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## Characteristics of a Good Assessment Program

- Asks important questions
- Reflects institutional mission
- Reflects programmatic goals and objectives for learning
- Contains a thoughtful approach to assessment planning
- Is linked to decision making about the curriculum
- Is linked to processes such as planning and budgeting
- Encourages involvement of individuals from on and off campus
- Contains relevant assessment techniques
- Includes direct evidence of learning
- Reflects what is known about how students learn
- Shares information with multiple audiences
- Leads to reflection and action by faculty, staff, and students
- Allows for continuity, flexibility, and improvement in assessment

( Palomba & Banta, 1999, p. 16)
Student Affairs Research and Evaluation

Mission and Vision

The university student experience is about learning—the kind of learning that elevates the soul, transforms the world, develops people, supports the community, and provides the foundation for the advancement of society, science, leadership, and knowledge. The Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office aspires to enable people to understand student learning better and to use that understanding to improve the student experience.

Focused upon delivering education about student learning, assessing student learning outcomes, and the student experience at Oregon State University, this office engages people in rich conversations about students informed by data. Additionally, the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office provides leadership for the Student Affairs Division with regard to the development and implementation of assessment processes directed to produce a culture of assessment within the Division. This also includes coordination of Student Affairs' university-wide research activities.

“... We and our students are part of an entire educational system that has developed at our institution from its teaching mission. In a system, each part affects the behaviors and properties of the whole system (Ackoff, 1995).” (cited in Huba & Freed, 2000).

History

Established only two years ago, the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office was commissioned to advance the educational assessment efforts of the Division of Student Affairs. Initially, this meant continuing to coordinate the administration of large scale surveys used to provide a snapshot of the OSU student experience. With the advent of a renewed Student Affairs Assessment Council, the office expanded duties to include consultation with departments regarding assessment activities and the development of a standardized format for planning as well as reporting results and actions taken. Additionally, the publication of the OSU Perspective, a quarterly newsletter containing articles informed by data on students fostered interest in the experience of students.

As others on campus become increasingly interested in the work of the Office of Student Affairs Research and Evaluation and the Student Affairs Assessment Council, opportunities for developing and increasing the collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs will occur.
“Learning is a complex, holistic, multi-centric activity that occurs throughout and across the college experience.”
(Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-wide Focus on the Student Experience, 2004).

2003-2004 Goals

1. Build assessment capacity in Student Affairs departments.
2. Build sustainable assessment structures in Student Affairs.
3. Disseminate assessment information about students to the university community.
4. Coordinate Student Affairs university-wide research activities.

2003-2004 Outcomes

1. Most Student Affairs departments (90%) will participate in assessment planning training activities sponsored by Student Affairs Research and Evaluation.
2. Participants will demonstrate their learning by developing initial assessment plans by April 7, 2004. At least 75% of Student Affairs Departments will submit plans with a mean rating of “2”, Plans Developing, according to a pre-determined rubric.
3. Student Affairs Department Heads and the Student Affairs Assessment Council will provide feedback and direction for further learning needs, service needs, and support for assessment using an annual survey.
4. Publish 4 issues of OSU Perspective in print and on the web.
5. Publish reports for CIRP, NSSE, YFCY, and FSSE during FY 03-04.
6. 2004 NSSE will be administered with IRB approval.
7. 2004 CIRP will be administered with IRB approval.

Significant Activities and Achievements Supporting Goals and Outcomes

The following are specific activities and achievements for FY 2003-2004. Engagement with individuals and groups involved with assessment and assessment planning allowed for greater collaboration, education, and leadership in assessment at OSU.
University Service

- Student Affairs Assessment Council-chair
- Institutional Review Board for the Use of Human Subjects in Research-member
- Retention Council Steering Committee-member
- Technology Service Center Task Force-member
- Faculty Senate-Student Affairs representative
- Academic Affairs Assessment of Educational Programs Task Force-member

“Ownership of teaching stretches across courses, services, and educational practices. It holds us collectively responsible for contributing to learning over students’ studies, providing multiple and varied opportunities for them to learn and practice what we value.” (Maki, 2004)

Significant Collaborations

- Student Employee Pre-and Post Survey with Memorial Union
- Pilot Faculty Survey of Student Engagement with Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Dr. Leslie Burns
- Student Affairs Assessment Council learning agenda and implementation
- Student Financial Aid to begin to assess student financial preferences
- National Survey of Student Engagement targeted over sample with the College of Health and Human Sciences
- Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Assessment Council preliminary planning for OSU Symposium on Student Learning and Assessment to be held November 2004

Assessment Planning Consultation with Individual Departments

- Greek Life
- Career Services
- Student Conduct and Mediation Programs
- University Housing and Dining Services
- Services for Students with Disabilities
- Admissions
- SMILE program
- Vice Provost for Student Affairs Office
- University Counseling and Psychological Services
- Student Health Services
- SOAR
- Financial Aid
- Memorial Union
• College of Health and Human Sciences
• OSU Cascades Campus
(Note: Most of these consultations occurred over time with multiple meetings and opportunities for exchange)

OSU Perspective

Four issues of the OSU Perspective were published during FY 2003-2004. This was an additional issue from the 2002-2003 fiscal year. In the future, three issues will be published, one each of the three academic year terms.

