences of different groups of students. Results are used to help inform programming and resource allocation.

We also track internally the number of Fulbright scholars each year, the percent of students participating in [study abroad](#), and the percent of students participating in [internships, externships, research, and practica](#) for credit, as achievements in these areas reflect the values of the college and help illustrate that we are fulfilling our mission. Results are examined over time and disaggregated by demographic characteristics when appropriate to identify potential gaps and to inform planning and programming.

Some recent changes implemented to help close equity gaps include:

- One- and two-credit class initiative: IR research and a dissertation project done at L&C's Graduate School demonstrated that more one- and two-credit course options would aid those students who take more than four years to graduate in part because some students took only 12 credits in their first few semesters instead of 16 (enough to be full time students but not enough to meet graduation requirements- 132 credits- in eight semesters). Following discussion of these findings, a group of faculty and staff attended a HEDS workshop and then developed an initiative to increase such one- and two- credit classes on campus. With seed money from the Office of the Dean, four new pilot classes were developed this year, with more in the pipeline. Advisors are already

Lewis & Clark College

commenting on how helpful it is (and will be) to have these courses to help fill student schedules without overburdening them.

- Another effort...This summer launched the first of what we hope will become more-regular summer study abroad programs. To provide more equitable opportunities for students on financial aid, faculty developed a seven-week program in Korea and Japan focused on art history and religious studies, producing twelve-credits of coursework, or the equivalent of full-time student status. Its maiden voyage proved very popular: 16 students were selected out of nearly 30 applicants.
- Restructured College Advising Center to create designated athletics-focused advisor position, an experienced advisor, with defined athlete caseload, who works with Athletic Director and coaches on supporting student athletes.
- The Hive: Students participating in focus groups during the fall of 2023 informed us that getting access to the appropriate information regarding campus resources was a barrier to them. The college lacked a single platform to connect students to the large swath of available resources. To remedy the issue, the college launched The Hive in the summer of 2025 to provide a customizable portal for students to gain access to what was once hard-to-find digital resources. This platform serves all students, faculty, and staff, but is particularly helpful for first-generation students who may lack the cultural knowledge about typical college resources.
- The New Student Peer Mentor program was launched in the summer of 2023 to help new students develop connections to the institution and a sense of belonging—a known challenge for our students (and college students writ large) due to isolation from the pandemic. Feeling a sense of belonging and being familiar with campus resources plays a role in students making academic progress early in their college career. Like The Hive, this program also helped bridge gaps that first generation and/or under-resourced students experienced.
- A group of faculty and staff in the CAS is currently exploring ways to be sure all of our students have access to the appropriate course materials at the beginning of the semester. We have learned that some of our students with limited family resources do not always purchase their books and course materials due to a lack of funding at the beginning of the semester. We have seen this inhibit student success. For this reason, we are exploring ways of ensuring that all students have access to all necessary course materials at the start of the semester to ensure that all students have an opportunity to succeed in their coursework.

Lewis & Clark College

Graduate School

The standards for state program approval and national accreditation are consistent across all providers and reports are often published or shared across institutions. Please see the Graduate School's [Program Accreditation and Reporting Cycle](#) table.

Law School

The Law School tracks, measures, and shares indicators for student achievement in the context of and in comparison with regional and national and peer institutions with respect to [first-time bar passage](#), [ultimate bar passage](#), and [job placement](#). These indicators of student achievement are high across all our graduates. Although the law school receives a report on job placement that disaggregates based upon race and gender categories, it does not publish disaggregated data. To protect the privacy of students, it publishes a [redacted version](#).

The Law School has continually sought to improve our curriculum in response to assessment information. In recent years, the Law School has changed its program of legal education in several ways after evaluating various metrics that include employment, bar passage rates, and feedback from employers.

