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Components of a Comprehensive Assessment Model
Components of a Comprehensive Assessment Model

- Tracking Use
- Assessing Needs
- Assessing Satisfaction
- Assessing Cultures and Environments
Components of a Comprehensive Assessment Model

Assessing Outcomes

- Benchmarking Against Comparable Institutions
- Benchmarking Against National Standards
- Cost Effectiveness Assessment
Why I Advocate for the Use of the CAS Standards
- They give staff choice and control on how to conduct assessment.
- They act as an educational opportunity.
- They de-politicize the assessment process.
- They promote the development of an educationally-based shared vision for excellence.
Examples of Program Reviews Completed

- Judicial Affairs
  - Code of Conduct Amended
Examples of Program Reviews Completed

- Multicultural Programs and Services
  - Mission Statement Revised
  - Advisory Board Established
Three Other Ways We Use the CAS Standards

➢ To develop new programs
➢ In the performance review process
➢ To educate staff on how to identify learning outcomes
Frameworks for Assessing Student Learning and Developmental Outcomes (FALDOS)
Learning and Developmental Outcomes

- Knowledge acquisition, construction, integration and application
- Cognitive complexity
- Intrapersonal development
- Interpersonal competence
- Humanistic and civic engagement
- Practical competence
ACPA Professional Competencies

- Advising and Helping
- Assessment, Evaluation, and Research
- Ethics
- Legal Foundations
ACPA Professional Competencies

- Leadership and Administration
- Pluralism and Inclusion
- Student Learning and Development
- Teaching
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Changes

- Name of Division
- Name of Departments
- Existence of Departments
- Organization Chart
- Became a Six-Year Cycle
Large Numbers

• 2006  21 Departments
• 2008  22 Departments
• 2009  27 Departments
Basis of Decisions

- Senior Officers (one per year)
- Division Size
- Limited Expertise
- Shorter Learning Curve
- More Manageable Overall
- Individual Attention for Each
- More Effective Action Planning
- Created Culture of Assessment
- Ongoing Assessment
- Periodic Updates
Criteria

• Reporting Lines
• Current Department Status
• Department Size
• Directors’ Schedules
• Other Assessment Activity
Learning Outcomes

• Departments
  – Improvements
  – Involvement of Team
  – External Reviewer

• Division
  – Increased Buy-In
  – Decreased Frustration and Fear
  – Shift from Oversight to Self-Regulation
  – Culture of Assessment
Implementing a Divisional Self Study using CAS

Lisa Nagy
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
University of Texas, Arlington
UT Arlington Background

• About UTA
  28,000+ students
  2\textsuperscript{nd} largest in UT System
  16 departments in student affairs
  No FTE for assessment

• Reasons for selecting CAS
  SACS Accreditation
  Learning Reconsidered
  UEP
UT Arlington Process

- Established Division Assessment Team
- Researched & created a self assessment plan for Division (3 phases)
- Simultaneously developed new guidelines for goals & objectives & SLOs
Internal Self Study Plan - Phase I

• Launched self assessment
  – August 2007-training division staff- 16 departments
  – Selected department liaisons
  – Collection of evidence – September-July
  – Periodic reports
  – Liaison meetings
  – CAS discussion at A-Team monthly meeting
Internal Self Study Plan - Phase II

- Campus Team Review
  - Summer 2008: Selection campus teams
  - Campus Team Make-Up (1 faculty, 1 division staff, 1 other staff, 1 student, 1 advisory board rep)
  - Kick-off luncheon & training
  - Fall 2008: team reviews begin
  - Jan/Feb: teams presented findings (VP, AVP, Director & A-Team chair)
  - March: department completed action plans
External Review- Phase III

• Summer 2010
• Assessment Team developing plans for external review
• 3-4 department rotation every 5 years
• 2-3 person teams
Pros:

- United the Division on common project
- Created buy-in and camaraderie
- Provided common language
- Allowed staff to implement change prior to campus review
- Learned lessons as we launch into phase III
- Tied learning outcomes together with CAS
- Helped develop a culture of assessment
- Created partnerships with others such as IRP
- Allowed others to see the scope of what we do in Student Affairs
Lessons Learned