• Volume 2(4) June, 2004
  Contents: Student Affairs Use of Large Scale Surveys, OSU Symposium Slated for Fall, 2004, Entering OSU First Year Students, First Year Student Experiences, Faculty and Students Respond to Surveys of Student Engagement, Student Affairs Assessment Team Invited to NC State Assessment Symposium
  http://oregonstate.edu/admin/student_affairs/research/Perspective%20vol%202%20(4).pdf

• Volume 2(3) February, 2004
  Contents: Use of a Large Scale Survey for Benchmarking Library Service Quality, "Matching Service" to Help Students Pick Roomies, OSU Odyssey--What Do Students Think?, First Year Students Tell Us about Their First Year at OSU.
  http://oregonstate.edu/admin/student_affairs/research/Perspective%20vol%202%20(3).pdf

• Volume 2(2) November, 2003 Special Edition
  Contents: Rec Sports-An Excellent Place to Workout and Play! Students Rate MU as One of the Best! How Do Students Rate OSU Student Health Services Quality? Use of External Resources for Conducting Assessment; What Do Students Who Use the OSU Counseling and Psychological Services Tell Us? GPA's of Students in Residence Halls Tops Those Who "Live Out." START Soars!

• Volume 2(1) September, 2003
  Contents: Student Leaders of Positive Innovation make Recommendations to Provost's Council, Student Affairs Council Wants You!, Gap Measurement Analysis: A Useful Model for Service Quality Assessment, Assessment Expert to Consult at OSU, MU Looks Good!
  http://oregonstate.edu/admin/student_affairs/research/PerspectiveVol2_1.pdf

Reports Written and Disseminated

General

• 2002-2003 Annual Report and Assessment Conceptualization
• Integrated Assessment Conceptualization for OSU
• Retention Planning and Outcome Statements
• Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Assessment Plan 2003-2004
• Student Affairs portion of Northwest Association Accreditation Report and editing of Institutional Assessment Section
Workshops/Trainings Developed and Implemented

Based upon feedback from the 2002-2003 Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Survey, several opportunities for further education and training about how to develop and implement assessment as an on-going part of the culture were offered.

- Dr. Marilee Bresciani, Director of Assessment at North Carolina State University. Two-day consultation with departments and several assessment presentations.

- The Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office offered four two-hour workshops on assessment for anyone in Student Affairs who wished to attend.

Assessment Planning in Student Affairs
Delivered once monthly for 4 months (January, 2004—April, 2004)
Topics: Assessment Planning: What is it?  
Mission and Goals  
Learning Outcomes  
Measurement Methods  
Implementation and Feedback

Goals for Workshop
- participants will interact with departments in the development of an assessment plan
- participants will understand assessment plan structure and be able to implement in their own departmental assessment plan
participants will develop a support and knowledge community around assessment (Workshop results will be discussed in the next section – Evaluation of Services and Assessment of On-going Service Needs)

- North Carolina State University Assessment Symposium Invited to bring a team to the pre-symposium round-table discussion. 12 Student Affairs faculty and staff attended the two-day seminar.

- Multiple opportunities to join a learning community on assessment as a member of the Student Affairs Assessment Council.

- Numerous articles and references on assessment sent to Student Affairs Assessment Council members and Student Affairs Department Heads via email.

Requests for Information

Responding to requests for information continued to be a service provided by this office. As can be seen from the following chart, persons or offices requesting information and the types of information requested varied considerably.

Fiscal Year 2003-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>INFORMATION REQUESTED</th>
<th>PERSON/OFFICE REQUESTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Information about surveys student affairs administers</td>
<td>Gary Beach, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Information from the Association of Institutional Research about types of surveys available and descriptions of them</td>
<td>Gary Beach, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Data from NSSE, CIRP, and YFCY that could be used for a self-study of ALS being done by Academic Programs for a program review</td>
<td>Michelle Rosowsky, Bob Burton, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Information about how NSSE was used with students: Leaders of Positive Innovation</td>
<td>George Kuh, NSSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Assessment resources for Career Services</td>
<td>Tom Munnerlyn, Edie Blakley, Career Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Review of Hobson’s survey and operational procedures</td>
<td>Michele Sandlin, Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Information on the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency</td>
<td>Michelle Rosowsky, Gary Beach, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Information about incoming students for alumni magazine</td>
<td>Pat Filip, Alumni Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>DRAFT 10 year plan for survey assessment from Student Affairs</td>
<td>Gary Beach, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Information on resources for assessment for the OSU Cascades campus</td>
<td>Nathan Hovekamp, OSU Cascades Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Information on potential assessment training</td>
<td>Megan Hoffart, Ag Sciences faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Information about establishing this position at NC State University</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Zapata, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, NCState University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Student Affairs Assessment Timeline</td>
<td>Bob Burton, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Information about how OSU is using NSSE</td>
<td>Jeff Young, Chronicle of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>OSU Perspectives</td>
<td>Tim White, OSU Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Information about religious preferences of incoming students and their parents</td>
<td>Lora Jasman, Student Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Student Affairs Assessment Council definitions and format for assessment plans and reporting</td>
<td>Michelle Rosowsky, Gary Beach, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>NSSE and YFCY Reports</td>
<td>Michelle Rosowsky, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>NSSE and YFCY Reports</td>
<td>John Shea, Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Information about NSSE and LibQual + and how they inform each other</td>
<td>Bonnie Allen, Valley Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>NSSE and YFCY and how they may relate to retention</td>
<td>John Shea, Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>NSSE report</td>
<td>Ken Hall, Hatfield Marine Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Information about student interest and participation in Greek communities from CIRP and YFCY</td>
<td>Collin Cordoza, Fraternity member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>YFCY and NSSE reports</td>
<td>Vicki Tolar Burton—WIC Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>YFCY report</td>
<td>Jill Schuster, University Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>IRB information</td>
<td>Janet Nishihara, EOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Student surveys and how we might partner—what is possible?</td>
<td>Kim McAlexender, Cheryl Jordan, College of Health and Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>NSSE, YFCY, CIRP, FSSE reports</td>
<td>Anita Helle, College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>OSU Perspective Information</td>
<td>Henri Jansen, Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>YFCY comparators</td>
<td>Jill Schuster, Angie-Marketing Intern, University Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Susan Hopp, OSU Cascades Campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presentations to Campus and Off-Campus Groups**

While the number of presentations to various groups declined this year, that was expected. Last year the office was new, the data on students was new, etc. While we have continued to collect data, the results have not changed very much since little has changed at SOU as a result of the data.