Following the success of our “Foundations of Professional Practice” course⁹ (implemented in 2017), other courses have been created in response to assessment. Our assessment of 1L writing outcomes in 2018 led to the creation of the Lawyering III course, an intensive writing course that is open to any student, but that saves a large number of seats for students who need one more semester to be proficient in lawyering skills. More recently, the faculty determined that the first-year students would benefit

⁹ Foundations of Professional Practice is a course designed to respond to a confluence of factors at the time, including declining employment outcomes, lower state-wide bar passage rates, and a decrease in law school applications nationally. The course was created to give students more scaffolding for the development of their professional identity from the outset of their law school career. To that end, we created this first-year course designed to improve the foundational skills and help students succeed in the classroom and in law practice. First offered in 2017, and mandatory for the entire 1L class every year since then, the course implements a number of objectives that our administration and faculty identified as being areas of growth for students: 1) Creating a strong professional identity; 2) Cultivating effective stress and time management strategies; 3) Understanding how diversity, equity, and inclusion concepts affect the way in which we interact and connect with other people; 4) Strengthening communication skills and how to employ active listening skills both to hear and understand; 5) Cultivating strategies for managing mental and physical health; 6) Engaging in career development training including creating a successful résumé packet, networking, and coaching students the best ways to present themselves in the job market; and 7) Educating students on the requirements of licensure, including the bar exam, alternative pathways to licensure, and character and fitness requirements.

Lewis & Clark College

from a mandatory course in legal research. That course was implemented in the 2023-2024 academic year.

The creation of our for-credit, pre-bar preparation course also reflects our assessment of and response to student outcomes¹⁰. In assessing the students' strengths and areas of growth, the Law School also sought to ensure that we are building practice-ready lawyers. The creation of the Advocacy Center significantly expands the students' experiential opportunities through new course offerings, a mentoring program, and increased opportunities for supervised participation in moot court and advocacy competitions.

We have more recently sought to provide greater structure, consistency, and depth for this process of assessment and improvement through a comprehensive assessment plan (conducted by a standing assessment committee), a curriculum audit, and a plan to map the curriculum to the Law School's essential competencies.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.D.2
College of Arts and Sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Retention Rates● Graduation Rates● Outcomes Data (Career Center)● Student Participation Tracking<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Study Abroad● Internships, Externships, Research, and Practica (for credit)
Graduate School of Education and Counseling <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Program Accreditation and Reporting Cycle
Law School <ul style="list-style-type: none">● First-time bar passage● Ultimate bar passage● Job placement● Disaggregated Data (redacted version)

¹⁰ The course was created in 2017 after the state's July bar pass rates plunged to 65% in 2014, 60% in 2015, and 60% in 2016. Although the Law School's pass rates were consistently higher than the state averages in those years, we cared deeply about helping our students leap this final hurdle to licensure. In the Advanced Analysis: Pre-bar Strategies and Skills course, students develop essential competencies for both bar exam success and legal practice. Through targeted instruction, they learn to hone critical analytical skills including deep reading comprehension, issue identification, and strategic legal analysis. Our bar passage rates improved after the creation of the course. In 2018, our pass rate for first time takers was 78%, and in 2019 it was 84%. This improved performance continues; our first-time pass rate for the July 2024 Oregon bar exam was 83.5% – the highest in the state.

Lewis & Clark College

Standard 1.D.3 - Student Achievement Indicators (Benchmarked and Published)

The institution's disaggregated indicators of student achievement should be widely published and available on the institution's website. Such disaggregated indicators should be aligned with meaningful, institutionally identified indicators benchmarked against indicators for peer institutions at the regional and national levels and be used for continuous improvement to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources.

Each of the three schools defines and assesses student achievement to ensure that indicators appropriately reflect program goals and degree level and that benchmarks are against appropriate peer institutions.

College of Arts & Sciences

Most student achievement data are monitored and reported by the Office of Institutional Research. [Their website](#) contains enrollment information, student-body demographics, retention and graduation rates, and [reports comparing L&C to peers](#). This information is publicly available, but accessed mostly by the faculty, staff, and administrators within the L&C community to inform planning, budgeting, and programming.

Standard academic achievement indicators (such as retention and graduation rates) are compared with regional and national peers using publicly available data such as IPEDS. The IR Office also posts the annual IPEDS [Data Feedback Reports](#) (DFR) and L&C's responses to the [Common Data Set](#) (CDS).

Results from various surveys administered through [NSSE](#) (National Survey of Student Engagement), [HEDS](#) (Higher Education Data Sharing) Consortium, American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment ([ACHA-NCHA](#)), etc. as well as the Career Center's participation in [NACE](#) also allow for comparisons with peers, although we do not always have the opportunity to narrow our comparison group to our specific peers. Historically, L&C has not shared results of national surveys publicly on our website because the reports are complex and may not be easily interpreted by all audiences. IR staff have been working, along with staff in other offices, to consolidate and simplify national comparison reports so that a broader audience can have access to the information. Offices and departments directly involved in decision making related to specific reports (First-Year Experience, Committee on Student Success, Health Services, Alumni and Parent Programs, the Career Center, etc) receive the reports and meet with IR staff to review results and discuss implications.