• Need a lot of faculty/staff volunteers
• Research colleagues who have implemented reviews
• Limit the number of reviews for Campus Teams
• Too much time for evidence collection. Things change so some evidence was outdated
• Don’t be afraid to customize without compromising the integrity of the standards
Considerations:

• How will you use the findings/expectations from departments
• How will you deal with departments that do not have standards
• What pieces do you need to customize? rating sheets, action plans
• How will you distribute evidence to teams
• Thank your volunteers (inside & outside division)
Examples of Impact of Campus Reviews

- Review of mission statement & core functions
- Development of departmental policies for internal control
- Development of clearer organizational structure
- Creation of student development plans
- Increase faculty involvement in program planning
- Development of strategic plan
- Refine assessment tools to evaluate learning
University of North Texas Division of Student Development

Jan Hillman, Ed. D.
Executive Director for Planning and Administration for Student Development
University of North Texas
Creating a CAS Dashboard to Aid Student Affairs and Campus Leadership
About the UNT Assessment Office

- 2 FTE, 1 GA
- Facilitate UNT involvement in NSSE, CIRP, VSA & other institution-wide assessment projects
- Lead 27 member Division-wide Assessment Team
- Conduct on-demand assessments and assist departments with other projects
- Manage assessment website and online resources
- Partner with Institutional Research and other campus units on Assessment
About UNT & Student Development

University of North Texas
- UNT founded in 1890
- 3rd Largest Public University in Texas
- 34K Students (including Graduate and Part Time)

Division of Student Development
- 300+ FTE Staff
- 27 Graduate Assistants
- 22 Departments
CAS in Practice at UNT

- Each department conducts CAS Standards Assessment every 5 years.
- Produce written CAS Reports on program review; moving to Executive Summaries
- Uses CAS standards to develop student and graduate assistant learning outcomes
- Utilizes a Departmental CAS Planning Chart
- Work on Next Generation CAS Tool
Interactive CAS Dashboard @UNT

• Goals Driving the Creation of the CAS Dashboard:

  – Streamline use of CAS Standards
  – Increase efficiency of staff time to complete CAS Process
  – Provide Senior Leadership with a “2 Minute Review/Snapshot” of a Program
  – Automate data entry process and produce quantitative and qualitative reports
  – Ensure consistency in use of CAS standards across all units/departments
Features Built Into The Interactive CAS Dashboard

- Features of CAS Dashboard:
  - Neatly organized by Program Review Section
  - Forced choice scoring to avoid typos
  - Automatic calculations to “quantify” CAS
  - Automatic qualitative report generation
  - Automatic quantitative graphing feature
  - Ability to quickly jump back and forth between program review sections
  - Integrated Worksheet A, B and C designed to explain scoring
  - Integrated area to place and store relevant files
Features of CAS Dashboard:

- Fully integrated navigation and instructions panel
- Ability to enter text only in pre-approved sections (no chances for mistakes)
- Ability to quickly forward files to supervisors and senior leadership with a minimum amount of paper used (green approach to assessment)
- Ability to easily convert document to PDF for website housing and cross-campus sharing of reports
- Ability to archive data for future use
Pilot Office: Office of Disability Accommodation

- First user of new dashboard.
- Dashboard distributed to staff in advance to fill out individually outside of retreat.
- Retreat held over the course of a day to share ratings and discuss findings.
- Director entered in final ratings and qualitative comments into the data-sheet.
- Post-review held with Planning and Assessment.
What Our Staff in ODA Told Us

• We spent a lot of time discussing our mission statement and as a result of this exercise we changed it. This process was very valuable.
• It was very easy to use and saved us time on creating the report.
• The process was straight forward.
• We liked the graphing features as it gave us instant feedback on how we felt we were doing.
• We wish we would have had a facilitator so that our Director could participate more fully.
Department II: Career Services

- Planning and Assessment facilitated.
- Staff worked individually on filling out datasheets.
- Planning and Assessment compiled scores into a master worksheet. Included raw, average and mode scores for each criterion measure. Shared at internal review.
- Short 30 minute norming session at internal review retreat.
- Voting system initiated to encourage conversation.
- Went through entire internal review in just 7 hours.
- Process encouraged dialogue and allowed for full participation of all key staff members.
- Springboard for next steps: External Review (Alumni, Employers, Students).
Department III: Recreational Sports

• Norming session added prior to beginning any work for key staff. Career Services experience demonstrated confusion over scoring.

