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CAS Reviews at UMBC
Re-starting Program Reviews as Part of Our Divisional Assessment Plan

• Susan Martin, Ed.D.

• Assessment and Research Coordinator for Student Affairs
Context

• UMBC
• Division of Student Affairs
• CAS reviews last done in 2001-2002
• Intentionally building a culture of assessment since Fall 2005
• Program reviews are part of our written assessment plan-5-year cycle (compressed 3 year restart)
Reviews Underway

• The Commons
• Office of Student Life
• Student Judicial Programs
• Career Services (NACE)

• Counseling and Health Services have outside accreditation
My role-Guide and Participant

• Internal consultant to Directors and staff
• In Fall 2007 did initial training about CAS
• Initial meeting to discuss process, hopes, lessons learned from other units
Commons Process & Lessons Learned

- Commons open for 5 years; Pause and reflect
- Team of 6; 3 areas (info desk, pub/game room, event planning; April-June condensed timeframe;
- Divide and Conquer
- Used regional colleagues
- Continuity of leadership for the process is critical & TAKES TIME
- Use of Blackboard for materials
Office of Student Life Process

- Interim Director for past 2 years
- Snapshot for new Director; 3 positions added 3 years ago
- Created 3 Subgroups (leadership, multicultural programs, student involvement
- Kick off meeting
- Don’t have lots of written materials on website; teams adding materials to Blackboard
Judicial Programs Process & Lessons Learned

• Brought in Consultant in 2002
• New Assistant Director & Hearing Officer—What’s Next?
• Team of 4 – new staff member and Residential Life
• Team discussion of scoring
• Mission Statement and Goals
Take-a-ways

• Leadership is critical to process
• Clarity about why doing program review
• Year-long process-have a timeline
• Use Bb; graduate students, colleagues
• Process of (re)educating about relationships between, mission, goals, programs/services, assessment, planning
• Record action steps along the way
• Keep Learning-Share lessons learned with staff and colleagues
Student Affairs Graduate Preparation Programs: CAS Assessment

Tracy M. Lara, Ph.D.
Kent State University
Background

• 2009 CACREP standards oriented to maintain professional counselor identity

• CACREP specialty area: Student Affairs and College Counseling

• CAS vs. CACREP standards
  – Faculty credentials
  – Supervised practice/professional practice
CAS vs. CACREP

“the development of counseling skills under supervision” (CACREP, 2009, p. 14).

“developmental work with individual students and groups of students in: program planning, implementation, or evaluation; staff training, advising, or supervision; and administrative functions” (CAS, 2006, p. 353).
Why CAS?

• Appropriate for SA program curriculum
• Standards and self-regulatory process mirror values of the SA profession
• Process aligns with functional area assessment process
• Faculty and SA practitioners familiar with the standards
Process

• Three Stages: Self-Study, Internal Review, External Review
• Timeline: 2 years
• Team: Faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, and students
• Template: Blackboard organizational site
Blackboard Features

• Communication tools
  – Announcements
  – Email
  – Discussion Board
  – Chat

• Accessibility
  – Internal and external reviewers
  – Key administrators (Provost, Dean, Assoc. Dean for Accountability and Research)
Blackboard Set Up

• Welcome and purpose statement
• Composition of review team
• Introduction to CAS standards and guidelines and Self-Assessment Guide; ratings and how to rate; timeline; and overview of process
• Self-Study in component parts and associated documentation
CAS Review Process Evaluation (Internal)

• 5 point scale
  Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree
  – Ratings and how to rate informed me how to proceed with ratings.
    • 1 Strongly Disagree
  – Accessing SAG was easy.
    • 1 Neither Agree or Disagree
  – Uploading SAGs was easy.
    • 1 Neither Agree or Disagree
“I have participated in another CAS review...this method is a new and improved way of completing the review process....This method should be shared so others may pilot it in their departments.”

“The process is well organized and efficient.”

“I think this was a very well organized CAS review.”
CAS Review Process Evaluation (Internal) - Comments

• By doing all the evaluation through blackboard some “richness” of discussion was missed that may have been present at face-to-face committee meetings... Especially true for reviewers not particularly comfortable with technology... Having at least one or two face to face meetings to discuss the ratings would be helpful.”
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Final Project Outline

- Introduction
- Procedure
- Assessment and Recommendations
  - Part 1: Mission
  - Part 2: Program (Day to Day Operations)
  - Part 3: Leadership
  - Part 4: Organization and Management
  - Part 5: Human Resources
  - Part 6: Financial Resources
  - Part 7: Facilities, Technology and Equipment
  - Part 8: Legal Responsibilities
  - Part 9: Equity and Access
  - Part 10: External Relations
  - Part 11: Diversity
  - Part 12: Ethics
  - Part 13: Assessment and Evaluation
- Conclusion
Questions?
Conducting a Standards Based Assessment
by Douglas S. Franklin, Ph.D.

• Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS, 2007)
• Baldridge Criteria for Excellence in Higher Education (Early and Current)

“The nice thing about standards is that there are so many of them to choose from.”
Andrew S. Tanenbaum
Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS)

- Mission
- Program
- Leadership
- Human Resources
- Ethics
- Legal Responsibilities
- Equity and Access
- Diversity
- Organization & Management
- Campus and External Relations
- Financial Resources
- Technology (Separated from Facilities and Equipment in 2009)
- Facilities & Equipment
- Assessment & Evaluation

Focus on effective student learning and development

2009 Standards
A Systems Perspective from Baldridge

Baldridge Criteria for Performance Excellence Framework: A Systems Perspective

Organizational Profile: Environment, Relationships, and Challenges

1 Leadership

2 Strategic Planning

3 Customer and Market Focus

4 Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management

5 Human Resource Focus

6 Process Management

7 Results

Focus on efficient business operations

Reinforces old argument of student as a customer.
What to do when faced with multiple standards?

- Create a framework
- Identify similarities

“The idea of perfect closes your mind to new standards..
John Eliot, Ph.D., Reverse Psychology for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS</th>
<th>Baldridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission (Focused on students)</strong></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (Student Learning Outcomes)</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td><strong>External Focus (Now Student, Stakeholder and Market Focus)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources</strong></td>
<td>Information and Analysis (Now, Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Faculty/Staff and Workplace Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>Process Effectiveness (Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Access</td>
<td><strong>Outcomes and Achievements (Results)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus and External Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment &amp; Evaluation: Establish systematic plans and processes…(to insure educational effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008: Baldridge National Quality Program: Education Criteria for Performance Excellence
Time Line for Assessment

- Initial contact (October, ‘07)
- Review standards (December, ‘07)
- Refine CAS instrument (Winter ‘08)
- Implement CAS & NIRSA Surveys (Spring ‘08)
- Implement EHE Survey (Fall ‘08)
- Implement Qualitative Reviews (Fall ‘08)
- Submit Draft Report (Dec 2008)
- Conduct External Assessment (June 2009)

“If you can't describe what you are doing as a process, you don't know what you're doing”  W. Edwards Deming
Process: Methodology

- Institutional Research Data
- Self Assessment Tool (SAT): 249 Question SAG
- Excellence in Higher Education Organizational Check List (Baldrige)
- NIRSA Student Employee SLO Pilot Survey
  - Measuring Outcomes from Recsports Experiences
- Qualitative Input
  - Internal Consultant & Assistant Dean
  - Student Reflection

“If all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail”  Russian Proverb
## Outputs: CAS Findings

### Table 1
Statistical Analysis of the Self Assessment Tool (SAT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Total Questions</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Questions Above 3.0</th>
<th>Percentage of Above 3.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission (EHE SP)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (EHE Multiple)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (EHE L)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Management</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources (EHE WF)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, Equipment and Technology</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Access</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus and External Relations (EHE EF)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Evaluation (EHE IA)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outputs: Baldridge Findings

### Table 2
Statistical Analysis of the EHE Organizational Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Group Mean (M) Average</th>
<th>Total Questions</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode for area questions</th>
<th>Percentage of Above 4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (CAS Leadership)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning (CAS Mission)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Focus (CAS Campus and External Relations)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Analysis (CAS Assessment and Evaluation)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Focus (CAS Human Resources)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Effectiveness (Multiple CAS)</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes and Achievement (Multiple CAS)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5: CRS Student Employee Outcomes – Rank Ordered (n= 147)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Before</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Before</th>
<th>Mean Now</th>
<th>Std. Deviation Now</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Choices</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Skills</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Courage</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Around Top Management</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Application Skills</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Focus</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outputs: Student Employee Reflections

• Student Employee Leaders
  – Student Leader 1: “This job gives me a chance to lead by example as a role model for students.”

  – Student Leader 2: “OP is a significant factor in my development as an employee and student.”

  – Student Leader 3: Because of the strong student growth and development ethic within CR, I have been given the responsibility of completely running the Trips and Clinics program.”
Outputs: Qualitative Reflections

• Division’s focus on creating a positive learning environment that enhances the development of students is sound.
• Strong relations with campus and community
• Use of advisory boards advised
• Diversity is not an area of strength.
  – Refine and implement diversity action plan

“Diversity creates the greatest challenge within the unit.” Franklin, ‘08
Feedback: Lessons Learned

• **Finding:** Self assessment survey development was arduous & time consuming
  – 249 questions was too long
  – Problematic structure impacted data input and analysis

• **Recommendation:**
  – Refine and combine EHE and SAG (100 questions)
  – Use Student Voice to collect data

• **Finding:** Distribution of the survey was limited.

• **Recommendation:** Distribute to stakeholders through sampling (include user groups, suppliers, and partners.) Scheduled for Spring FY 2010

• **Finding:** Other standards were not used in this assessment.

• **Recommendation:** Identify specific area standards and include in the overall assessment.
Feedback: Phase 2 - Action Plans

• Refine and implement diversity plan
• Refine and implement a more robust assessment plan
  – Assess achievement of student learning outcomes
  – Integrate StudentVoice
• Refocus campus and external relations
• Implement stakeholder review

Meaningfully engage under-represented populations
Resources

• Campus Recreation Resource Page
  – http://www.ohiou.edu/recreation/resources/index.htm

• Contact Information
  – Douglas Franklin, Ph.D.
  – Ping 140H
  – 740-593-0805
  – franklin@ohio.edu