Lewis & Clark College

As noted in Standard [1.D.2](#), the Career Center administers a [First-Destination Survey](#) to all graduating seniors that is compliant with the standards and protocols identified by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). We share de-identified [summaries of these results](#) for benchmarking purposes with peer and aspirant colleges in the Liberal Arts Career Network (LACN), a group of 43 liberal arts schools throughout the United States and regularly compare the results with [larger trends reported by NACE](#). LACN also produces a [dashboard](#) that allows us to compare ourselves to peers on operational and engagement measures.

We currently monitor the combined outcome category percentages of “Working”, “Continuing Education”, and “Volunteering” and the individual “Still Looking” categories for both internal and external variances. Disaggregated data from these categories are similarly used to inform internal and external trends and cyclically plan career development programming and employer relations efforts. Publishing of disaggregated outcomes is hindered by low numbers of data points across majors and industries in favor of maintaining confidentiality of student-level data. Disaggregated Career Center engagement data is regularly reviewed in collaboration between the Office of Institutional Research and the Career Center for planning and necessary intervention efforts. Analysis of Career Center engagement has shown that Pell-eligible students, students of color, first generation students, and international students meet or exceed their expected engagement averages based on enrollment.

Graduate School

Data from key assessments in accreditation reports are disaggregated, where possible, and used by program directors for program improvement and reporting to the dean. Low n’s in key assessment reports often makes it impossible to disaggregate achievement data by demographic categories and also maintain confidentiality of student-level data. We are sometimes able to collapse demographic categories to meet the threshold of ten or more (as set by the program accreditor(s) and is common in the field). We often have to aggregate multiple cycles of data to reach the accreditor threshold. Disaggregated demographic data is also reported on admissions (applications, yield, scholarships) and graduation rates, although here too, the n’s may be too small to publish.

Law School

While the Law School closely monitors student achievement outcomes, it does not disaggregate its data based on demographic characteristics. It does, however, use the data to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources for all students. For example, the Law School added a for-credit bar success course to its curriculum after a year in which its first-year pass rate fell behind peer schools. It has continued to

Lewis & Clark College

offer the class even as its first-time pass rate continues to outperform that of all the other law schools in the state.

The Law School also tracks “ultimate bar passage” rates for all graduates two years following graduation (against all ABA accredited schools) and also compares job placement results nationally.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.D.3

College of Arts and Sciences

- [Institutional Research Website](#)
- [Peer Comparisons](#)
- [IPEDS Data Feedback Reports](#)
- [Common Data Set](#) (CDS)
- [First Destination Survey Summary](#)
- [NACE Trends](#)
- [LACN Dashboard](#) example

Standard 1.D.4 - Transparent Student Achievement Indicators

The institution’s processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.

Institutional Overview

Data used to assess student achievement are collected in various forms by offices across the College including, but not limited to, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, the CAS Dean’s Office, HR, Business and Finance, Admissions offices, and various offices within Student Life, the Graduate School and the Law school. The data collected and used allows the College to establish benchmarks to monitor progress as well as provide information to guide decision making across the College.

[Institutional-level data](#) and [CAS-specific data](#) (including disaggregated achievement indicators, when appropriate) are available on the [Institutional Research and Planning website](#), which is accessible to all members of the campus community and to the public. Other data (most of which are described in the section below) are kept internally to be accessed by members of the executive council, directors, and department chairs.

Lewis & Clark College

College of Arts & Sciences

Academic

Integrated data-informed planning around curricular planning and resource allocation at the undergraduate level has been expanded and strengthened at CAS in the past three years through several initiatives. While internal and external program decennial reviews routinely used extensive data sets (course enrollments, number of majors, faculty-student research, etc.) to inform long-term planning, annual planning did not have sufficiently centralized, standardized, or efficient modes for effectively using data for course planning, staffing, or other regular operational oversight. Our work with the Strategic Enrollment Management team from 2017-2021 had formalized data collection and reporting for new program development and for augmenting current curricular offerings. That team established a list of key performance indicators along with strategic reporting dates in order to gain an understanding of current enrollment, projections, and opportunities for strengthening program development. In the last two years, we have expanded our planning and operational processes under the rubric of [Annual Departmental Planning \(ADP\)](#), which provides departmental chairs and program directors with a standardized set of data KPIs and a process for ensuring we are efficiently aligning our resources with student needs as they move through the curriculum. By creating transparent data sets, aligning on primary and second KPIs, and strengthening collaboration across departments, ADP has been a significant element in ensuring effective curricular and resource planning.

