### Standard 1. Purpose, planning, and evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>How to use Student Information Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2.1 Institutional evaluation</td>
<td>Using the instruments, analyzing the data, and reporting data-driven changes and enhancements all demonstrate the use of information gained in evaluation processes for administrative and educational planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2.2 Degree program evaluation</td>
<td>Standard 1.2.2.2 deals with degree programs and student learning outcomes. Cross-reference this to Standard 3, which addresses the curriculum, the new ES standard, section 6, and the degree program standards A through J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 Comprehensive evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 2. Institutional integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>How to use Student Information Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.3 Accurate representation of institution to constituencies | Are the professional plans of your students consistent with the mission and purpose of your educational programming? See the professional plans tables and charts:  
ESQ—21 through 23  
GSQ—22 through 26  
AQ—10, 13, 24  
Are your students’ denominational affiliations well-served by your institution?  
ESQ—13 |
| 2.5, 2.6 Promotion of awareness and inclusion of racial and gender diversity | How diverse is the student body? Are graduation rates for racial/ethnic and gender minorities tracking with enrollment of these students? Check the tables and charts that report demographics:  
ESQ—1 through 5  
GSQ—1 through 6  
Are the satisfaction rates for educational experience, services, placement, and programming comparable between male and female students? How comparable are the job histories and attrition rates in ministry? One of the two primary variables used in reporting data is gender. (The other is degree program.) See the growth and satisfaction tables and charts:  
GSQ—14 through 21 (growth, satisfaction, overall experience)  
AQ—10 through 16 (job history); 19, 24, 27 through 29 (satisfaction) |

*Reflects revision of Qs effective August 1, 2013*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>How to use Student Information Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. The theological curriculum: learning, teaching, and research | 3.1 Goals of the theological curriculum  
3.2 Learning, teaching, and research | The goals of each of the degree programs include the development of “theological understanding”—the integrated and mature capacity for reflection and wisdom in a life of faith. Although this should not be the only measure you use to see if the school is successful, how effectively do students think their education prepared them for this? See the tables and charts related to growth, skills, influences, and impact:  
GSQ—14, 15 (personal and skill growth); 17 (educational influences); 18, 19 (field education)  
AQ—19 (satisfaction with skills); 21 through 23 (effectiveness) |
| 3.2.2 Teaching                               | How important were the faculty to the students’ educational experiences? How effective do students think their education was in facilitating the personal and professional capacities necessary for ministry? See the perspectives of both entering and graduating students:  
ESQ—16 (how student first learned about school); 17 (first contact); 19 (reasons for choosing institution)  
GSQ—14, 15 (educational effectiveness); 20 (experiences with faculty) |
| 3.3 Characteristics of theological scholarship | Two of the standards in 3.3 address the students’ engagement with diverse publics and global awareness as necessary components of their education. The ESQ and GSQ have a number of tables and charts that address these issues:  
ESQ—19 (reasons for choosing institution)  
GSQ—14, 15 (personal and skill growth); 17 (educational influences); 21 (overall experience) |
|                                              | Pay particular attention to the measures that consider multicultural and ecumenical experiences. |
| 4. Library and information resources         | 4.1 Library collections  
4.2 Contribution to learning, teaching, and research | Look at the level of satisfaction with the school’s services and academic resources, which lists three criteria in this area:  
GSQ—20 (access to and adequacy of library collection, writing and research support) |
| 5. Faculty                                  | 5.2 Faculty role in teaching | Once again, look at the GSQ satisfaction measures that refer to the faculty: 5.2.2 encourages the integration of the disciplines and the primary degree program goals. Section 1 of the ES discusses the purposes of each degree program, echoing this integration and pointing toward the educational expectations of curricula. Note that field education is often a primary focus for this integration. The AQ can help determine if that integration holds over time:  
GSQ—14, 15, 16 (effect and importance)  
AQ—18, 19, 21 through 24 (field education) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>How to use Student Information Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6. Student recruitment, admission, services, and placement | 6.1 Recruitment | Who is being recruited, how are they being recruited, and why are they choosing the school? Look at the tables and charts that profile the entering student body:  
ESQ—13 (denomination); 15 (first consideration of seminary); 16, 17 (gathering school information); 18, 19 (decision-making factors); 21 through 23 (professional plans) |
| | 6.2 Admissions | Are students being accepted who will be well served by the institution's resources and able to do graduate level work? How diverse is the student body? View demographics tables and charts:  
ESQ—1 through 6 |
| | 6.3 Student services | Look at the GSQ table and chart that reports student satisfaction with twenty-three areas of service and academic resources. If the school has extension sites/distance education programs, compare the data for the various groups to ensure that all students are adequately served:  
GSQ—20 (rating of services) |
| | 6.4 Student borrowing | Student borrowing now has its own standard. The ESQ, GSQ, and AQ all contain a number of tables and charts that address student finances; schools must “review student educational debt” and “develop strategies” to mitigate the impact of that debt; heavy debt will impact their ministerial plans:  
ESQ—8 through 12 (debt, planned hours of work)  
GSQ—7 through 11 (debt); 22 through 26 (professional plans)  
AQ—5, 6 (debt, adequacy of finances) |
| | 6.5 Placement | Historically, vocational discernment and career placement have been the most poorly rated student services. Schools have a responsibility to provide “appropriate assistance” to students seeking employment and to adjust programming in light of current market trends. Are their professional plans realistic? Are they graduating with offers of employment? See reports of student expectations and experiences:  
ESQ—21 through 23 (professional plans)  
GSQ—20 (rating of services); 22 through 26 (professional plans)  
AQ—10, 11, 12 (first job, length of time to find job, helpfulness of placement services); 13 through 18 (subsequent jobs, future plans) |

Note that placement is also considered to be one of the indicators of educational effectiveness (see ES 6). The AQ looks at the number of jobs they have had, what those jobs have been, how long it took to find placement in their first jobs, and their attrition rates in ministry. Consider comparing as well the experiences of graduates by gender and degree program:  
AQ—10, 11, 12 (first job, length of time to find job, helpfulness of placement services); 13 through 18 (subsequent jobs, future plans) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>How to use Student Information Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Authority and governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Institutional resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>In considering student perspectives on the adequacy of various institutional resources, the GSQ can give a diagnostic snapshot of resource areas that might need further consideration: GSQ—20 (rating of services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple locations and distance education</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the institution has multiple sites or uses distance education delivery methods, compare the experiences of students in the different programs to ensure that their educational experience is comparable across the board and that the degree program goals are all being adequately met for all students. Educational delivery mode is a variable used in the following tables: GSQ—14, 15 (personal and skill growth); 17 (educational influences); 18, 19 (field education); 20 (rating of services); 21 (overall experience) Also consider the preferred modes of educational delivery as indicated by incoming students. Is the institution able to accommodate them? ESQ—19 (reasons for choosing institution); 20 (interest in educational formats)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, visit the ATS website, www.ats.edu. See in particular the featured resources on the Student Data page under Resources or on the Self-Study and Assessment page under Accrediting.