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Process

- **UCS&A Program** - 7 Areas initially
- Unions and Event/Conference eliminated
- Final Areas for 2010
  - Campus Activities Programs
  - Commuter and Off Campus Living Programs
  - Information and Visitors
  - Fraternity/Sorority Life
  - Leadership
Assessment Schedule

- Nov 2 – Dec 4: Team Selection
- Dec 15: Team Training
- Jan 11 – Mar 5: Compile and Review Documentary Evidence
- Mar 8 – Apr 26: Judging Performance
- May 31: Final Reports Due
Assessment Schedule (Revised)

- **By Feb 16:** Team Selection
- **Feb 22-26:** Team Training
- **Mar 1 - 31:** Compile and Review Documentary Evidence
- **Apr 1 – Apr 30:** Judging Performance
- **June 15:** Final Reports Due
Training and Education

- CAS Website
- CAS Text
Blackboard Groups

- Page for each team
- Access for all team members
- Teams have staff, students and faculty
Blackboard Groups
CAS General Standards

- Part 1. Mission
- Part 2. Program
- Part 3. Leadership
- Part 4. Human Resources
- Part 5. Ethics
- Part 6. Legal Responsibilities
- Part 7. Equity and Access
CAS General Standards

- Part 8. Diversity
- Part 9. Organization and Management
- Part 10. Campus and External Relations
- Part 11. Financial Resources
- Part 12. Technology
- Part 13. Facilities and Equipment
- Part 14. Assessment and Evaluation
1. All reports posted to Blackboard
2. Important areas highlighted
## Area Results (Averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>COCLP</th>
<th>CIAVS</th>
<th>FSAP</th>
<th>SLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Access</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org and Mgt</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Ext Relations</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Equipment</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/ Evaluation</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results Overall

- Number of areas (approx. 15%) ND/NR
- Leadership too many to make few reported valid
- HR/Ethics/legal – mixed ND/NR
  - Used department as base
Most areas lacked specific mission statement.
Each area operated from a “professional mission” basis or
Operated from the basis of the departmental mission statement.
Leadership team could not rate leadership mission: no evidence of a unified leadership concept.
Results #2: Program

- Generally met standards in this area
- Cognitive complexity was low for F/S Life
- Most programs highly integrated into Department/University
- Interpersonal relationships was moderately high
- Practical competence moderately high
Results #3: Leadership

- Professional leadership strong
- Emerging attention to qualifications and certification/training
- Annual evaluation and job performance plans in all areas including graduate assistants
Results #4: Human Resources

- Hiring process excellent across all areas
- Training mixed but still mostly met
- Professional development mixed
  - Classes and on campus opportunities strong
  - Prof Assn., conference, off-campus heavily hindered by funding.
- Salary levels rated at low end of available scales
Results #5: Ethics

- VCU Ethics Statement
- USC&A Professional Statement
- VCU Creed
- Where rated – generally fully or mostly met
Results #6 & #7: Legal/Equity

- Governed mostly by University/State
- COCLP & F/S Life highly aware of legal and equity issues but still not fully met in all areas
- Systematic training in legal and equity issues
- All programs and services fully accessible where required
  - Disability Student Services Office in Student Commons
Results #8: Diversity

- VCU most diverse campus in VA
- CIAVS, F/S L and COCLP extremely proactive in all areas of underserved.
Main reason not to do Event/Conference CAS

- Lower rated issues across the area included
  - Procedures for decision making/conflict resolution
  - Process for reward and recognition

- Higher rated issues
  - Structured purposefully
  - Managed Effectively
  - Policies/procedures aligned with institution
Results #10: Campus & Ext. Rel.

- CAP, COCLP, CIAVS all generally good.
  - COCLP highly linked to internal and external communities. Some issues raised about emergency response for off campus student crisis
  - CAP/CIAVS work very closely with many constituencies meeting standards
  - F/SLP not so much!
    - Evidence of great work internally but great need to develop external
SURPRISE, SURPRISE

- All areas reported as least well met in this area.
- Info on low end of budgetary scale
- Commuters recently moved into new offices with extended services – honeymoon period
- CAP student programming fund balances near $100K
- F/SLP reported adequate funding – new center!
- Leadership grants not considered in review-why?
Results #12: Technology

- Best overall area.
- Spent tremendous funds on computers, software and services.
- Some issues with longevity of computers and slow response in purchasing.
- Centralized web management issues are important but not critical.
Results #13: Facilities/Equip

- Another Surprise
  - Direct conflict with space/equipment needs analysis 2009
  - CAP/COCLP rates facilities low but equipment high?
  - Office security, emergency preparedness, etc. Al rated very high
  - F/SLP moved into new offices 2009
Results #14: Assess/Evaluation

- F/SLP highly assessed. Council shared standards program drives assessment
- Info and CAP programmatic surveys are popular but question assessment
- COCLP results surprising.
  - Heavily surveyed
  - Highest use of Student Voice
  - Acknowledgement of lack of “true assessment”
All standards for all areas meet standard or minimally met where purposefully part of the departmental program.

Most areas are "well met"

Critical areas of "not met" include staffing, funding and facilities in certain areas

Consistent Assessment is a critical area of need
Next Steps

- Each Team will review and resubmit Work Form A.
- USC&A Management Team will review.
- Each Team will complete work Forms B & C in cooperation with Management Team.
- Forms will be incorporated into Annual and Long Range Goals during 2011-2012 Annual Cycle.
Questions & Discussion