In the CAS, course planning has long been centralized in the Office of the Dean. With the 2021 creation of the position of Director of Operations and Finance (DOF), which reports to the Dean of the College, we've improved coordination and planning with individual department chairs for course schedules, personnel allocations, etc. Annual schedules and four-year plans are submitted to the Office of the Dean for review and approval by the Director of Operations and Finance, and subsequently by the Dean. We have continued this general framework of annual and four-year planning, but this system left departments silo-ed, without a clear understanding of larger institutional needs. It relied on a stability of enrollments and staffing allocations. But in late 2022, given recent volatility in enrollment patterns, we determined a more dynamic, responsive system was needed to efficiently align enrollment patterns with resource allocation.

Beginning in 2023, and through an entire cycle in 24-25, we instituted a process called '[Annual Departmental Planning](#)' (ADP) which is a significant expansion of our operational planning, since it brings departments and programs much more fully into the data-informed planning process. The process begins mid-year, with departments receiving an updated data-set that contains KPIs for their department, as well as for all departments on campus. This institution-wide sharing of all departmental data was an intentional effort to build departmental capacities for understanding needs across the

Lewis & Clark College

institution, allowing departments to see their own data alongside that of other areas of the College. Through work with a faculty steering committee and department chair listening sessions, we aligned on a set of KPIs (four primary, sixteen secondary) that are roughly divided into four categories (size, growth, efficiency and workload equity, outside teaching). These include everything from student-credit-hour/FTE and major completions to contributions to General Education. See a copy of the [ADP 24-25 data sheet](#). Departments were also provided a [qualitative response form](#), and were instructed to use a department meeting to discuss the data and complete the sheet. The ADP faculty steering committee compiled all these responses and used them as the basis for a day-long workshop, held this year on May 15, 2025, where departments with similar profiles were given a set of planning guidelines to inform their work for the coming year. The goal of ADP was to make the planning process more transparent, more collaborative, and more intentional. It has succeeded on all these fronts, with departments seeing a standardized set of KPIs for their own department and for every department on campus. It has provided them guidelines for curricular and resource planning that has a clear foundation and rationale. This visibility has strengthened departmental capacity for seeing *institutional* needs and for collaborating, either with other departments or with general education, in ways that serve the individual department, the students, and the larger College.

In addition to this annual planning, the College engages in decennial external reviews, an extensive process of self-study and review (overseen by Faculty Council and Dean's Office) that provides a more substantial opportunity to assess departmental success in achieving a broad set of goals involving academic quality, student success, and actualization of departmental learning objectives in the delivery of curriculum. This process also aids in Curriculum Committee discussions of program revisions, as well as in faculty council discussions of college-wide planning. External reviews were halted during the COVID-19 pandemic, but have been restarted in recent years. Recent decennial reviews include: [World Languages and Literatures](#) (WLL) and Classics in 2023, [Asian Studies](#) in 2024, and [Music](#) in 2025. A [guide to the decennial external review process can be found here](#). These reviews are a year-long process of compiling a self-study (the WLL self-study runs 98 pages), coordinating an external visit with experts in the discipline, responding to the reviewer report, and then building a plan for any changes that result from the review. As a [result of the Asian Studies review](#), the program faculty voted unanimously to discontinue their major and to focus on strengthening the minor. This was subsequently ratified by the entire faculty. These reviews are coordinated through the Office of the Dean, with consultation throughout from the Faculty Council and the Curriculum Committee.

Regular faculty reviews, done every two years for pre-tenure faculty and every three years for tenured faculty, is the primary place where faculty curricular, scholarly, and classroom practices are assessed. Pre-tenure faculty submit a portfolio of their teaching,

Lewis & Clark College

scholarship, and service at years two and four, and a three-faculty committee, usually led by their department chair, reviews the file and meets with the junior-faculty member to assess their progress. The committee then submits a letter to the Dean, who responds with a letter to the junior faculty member (cc'd to the committee). This letter becomes a part of their pre-tenure file.