Number of Presentation Contacts: 203  
Mean number of contacts per presentation: 20.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Topics</th>
<th>Group Presented To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Assessment</td>
<td>Provost’s Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Are Students Thinking (CIRP and YFCY results)</td>
<td>TRIAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YFCY, FSSE, and NSSE data</td>
<td>Community for Academic Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Planning</td>
<td>Student Life Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Services and Assessment of On-going Service Needs

The evaluation of the programs and services delivered during FY 03-04 was measured in several ways. First, the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation office in conjunction with the Vice Provost for Student Affairs reviewed all of the departmental assessment plans using an evaluation rubric developed for that purpose. Second, the number of departments that participated in the opportunities provided for learning more about assessment planning and implementation was observed and recorded. Third, a written survey was conducted in June-July, 2004, to allow department heads in Student Affairs and members of the Student Affairs Assessment Council to provide written feedback.

The results of the first two assessment activities are summarized below. The full report of the 2003-2004 Assessment Plan is contained in Appendix A.

Over the course of the FY2003-2004, six assessment educational opportunities were available for Student Affairs faculty and staff. A total of 83% of the departments had representatives in attendance on at least one occasion. While it was hoped that 90% of the departments would have representation at the trainings, having 83% was satisfactory for this year. In addition 63% of the departments had representatives at more than one training. Many of those participated in 3 or more. The level of involvement in educational opportunities was likely related to the difference in quality and development of assessment plans.

Assessment plans for Student Affairs departments were due in April 2004. At that time 83% of Student Affairs departments submitted written plans. For this submission departments were asked to have a mission, goals, and at least one outcome and measurement for one goal. Most departments who submitted plans had worked through more than that however. When plans were reviewed using a previously developed and distributed rubric, the expectation was that most departments would have a mean rating of “2”, Plans Developing. In actuality most departments mean rating was between Plans Beginning and Plans Developing. Given the time frame and the newness of the activity, these results were nevertheless promising.

“Without a focus on teaching and learning, assessment runs the risk of remaining or becoming marginalized. Worse yet, it remains an empty and intellectually unfulfilling activity.” (Maki, 2004)
The following is a graph of the mean rating per assessment plan submitted by the due date. It should be noted that one other plan was submitted a month or so after the due date. Those results are not reported in this document.

**Mean Rating of Submitted Assessment Plans (April, 2004)**

1 = Beginning, 2 = Developing, 3 = Accomplished, 4 = Exemplary

A written survey was administered to Student Affairs department heads and members of the Student Affairs Assessment Council at the end of the 2003-2004 fiscal year. Feedback from that survey is summarized below. The complete report of results is contained in Appendix B. Forty-one surveys were distributed and 14 were returned for a return rate of 34%.

Overall, the parts of the survey related to satisfaction were very positive with mean ratings in the "somewhat satisfied" and "very satisfied" range. On most items over 80% reported that they were “somewhat or very satisfied.” An area that continued to be the lowest rated item is that of the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation web page. While 71% of the respondents were “somewhat or very satisfied,” this remained the lowest rated item despite major efforts in redesign. This will be an area to continue to upgrade and improve. Generally, there was an increase in use of consulting services and resources directed toward assessment planning rather than with use of existing data (e.g., NSSE, CIRP, etc.). This was likely driven by the need to submit assessment reports this year. It is expected that these types of requests will likely continue until the departments begin to incorporate assessment and assessment planning into their culture.

In terms of the influence that the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office has had on Student Affairs Departments, there has been a substantial increase in frequency of discussion, involvement, dedication of resources, and use of data in decision-making from last year’s results. This too was expected since this was the first year that written assessment plans were requested by the Vice Provost for Student Affairs. Additionally, those departments that engaged in the 4-session workshops provided by the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office were given assignments that required conversation in departments.

With regard to comments, they were overwhelmingly positive. In reviewing them, several themes emerged. These included:
1. Continued need for training and practice at writing and thinking about assessment plans and implementing those plans;
2. Continued feedback needed to help in refinement;
3. Help in assessment methodology, especially alternatives to surveys;
4. Help with how to write up data and present it better;
5. Help in finding resources (people and money) for assessment; and,
6. Picture of how unit assessment plans fit with division strategic plan and also university plan.

These areas will be focused upon regarding training opportunities in the coming year.

Other areas of assessment in which results were positive included:

1. Publishing 4 issues of OSU Perspective;
2. Administering and disseminating NSSE, CIRP, FSSE, and YFCY surveys and reports;
3. Gaining IRB approval for all the of the aforementioned projects

**Student Affairs Assessment Council**

The Student Affairs Assessment Council (SAAC) was created a mere eighteen months ago as a rebirth of the previous committee. That committee had however laid a great foundation upon which the current assessment efforts built.

During this last fiscal year, the SAAC met regularly every two week throughout the year, including the summer. While not all members could come for every meeting, the work continued.

This was a particularly invigorating year with a great deal of energy on the council and a tremendous amount of learning and work to create an assessment culture in Student Affairs and OSU. While the group was very prolific in conversation and meetings, the spirit of hard work, support, generosity, and good will made the creativity, energy, and productivity of the group possible. The following is a list of the more tangible major accomplishments of this group.