• Internal review occurs over a span of several days.

• Internal review will be followed up with external constituency group meetings including: students, alumni, faculty and staff over several days.

• Director and senior staff will reconcile any discrepancies in ratings using adapted CAS worksheets which were merged in the Dashboard.
Norming Process

- Meeting held prior to scoring

**LET’S NORM OUR RATING SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ND</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Done</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>Minimally Met</td>
<td>Well Met</td>
<td>Fully Met</td>
<td>Not Rated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONVERSATION STARTERS:**
- What is the difference between an NR, ND and a BLANK?
- How do you know what the difference between a 3 and 4 is?
- How will we make final decisions on ratings?
- What happens when the group is divided?
- What is your role to vote without pressure from others?

2009 CAS PROCESS: Recreational Sports
Norming Process

- Wanted to set staff at ease

**CAS Is Not...**

- A chance to punish staff or an office for performance
- A tool used to help leadership bring about disciplinary action
- A mechanism to embarrass, isolate or marginalize staff or constituents
Pre-Meeting Scoring

- Staff completed worksheets in advance and results compiled prior to retreat - average and mode reported

### 2009 Pohl Recreation Center CAS Process: Part ONE

**CAS AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>R7</th>
<th>R8</th>
<th>R9</th>
<th>R10</th>
<th>R11</th>
<th>R12</th>
<th>R13</th>
<th>R14</th>
<th>R15</th>
<th>R16</th>
<th>R17</th>
<th>R18</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>MODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>A program mission and goals statement is in place and is reviewed periodically</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Student learning, development, and educational experiences are incorporated in the mission statement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>The mission is consistent with that of the host institution and the CAS standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>The program functions as an integral part of the host institution’s overall mission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>The program provides opportunities for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5a</td>
<td>a variety of activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5b</td>
<td>cooperative and competitive play</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5c</td>
<td>leadership, management, program planning, and interpersonal skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5d</td>
<td>access to quality facilities, equipment and programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking the process to retreat

- Agenda from first retreat – Part 1 Mission

Today’s Session

- Introductions
- Ice Breaker
- Role of Rec Sports
- Putting the Mission into Context: History of Facility/Program
- Brief Review of Standards
- Cover Part 1 – Mission
  - Review of Staff Scoring for Part 1
  - Review Current Mission
  - Review of Peer Institution Mission Statements
  - Discussion about Mission v2
  - Re-vote on Mission
Comparison between Dashboard and Word-Based Processes

Word-Based Process
- Time intensive
- Repetitive Steps
- Paper Intensive
- Hard to quickly find relevant information
- Comfortable for non-technical staff

New CAS Dashboard
- Convenient
- Efficient Over Time
- Future Oriented
- Limited Technical Skills Needed
- Ability to Bring Together Multiple Datapoints
What Are The Future Plans For The CAS Dashboards

- In discussion with CAS on potential distribution
- CAS is currently updating their forms and we would need to integrate these changes
- Open to sharing with other institutions once all coding bugs are worked out and files tested
- Would hope institutions would make their results available to other institutions (if open to this)
Other uses of CAS Standards

Doreen Tobin, Ed. D.
Vice President for Student Affairs
East Stroudsburg University
Other Uses of CAS Standards

- Expansion of current programs
- Justification of current programs
- New program development
- Benchmarking
- Special topic assessments
- Staff development opportunities
Expansion of current programs

• Identify emerging or unmet needs of students
• Identify program identity needs
• ESU LGBTQ Programs and Services example
Justification of current programs

• Program prioritization processes
• Degree to which program addresses current student need and professed learning outcomes
• KU Greek programs example
New Program Development

• Use of standards to identify program structure, resource needs and benchmarks for program development

• ESU Commuter and Off Campus Living programs example
Benchmarking programs

- Compare programs across institutions
- Identify key improvement needs across programs studied
- PASSHE ATOD programs example
Special topic assessments

• Conduct a study across a division in a particular area
• Identify how departments across a division address and meet adopted learning outcome objectives
• ESU Diversity study example
Staff development opportunities

• Review aspects or understanding of standards in staff meetings
• Reconsider program mission and goals
• Address standards in training of new staff or student staff
• Research and evaluate best practices in areas deemed deficient or ineffective
Final Thoughts
and Q&A
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