Tenured faculty reviews (triennial reviews) are done via a professional activities questionnaire (PAQ), where faculty list their teaching, scholarly, and service work for the past three years. The Dean reviews this material and writes a letter in response. In addition, departments work closely, both through these regular faculty reviews (where teaching, scholarship, service are assessed, and concerns can be identified) and through regular work with support structures, such as our Teaching Excellence Program and College Advising Center, to identify areas in need of enhancement and improvement. Some recent examples of this work include:

- As a result of the Asian Studies (AS) decennial review in 2024, the AS faculty unanimously voted (followed by a nearly unanimous faculty vote) to discontinue the Asian Studies major. The program is continuing as a minor only.
- Faculty Council (regular annual business of faculty council includes composing committees for searches, faculty reviews, and grants; making recommendations for faculty awards; reviewing sabbatical applications and position requests; prioritizing academic capital project submissions, overseeing departmental external reviews).
- Development Chair training (including annual Chair's workshop in the Fall), which guides both new and experienced Chairs in matters of departmental leadership, assessment of course-room instruction, curriculum delivery, and student support. Chair performance is assessed, by the Dean's Office, at the time of the three-year faculty triennial review.
- The Teaching Excellence Program (TEP) designates and trains Pedagogy Fellows and Distinguished Teaching Fellows (peer consultation). The program uses peer-to-peer training to build pedagogical strengths in the classroom, as well as develop inclusive pedagogical methods and faculty leadership.

Student Life

In addition to the ongoing assessment efforts in each of the academic divisions, the programs in the Division of Student Life (primarily, but not exclusively a CAS service) have been collecting and assessing data to evaluate the achievement of each program's goals as well as alignment with the mission and goals of the division. The [Student Life assessment](#) efforts have waxed and waned over the last several years due to changes in leadership. Although assessment has not continuously taken place at the divisional level,

Lewis & Clark College

departments within Student Life continue to assess their programs. These departmental assessments are discussed at divisional lead-team meetings. Examples of departmental program assessment are in [this document](#).

Graduate School

In addition to the processes described in previous sections, the GSEC utilizes innovative technology to meet data collection, analysis, and reporting needs. The school adopted the cloud-based TaskStream assessment tool to make the collection and use of program-level data more systematic. The full adoption of this system has provided an effective foundation for collecting, reviewing, and using program data for both program and unit improvement. The data are easily accessible, reported, and used regularly by faculty for the purposes of program improvement. All students and faculty receive workshop training in the use of TaskStream so as to help ensure the effective use of this valuable tool. The analysis of assessment data has resulted in a variety of changes at both the program and unit level. Attached is [an overview of the kinds of changes that have occurred](#) as a direct result of the analysis of program and unit assessment data. Specific changes in programs are documented in both internal annual program reports and annual accreditation reports.

The Graduate School's QAS provides multiple data points related to the disaggregation of student demographic/performance information at both the unit and program levels. This includes application rates, yield, scholarship support, enrollment, and program completion data. The Graduate School has also (this year) reorganized the current Graduate Admissions Office to provide greater support to students, especially those whose prior experience may not include familiarity with the processes, procedures, and demands of graduate education. The renamed Graduate Admissions and Student Support Services Office will coordinate with related campus offices (e.g. Financial Aid, Office of Student Accessibility, and the Health/Counseling center. It will also work closely with Graduate School offices (e.g. Registrar, Career and Licensing Services, and the Center for Communication Engagement, as well as academic office staff and program faculty.

Law School

Providing transparency in our processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement is a primary goal. We want students to understand what they are required to do, what they are learning, and what knowledge and skills they can expect to attain during their time in law school. As legal education evolves, we will ensure faculty are equipped with training on best practices for developing and assessing learning objectives. The assessment committee's findings will be published annually to maintain transparency and accountability. All collected data will guide our decision-making process, with student interests serving as our primary focus. Through

Lewis & Clark College

this comprehensive approach, we aim to identify and eliminate learning gaps, particularly for academically vulnerable students who need additional support to succeed.