- Preliminary attempt to determine learning goals and outcomes on a division-wide scale;
- Pilot study of set of questions and methodology for survey delivery and reporting for all departments in the division;
- Development and implementation of an Assessment Audit;
- Hosting an assessment consultant, Dr. Marilee Bresciani, to jump-start and provide guidance for our assessment efforts;
- Set learning agenda for the year and implemented;
- Developed a common assessment language for use in the division;
- Developed a common format for development of assessment plans in the division;
- Set timelines for assessment planning and submission of plans and reports on results on an annual basis;
- Determined process for assessment plan review and feedback on an annual basis;
- Invited to send a team of 12 student affairs folks to the NC State Assessment Symposium;
- Reviewed and provided input to Academic Affairs and Institutional Research on their development of a web-based assessment plan and reporting page that Business Solutions Group is working on for implementation at OSU; (general consensus is that it will not have the needed functionality)
- Began planning the OSU Student Learning and Assessment Symposium scheduled for November 9-10, 2004, including goals and learning outcomes, methods of measurement, implementation, decisions, follow-up.

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can change the world; indeed it is the only thing that ever has.
(Margaret Mead)

**Challenges and Opportunities**

This document is filled with successes, yet there remain significant challenges for the coming year. Note that some of them are specific to Student Affairs and others are related to University challenges which impinge upon the work of Student Affairs.

1. While many departments in Student Affairs are actively engaged in working with assessment and are only in need of more practice, experience, and some additional guidance and training, other departments have yet to really begin the process.
2. The Student Affairs Assessment Council works very hard and is committed to doing an excellent job. Their health is critical to the continued high functioning of the division in terms of assessment. Specifically, acknowledgment, and opportunities for celebration and recognition are needed both from the division and also from their home departments.
3. The university seems to lack direction in terms of what it is trying to accomplish. The strategic plan has not seemed to “come alive” in a way that allows people/departments to form around a common set of goals. This creates some anxiety when working on assessment plans that should obviously fold into the strategic plan or the goals of the university.
4. The university needs a structure upon which to hang all of the assessment efforts. Right now it is disjointed and uneven.
5. Supporting the assessment efforts of departments is becoming increasingly difficult and will continue to be so until there is some web-based structure to collect plans, and keep an archive of old plan, new plans and their results, decisions, etc. Right now most of these things are in a file in someone’s office. Thus, when reports are needed or information needs to be retrieved, it is very difficult to find and then use.
6. The Student Affairs Division strategic plan and goals are needed to further the work of assessment. In this way departments can see the direction that the division is taking and can begin to direct their efforts and thus their assessment toward making a contribution to a cohesive whole.

7. Student Affairs departments will need to realistically assess how much assessment they can do in any given year. Right now several departments may be assessing so much that they do not even have the time to reflect on the results. This will defeat the assessment effort.

Even with these and likely many other challenges, the opportunities also abound. For the most part the assessment area is sort of uncharted waters at OSU and whenever there are uncharted waters, there is always opportunity. In this coming year the change in leadership in Academic Programs provides a wonderful opportunity for better collaboration on projects, education, etc. around assessment.

Additionally, the initiation of the first Student Learning and Assessment Symposium in November is providing a great venue already to approach faculty and to begin to enlist their assistance in this effort. To date, faculty have been supportive of the effort to host such a symposium. It also seems that with the accreditation report insisting that a university structure be established, that some of the obstacles to moving forward may at least be different than before. This too provides some opportunity for moving things forward.

Lastly, the development of the Student Affairs Assessment Council and the progress that the membership has made and the future development possibilities hold great promise in terms of leadership for the university.

“It is essential for any organization, academic or not, to assess the extent to which individual work contributes to collective needs and priorities. No organization can function effectively as a collection of autonomous individuals in which everyone pursues personal priorities and the overall achievement consists, in essence, of a casual, nonoptimal aggregate of activities. If universities are to have the resilience and adaptability they will need in the decades to come, they must find better ways to make individual faculty members’ work contribute to common organizational needs, priorities, and goals.” Ernest Lynton, 1998 (cited in Maki, 2004)

Decisions and Next Steps

This year has been one of tremendous success and progress toward creating a culture of assessment in Student Affairs. The direction for the coming year is partly based upon the formal assessment activities of the office and also partly based upon the changing circumstances. While the assessment plan (Appendix C) for 2004-2005 articulates some areas of continued investigation, there are however some other areas that need attention.
The Assessment Council works very hard and has not yet undertaken how to set up reward systems for their and others work on assessment. This will need to be a topic of discussion during the year.

Additionally, the learning agenda for the next year appears to be focused on assessment methodologies more so than in the past year when “assessment basics” were being learned. While the “assessment basics” will still need to be reinforced and practiced, a broader perspective on methodologies and learning new methods will also be a larger part of the agenda.

From a practical perspective, the agenda for survey administration needs to be re-worked. When it was developed a year ago, it was ambitious but with the limited personnel resources, the amount and frequency of surveys needs to be adjusted. This is based upon the amount of time not only to administer the surveys but also to analyze data, write the report, attend to the IRB stipulations, etc.

Lastly, the change in administrative personnel in Academic Affairs provides an opportunity to forge a closer alliance with Academic Programs. The effort to create a culture of assessment at OSU will take the focused involvement of many on the campus, including Student Affairs. The opportunity to work hand-in-hand with Academic Programs in this regard is very welcomed.