Evidence Documentation for Standard 1.D.4
Institutional <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Institutional-level Achievement Data
College of Arts and Sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none">● CAS-Specific Achievement Data● Annual Departmental Planning (ADP)<ul style="list-style-type: none">● ADP 24-25 Data Sheet● Qualitative Response Form● Recent Departmental Review Examples<ul style="list-style-type: none">● World Languages and Literatures (2023)● Asian Studies (2024) and Response● Music (2025)● Guide to External Review Process● Student Life Assessment<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Department Program Assessment Examples
Graduate School of Education and Counseling <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Overview of Recent Changes

Conclusion

Throughout this report, you have read how the whole is greater than the sum of its parts at Lewis & Clark College- something we all experience on a daily basis but at times find difficult to articulate. We see the success in small and large accomplishments each semester and each year. Compiling this self-reflection allowed us to look back further and more broadly. While working on the EIE and PRFR reports over the last two years, it has been exciting to see how far we have come. In 2018 we spoke about strengthening the established governance structure, creating greater transparency and improved collaboration in the decision-making process, launching our first comprehensive campaign in more than 20 years, systematizing planning and assessment, and making better use of data. We acknowledged that excessive turnover in the CAS deanship led to disruptions to the process of continuous improvement. Now, in 2025, we can proudly say that we met all those goals and more.

Lewis & Clark College

Not only did we meet our Capital Campaign goal, [we exceeded it](#). This is due, in part, to strong and stable leadership that has engaged in transparent and collaborative decision making, articulated clear goals, and worked hard with constituents across campus to assure that we are working together as effectively as possible. It is due to an engaged and thoughtful board of trustees, who truly support the mission of the college. It is due to making systematic use of data to assess where we are and inclusive processes to determine where we should head next. It is due to the parts—the students, faculty, and staff—that make up the whole.

As predicted in our [Year Six PRFR report](#) (p. 65), we had an active and productive year in 2024-25 and, as you have read, have significant new information and progress to report. Despite the ever-changing external pressures and a tenuous landscape for higher education, it is an exciting time to be at Lewis & Clark College:

- New deans in both the Law and Graduate schools will provide leadership to maintain current programming strengths while also exploring areas for growth or refinement.
- We revised our Mission Statement to include terms that better align with the current academic environment and speak to the aspirations of our potential students while still holding true to our core values and traditional liberal arts approach to education.
- This fall, we will begin rolling out new strategic initiatives to fulfill our mission to prepare students for “lifelong success in a connected, rapidly evolving world.”
 - The [new director](#) of [The Career Accelerator](#) started August 4th and will help reimagine the current undergraduate Career Center to better pair our undergraduate liberal arts education with targeted, high-impact career development experiences designed to help students develop the skills needed to secure competitive jobs after graduation.
 - The President appointed an [Executive Director of Community Partnerships](#) to spearhead efforts with the [Albina Vision Trust Partnership](#) and other projects that will help foster learning as a core value of the community, provide opportunities for Albina area and other local residents and educational experiences and opportunities for students that develop their leadership capacity and readiness to make an impact on their communities and the world.
 - Faculty and staff will work this year on strengthening pathways from the College of Arts and Sciences to the Law School and Graduate School, taking advantage of unique opportunities at Lewis & Clark and providing students with greater options for career preparation and readiness.

Lewis & Clark College

- We will also continue—and accelerate—transparent and inclusive planning and actions to assure that institutional revenues and expenses align in a time of increasing costs and decreasing undergraduate enrollment and revenue. In this environment, it can be necessary to make difficult decisions about resource allocation, tuition and fee increases, enrollment targets, employee compensation and benefits, investment in new initiatives, and the consideration of new revenue opportunities. A new Strategic Advisory Council on the College of Arts and Sciences Budget, made up of faculty and staff, will directly advise the president, dean, and vice presidents over the course of the coming year regarding CAS budget decisions. Due to sound fiscal management and conservative budgeting, we are well poised to do this work.

With regard to our outstanding recommendation: Our General Education assessment plan has been fully executed. We now have a better understanding of the impact and success of the general education curriculum and the data to help us move forward in a way that ensures we meet student needs and institutional goals. Furthermore, we confirmed that the process we devised is sustainable and provides appropriate information to help evaluate individual learning objectives and the General Education program as a whole. This fall, the Curriculum Committee and the General Education Steering Committee will continue to unpack all that we have learned from our assessments in the last few years so that this spring we can make recommendations to the faculty for any adjustments that are needed to ensure our students graduate with the knowledge, skills, and experiences we hold to be paramount to a Lewis & Clark Education.

Looking ahead, we know we have work to do to better ensure our policies support students taking courses online, especially for those in the College of Arts and Sciences and Graduate School. Current practices include multi-factor authentication, [guidelines](#), and regular and substantive interaction with students for all three schools, but the [comprehensive policy](#) is specific to the Law School. This fall, a working group will meet to review and update the policy (as needed) to ensure online students have the access and protection they need and the faculty interaction they expect. The committee will also adjust the policy so that it covers the entire institution.