“In a systems framework, we work together to design and deliver a curriculum that is coherent to students. . . (p 7). We also seek partners in other academic departments, student affairs, the library, the computer center, and other segments of the institution that provide services to enhance learning. (p 7)” This is systems thinking and it has been fostered by the assessment movement in higher education. “Assessment is a learner-centered movement. . . (p 7).” (cited in Huba & Freed, 2000).
Appendix A

Departmental Assessment Plan
FY 2003-2004

Date: April 7, 2004

Department: Student Affairs Research and Evaluation

Director: Rebecca A. Sanderson, Ph.D.

Assessment Contact: same as above
   Email: Rebecca.sanderson@oregonstate.edu
   Phone: 541-737-8738

Statement of Mission:

Student Affairs Research and Evaluation provides leadership for the coordination and dissemination of data gathered by Student Affairs units and offices.

Statement of Goals:

1. Build assessment capacity in Student Affairs departments
2. Build sustainable assessment structure in Student Affairs
3. Disseminate assessment information about students to university community
4. Coordinate Student Affairs’ university-wide research activities

Statement of Outcomes:

Goal 1: Build assessment capacity in Student Affairs departments

   Outcomes: A. Most of the Student Affairs departments will participate in Assessment Planning training activities sponsored by Student Affairs Research and Evaluation.
               B. Participants will demonstrate their learning by developing initial assessment plans by April 7, 2004.
               C. Student Affairs Department Heads and the Student Affairs Assessment Council will provide feedback and direction for further learning needs, service needs, and support for assessment.

Goal 2: Outcomes, TBA

Goal 3: Disseminate assessment information about students to university community

   Outcomes: A. Publish 4 issues of OSU Perspective
              B. Publish reports for CIRP, NSSE, YFCY, and FSSE during FY 03-04

Goal 4: Coordinate Student Affairs’ university-wide research activities

   Outcomes: A. 2004 NSSE will be administered with IRB approval
              B. 2004 CIRP will be administered with IRB approval

Evaluation Methods:

Goal 1, Outcome A: Count departments represented at: Dr. Bresciani’s consultation,
Assessment workshops, NC State Assessment Symposium. Success if 90% of departments have participated in at least one of the training experiences.

Goal 1, Outcome B: Count number of assessment plans submitted. Measure quality of plan using rubric. Establish baseline. Success if at least 75% of Student Affairs Departments submit plans with a mean rating of “2” Plans Developing according to attached rubric.

Goal 1, Outcome C: Using survey assess satisfaction, use of service, influence on department, continuing departmental needs. Success: If 80% of respondents using services in Section A are satisfied or very satisfied; If 80% of respondents in Section C have a mean rating of 2 across all categories; In Section B if respondents provide needs that can be used to structure educational programs to further the assessment learning agenda.

Goal 2 TBA

Goal 3, Outcome A: Count number of OSU Perspectives published in FY 03-04. Success if 4 issues are published

Goal 3, Outcome B: Count number and type of reports of university-wide surveys published in FY 03-04. Success if executive summary and full report are completed for CIRP, YFCY, NSSE, FSSE.

Goal 4, Outcome A: Document IRB approval and that the 2004 NSSE survey was administered

Goal 4, Outcome B: Document IRB approval and that the 2004 CIRP survey was administered

**Implementation of Assessment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Who Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Build capacity</td>
<td>A. Most SA departments will participate in training activities</td>
<td>A. Count</td>
<td>Over time during FY 2003-2004</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Participants will demonstrate learning by developing initial assessment plans</td>
<td>B. Count and use of rubric</td>
<td>April, 2004</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Feedback and direction from SADH and SAAC</td>
<td>C. Survey</td>
<td>June, 2004</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Build structure</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Who Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disseminate info</td>
<td>A. Publish 4 issues of OSU Perspective</td>
<td>A. Count number of OSU Perspectives published</td>
<td>Sept, Nov, Feb, May</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Publish reports for CIRP, NSSE, YFCY, and FSSE during FY 03-04</td>
<td>B. Count number and type of reports of university-wide surveys published in FY 03-04</td>
<td>Aug, Dec, Feb, March</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinate</td>
<td>A. 2004 NSSE will be administered with IRB approval</td>
<td>B. Document IRB approval and the survey was administered</td>
<td>Jan-May, 2004</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 2004 CIRP will be administered with IRB approval</td>
<td>B. Document IRB approval and the survey was administered</td>
<td>June-Aug, 2004</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results:**

Over the course of the FY2003-2004, six assessment educational opportunities were available for Student Affairs faculty and staff. A total of 83% of the departments had representatives in attendance on at least one occasion. While it was hoped that 90% of the departments would have representation at the trainings, having 83% was satisfactory for this year. In addition 63% of the departments had representatives at more than one training. Many of those participated in 3 or more. The level of involvement in educational opportunities was likely related to the difference in quality and development of assessment plans.

Assessment plans for Student Affairs departments were due in April 2004. At that time 83% of Student Affairs departments submitted written plans. For this submission departments were asked to have a mission, goals, and at least one outcome and measurement for one goal. Most departments who submitted plans had worked through more than that however. When plans were reviewed using a previously developed and distributed rubric, the expectation was that most departments would have a mean rating of “2”, Plans Developing. In actuality most departments mean rating was between Plans Beginning and Plans Developing. Given the time frame and the newness of the activity, these results were nevertheless promising.

The following is a graph of the mean rating per assessment plan submitted by the due date. It should be noted that one other plan was submitted a month or so after the due date. Those results are not reported in this document.
A written survey was administered to Student Affairs department heads and members of the Student Affairs Assessment Council at the end of the 2003-2004 fiscal year. Feedback from that survey is summarized below. The complete report of results is contained in Appendix B. Forty-one surveys were distributed and 14 were returned for a return rate of 34%.