Lewis & Clark is an institution committed to continuous improvement, as evidenced by the systematic and ongoing evaluation processes across our three schools and at the institutional level. Once again, our Year-Seven evaluation comes at an opportune time for the College in that it coincides with our strategic planning process. Having recently reflected on our goals, mission, and values, writing the Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness was a natural next step in summarizing our work to demonstrate the introspection and assessments we conducted and our plans moving forward.

Lewis & Clark College

Report appendices for both Standard 1 and Standard 2 are accessible via:

[LC EIE Report Evidence August 2025- Appendices](#)

[LC PRFR Report Evidence Sept 2024- Appendices](#)

Copies of Previous Reports:

[Mid-Cycle Report](#) (2021)

[Year Six PRFR](#) (2024)

Addendum

Response to Findings

Distance Education Addendum

We have chosen to address these together, as they cover the same material.

Finding

Type 1: Fall 2024 Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review - The following standards are areas substantially in compliance but where improvement is needed. (2020 Standard(s) 2.G.7).

Institutional Response

This spring, we received the PRFR Evaluation Committee’s review noting that “Lewis & Clark is just moving into the world of online and distance education. As such, they do not have fully developed plans.” They indicated that we did not provide enough evidence to demonstrate “Policies/procedures for ensuring the student who registers in a distance education course/program is the same student who participates in the course and receives credit” nor “Academic policies/procedures for instructors to implement requirements for regular and substantive interaction in distance education courses/programs.”

The L&C Law School’s current [distance learning policy](#) covers these aspects, but not to a sufficient degree because it is school specific and not an institutional policy. In addition to broadening the policy to cover all three schools, we want to ensure that we are complying with the appropriate standards, and-- more importantly-- appropriately and effectively supporting our distance students. This fall, a committee will review the policy, the standards set for by the NWCCU and our various program level accreditors, and will make recommendations to update the policy and/or language therein.

The Law School partners with Carolina Academic Press (CAP) to administer its distance programs (LLM and MSL degrees in Animal and Environmental Law). CAP handles marketing for the programs and oversees the application portal. They do not make admissions decisions; they take care of behind-the-scenes application processing. See copies of contracts [here](#).

For all schools, each student is assigned a unique account username and credentials for authenticating to gain access to course materials, exams, etc. This is true for in-person students, as well. Students participate in classes using unique credentials that include username, passwords, and MFA (Multi-Factor Authentication). Access logs for any

Lewis & Clark College

applications that require SSO (Single Sign On) or MFA are maintained and regularly reviewed to identify access behaviors outside of the standards established by the L&C Security Operations Center team. All faculty are required to complete training related to student privacy and cybersecurity, as well as the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Student privacy and data security is paramount to the institution. As such, the College posts information about [FERPA](#), consent forms for the release of data, and a [privacy notice](#) on its website.

Of note, the institution has finished implementing [Multi-Factor Authentication](#) for most institutional applications (including both Moodle, Google Classroom, and L&C email). This helps safeguard college data and helps protect and verify the user's identity. Lewis & Clark College does not charge any additional fee to verify identity; it is part of our regular operating procedures.

Both the [distance education policy](#) and the CAS [Online Instruction & Distance Learning Guiding Principles](#) provide policies and procedures to ensure regular and substantive interactions. These policies and procedures will be part of our comprehensive distance education policy review in the fall so that we can ensure regular and substantive interactions and consistency across all three schools.

Additionally, the law school partners with a team of instructional designers from CAP to help build out the structure and design of the courses. L&C Law faculty determine the content. Courses are taught through Canvas LMS for which CAP acts as technical support and platform host. When appropriate, exams are proctored.

All online programs are the same as in-person programs; individual courses taught via distance ed are the same courses as those taught in person, although the structure and methodology may be adjusted to support distance engagement. All online programs and courses have the same learning outcomes and levels of student achievement assessment as in-person programs.

Evidence Documentation for Addendum

- [Online Instruction & Distance Learning Guiding Principles](#) (CAS)
- [Distance Learning Policy](#) (Law School)
- [Carolina Academic Press \(CAP\) Contracts](#) (Law School)
- [FERPA](#) Information
- [Consumer Privacy Notice](#)
- [Multi-Factor Authentication](#) information