Overall, the parts of the survey related to satisfaction were very positive with mean ratings in the “somewhat satisfied” and “very satisfied” range. On most items over 80% reported that they were “somewhat or very satisfied.” An area that continued to be the lowest rated item is that of the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation web page. While 71% of the respondents were “somewhat or very satisfied,” this remained the lowest rated item despite major efforts in redesign. This will be an area to continue to upgrade and improve. Generally, there was an increase in use of consulting services and resources directed toward assessment planning rather than with use of existing data (e.g., NSSE, CIRP, etc.). This was likely driven by the need to submit assessment reports this year. It is expected that these types of requests will likely continue until the departments begin to incorporate assessment and assessment planning into their culture.

In terms of the influence that the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office has had on Student Affairs Departments, there has been a substantial increase in frequency of discussion, involvement, dedication of resources, and use of data in decision-making from last year’s results. This too was expected since this was the first year that written assessment plans were requested by the Vice Provost for Student Affairs. Additionally, those departments that engaged in the 4-session workshops provided by the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office were given assignments that required conversation in departments.

With regard to comments, they were overwhelmingly positive. In reviewing them, several themes emerged. These included:

1. Continued need for training and practice at writing and thinking about assessment plans and implementing those plans;
2. Continued feedback needed to help in refinement;
3. Help in assessment methodology, especially alternatives to surveys;
4. Help with how to write up data and present it better;
5. Help in finding resources (people and money) for assessment; and,
6. Picture of how unit assessment plans fit with division strategic plan and also university plan.
These areas will be focused upon regarding training opportunities in the coming year.

Other areas of assessment in which results were positive included:

4. Publishing 4 issues of OSU Perspective;
5. Administering and disseminating NSSE, CIRP, FSSE, and YFCY surveys and reports;
6. Gaining IRB approval for all the of the aforementioned projects

Decisions and Recommendations:

Based upon feedback, the following decisions will be implemented in the coming year.

1. Work to update and revise the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation web page in terms of readability and navigation;
2. Focus a new set of workshop offerings on assessment methodology and writing results;
3. Continue to offer initial workshop based upon demand;
4. Continue NSSE for one additional year in order to collaborate with College of Health and Human Sciences; (then skip to every other year)
5. Continue CIRP for one additional year in order to institutionalize new administration method; (then skip to every other year)
6. Provide additional opportunities for feedback sessions on assessment planning.
Appendix B

Complete Results of the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Assessment Survey
July, 2004


Number of individuals surveyed: 41 (Student Affairs Assessment Council and Student Affairs Department Heads)

Number of returned surveys: 14
Return rate: 34%

A. Please indicate those services that you have used and the degree to which you were satisfied.

(1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = somewhat dissatisfied, 3 = somewhat satisfied, 4 = very satisfied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied or Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Mean/ Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2003 National Survey of Student Engagement Report</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2003 Cooperative Institutional Research Program Freshman Survey Report</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2003 Your First College Year Report</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2003 Faculty Survey of Student Engagement Report</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PowerPoint presentation on 2003 National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Presentation on CIRP, NSSE, YFCY, or FSSE</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OSU Perspective (quarterly newsletter)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Web Page</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<a href="http://oregonstate.edu/admin/student_affairs/research/res_introduction.html">http://oregonstate.edu/admin/student_affairs/research/res_introduction.html</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assessment articles and resources sent via email</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Consultation on assessment project or survey</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Presentation on assessment related topic</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. The work of the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. influenced my department to discuss departmental assessment issues</th>
<th>1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Occasionally, 4 = Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently = 50%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally = 43%</td>
<td>Median = 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely = 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never = 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. influenced my department to reassess our involvement in assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently = 64%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally = 36%</td>
<td>Median = 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely = 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never = 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. influenced my department to introduce available data into our planning process</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently = 14%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally = 71%</td>
<td>Median = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely = 14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never = 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. influenced my department to devote more time and resources to assessment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently =64%</td>
<td>Mean = 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally = 36%</td>
<td>Median = 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely = 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never = 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. influenced my department to use data that is available for decision-making</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently = 14%</td>
<td>Mean = 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally = 64%</td>
<td>Median = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely = 21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never = 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Assessment articles and resources sent via email—sometimes so many I feel overwhelmed and either don’t read them fully or don’t know what to do with the info.

The assessment plan we’ve worked on this year will really help, but in our area we need to restructure time for employee to put more focus on assessment. Next year we need to work on getting more tangible data and report our results.

We could still use help with all of the above: student learning outcome assessment, Assessment methods, Data management/analysis, Reporting of results, Using assessment results in program planning and improvement.

Our department has been receiving what it needs in order to further our efforts in developing/identifying student learning outcomes. The information provided by SARE, the workshops, and the working sessions in the Assessment Council are very helpful. I think the key here is just practice and having the ability to receive feedback on our efforts.

We could use more training on creating useful instruments (how to draft questions that “get at” what we’re looking for” how to correctly document interview and other kinds of data that can’t be quantified (or can they be?); help in broadening our kinds of assessment.

Thanks again, Rebecca, for your tireless efforts. You’re a wonderful mentor and teacher!

Excellent services; very satisfied when I/we use them.

Student learning outcome assessment: Standard format and approach for all Student Affairs depts. would be helpful.
Readings, other resources on the basics of understanding qualitative and quantitative research, and conducting such research.

Training program for SPSS.

Templates/formats to use in reporting results of assessment; tips and suggestions for effectiveness.

The services and information that you and your Committee provide are invaluable and timely. We in Student Affairs need to embrace the use of data and assessment more deeply and make it a standard part of our work.

Need practice and time to read the resources, time to learn, time to do, and time to practice.

Support and encouragement has been outstanding. I really appreciate that Rebecca keeps an eye out for resources/articles/examples and forwards them accordingly. I most appreciate that Rebecca has “met people where they’re at” in terms of learning/ability and encouraged growth from that point. Also appreciate the space to be not perfect with progress or plans and willing to give concrete suggestions.

I’m not sure “becoming familiar’ with services is the same as “using” them, but hearing presentations, and using information as resources has been very useful to my learning. Seeing more of the bigger picture will be critical to our office in assessment planning.

Assessment methods: these might be the most important first steps for us this year as we decide what goals(s) and initiatives to realistically pursue. All 5 areas are important to our office. Also, we will need to look at learning outcomes assessment in a broader way than just students.

We need to enhance our skills in couching the work of our department in the language and framework that will garner greater support for what we do.

It would help us to know the best ways of reporting our results so that their validity and value resonate with end users.

Need help in reporting results of assessment.

Need guidance in terms of clarification and planning for assessment activity. Need guidance in understanding most applicable tools. Need review and suggestions in terms of data management/analysis and reporting.

As we have discussed, OSU’s dual enrollment programs create a substantial research agenda related to student satisfaction, persistence, and degree completion.

We need to find new ways to bring student outcomes assessment into direct alignment with enrollment goals and programs. Let’s find an opportunity(s) for you to meet with the Strategic Enrollment Management Group.

Need additional training for all staff on student learning outcome assessment.

Survey research design and, even more so, methodology other than surveys.

Integrating data collection into program development.
The coordination of the Assessment Council and the shared learning processes that happen during those meetings is very effective. I appreciate the open structure of the meetings and find that much of what is learned there I take back to my department. Rebecca has shown great initiative with this group.

Rebecca—you have been very willing to present on/help with research—thank you.

Continued training on assessment methods and the best ways to do it—continued consultation opportunities.

Continued training opportunities and feedback on current methods.

I think we need more work with the products like the NSSE as it focuses SA and the direction and mission of both SA and the campus overall. While this may have been beyond the scope of SA evaluation initially, it sets the tone and helps us focus, strategically, on areas of prime interest. I think we all need to do a better job of articulating the roles of each of us in the mission—not just lip service—and how we help each student to achieve their and their families goals. This is part of linking campus-wide.

We need a better sense of the roles of college students with our program and the essential aspects of their skills and participation we require for effective programs. Then we need to find resources, people, time and money to provide a better data collection effort. We need to find methods other than surveys that help us get at these essential elements and find ways to measure these that don’t undermine our programmatic mission.

We need partners in supporting assessment through funding, expertise and in helping us define those aspects that are supported by research. These partners may be on campus or may be regional or national. We need to build “focus groups” or boards of advocates that support our program and give us comments on how well we are doing. We want to build a broader connection to CSSA programs to support programs design, outreach, and assessment.

We need money and time to fund numbers crunching and report generation. A fund for a student position would help, as would a person interested in research that supports our use of assessment in program design.

We need articulation for a focused report from leadership at the highest levels as to the strategic planning of efforts so that reporting reflects a concerted rather than an annual broad effort. What is the story we are trying to tell, do we have specific targets, an important task for the biennium, and how does the data support our, and SA, in a total story that supports combined efforts.

Using assessment results in program planning: We do this well but we’re finding new ways to use what we’re learning to define and refine efforts. This is the most useful aspect of assessment, in program evaluation, design and reflection. Really, these are beyond assessment and venturing into evaluation and planning.

We would like to see better articulation of the role of assessment in strategic planning for university-wide efforts that support student learning, retention, and deals with campus climate issues.

We use data a lot and the focus specifically on students learning is such a small piece of the overall conversation it has not greatly influenced our use of data to make decisions. It has, in the narrow context of the role of college students in our programs, supported and ongoing need to reflect on their experiences in light of their broader education here at OSU.
I think the conversation is just beginning. I see many positive aspects of the focus on students’ learning and student-centered outcomes but there are other closely related areas that need integrated attention. Staff learning and outcomes, using assessment tools to inform practice, linking practice and research in a more elegant way. And then a broader picture where groups and departments develop true evaluation plans that build on all these areas—from research and past practice, to defining goals and objectives for further reflection, and assessing the outcomes that are most important to the university mission. Moreover, ultimately linking this back to strategic plans articulated from the top in terms of leadership to each worked as an element of a coherent plan, mission for the university.

I would suggest developing working team who take on specific tools or strategic tools or strategies together. There are groups who are further ahead who could provide time and support for like-minded programs. It seems a useful development, particularly as these becomes presenters at the symposium. And this would expand the overall focus to a more reiterative project that includes conversations on design implementation, measurement and reflection. We are focusing on defining and measuring somewhat out of context.

Like the individual help and encouragement.

Need help in buy-in from staff. A further understanding that this isn’t something new but an enhancement of what we already do. To glean meaningful data and to articulate our story. Just beginning to use assessment results in program planning and improvement.
Appendix C

Oregon State University
Division of Student Affairs

Departmental Assessment Plan
FY 2004-2005

Date: September 13, 2004

Department: Student Affairs Research and Evaluation

Director: Rebecca A. Sanderson, Ph.D.

Assessment Contact: same as above
   Email: Rebecca.sanderson@oregonstate.edu
   Phone: 541-737-8738

Statement of Mission:

The university student experience is about learning--the kind of learning that elevates the soul, transforms the world, develops people, supports the community, and provides the foundation for the advancement of society, science, leadership, and knowledge. The Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office aspires to enable people to understand student learning better and to use that understanding to improve the student experience.

Focused upon delivering education about student learning, assessing student learning outcomes, and the student experience at Oregon State University, this office engages people in rich conversations about students informed by data. Additionally, the Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Office provides leadership for the Student Affairs Division with regard to the development and implementation of assessment processes directed to produce a culture of assessment within the Division. This also includes coordination of Student Affairs' university-wide research activities.

Statement of Goals:

1. Build assessment capacity in Student Affairs departments
2. Build sustainable assessment structures in Student Affairs
3. Disseminate assessment information about students to the university community
4. Coordinate Student Affairs’ university-wide research activities

Statement of Outcomes:

Goal 1: Build assessment capacity in Student Affairs departments

   Outcomes:  
   A. Most of the Student Affairs departments will participate in the OSU Student Learning and Assessment Symposium  
   B. Assessment Council participants and Student Affairs departments will demonstrate their learning and development by submitting 2004-2005 assessment plans by September 13, 2004; mean rating of plans will have increased from previous year.
C. Student Affairs Department Heads and the Student Affairs Assessment Council will provide feedback and direction for further learning needs, service needs, and support for assessment.

Goal 2: Build sustainable assessment structures in Student Affairs

Outcomes: A. Assessment plans will reflect the standard format and design developed by the Student Affairs assessment Council.
B. Student Affairs Departments will have departmental assessment councils.

Goal 3: Disseminate assessment information about students to university community

Outcomes: A. Publish 3 issues of OSU Perspective
C. Publish reports for CIRP, NSSE, and FSSE during FY 04-05

Goal 4: Coordinate Student Affairs’ university-wide research activities

Outcomes: A. 2005 NSSE will be administered with IRB approval
B. 2005 CIRP will be administered with IRB approval
C. 2005 FSSE will be administered with IRB approval

Evaluation Methods:

Goal 1, Outcome A: Count departments represented at: OSU Student Learning and Assessment Symposium Success if 90% of departments have participated

Goal 1, Outcome B: Count number of assessment plans submitted. Measure quality of plan using rubric. Success if at least 75% of Student Affairs Departments submit plans with a mean rating higher than or equal to the previous year’s rating.

Goal 1, Outcome C: Using survey assess satisfaction, use of service, influence on department, continuing departmental needs. Success: If 80% of respondents using services in Section A are satisfied or very satisfied; If 80% of respondents in Section C have a mean rating of 2 across all categories; In Section B if respondents provide needs that can be used to structure educational programs to further the assessment learning agenda.

Goal 2, Outcome A: Assessment plans will reflect the standard format and design developed by the Student Affairs assessment Council. At least 90% of those submitted.

Goal 2, Outcome B: Student Affairs Departments will have departmental assessment council or some sort of standing committee designed to support departmental assessment. Success if 50% of departments have this.

Goal 3, Outcome A: Count number of OSU Perspectives published in FY 04-05. Success if 3 issues are published

Goal 3, Outcome B: Count number and type of reports of university-wide surveys published in FY 04-05.
Success if executive summary and full report are completed for CIRP, NSSE, FSSE.

Goal 4, Outcome A: Document IRB approval and that the 2005 NSSE survey was administered

Goal 4, Outcome B: Document IRB approval and that the 2005 CIRP survey was administered

Goal 4, Outcome C: Document IRB approval and that the 2005 FSSE survey was administered

**Implementation of Assessment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Who Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Build capacity</td>
<td>A. Count departments represented at: OSU Student Learning and Assessment Symposium Success if 90% of departments have participated</td>
<td>A. Count</td>
<td>November, 2004</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Assessment plans will reflect the standard format and design developed by the Student Affairs assessment Council. At least 90% of those submitted.</td>
<td>B. Count and use of rubric</td>
<td>Sept/Oct, 2004</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson and members of assessment council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Feedback and direction from SADH and SAAC</td>
<td>C. Survey</td>
<td>June, 2005</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Build structure</td>
<td>A. Assessment plans will reflect the standard format and design developed by the Student Affairs assessment Council.</td>
<td>A. At least 90% of those submitted.</td>
<td>Sept/Oct, 2004</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Student Affairs Departments will have departmental assessment</td>
<td>Success if 50% of departments have this.</td>
<td>June, 2005</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disseminate info</td>
<td>A. Publish 3 issues of OSU Perspective</td>
<td>A. Count number of OSU Perspectives published</td>
<td>Oct., Feb, May</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Publish reports for CIRP, NSSE, and FSSE during FY 04-05</td>
<td>B. Count number and type of reports of university-wide surveys published in FY 04-05</td>
<td>Dec, Feb, March</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. 2005 NSSE will be administered with IRB approval</td>
<td>A. Document IRB approval and the survey was administered</td>
<td>Jan-May, 2005</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 2005 CIRP will be administered with IRB approval</td>
<td>B. Document IRB approval and the survey was administered</td>
<td>June-Aug, 2005</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. 2005 FSSE will be administered with IRB approval</td>
<td>C. Document IRB approval and the survey was administered</td>
<td>Jan-May, 2005</td>
<td>Rebecca Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results:**

**Decisions and Recommendations:**
For more information about Student Affairs Research and Evaluation visit the web site at:

http://oregonstate.edu/admin/student_affairs/research/res_introduction.html

Rebecca A. Sanderson, Ph.D.
Director

Definition of Insanity: Doing the same thing, the same way, all the time—but expecting different results (Anonymous).

Student Affairs Research and Evaluation
102 Buxton Hall-UHDS
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331

541-737-8738