

Stark State College  
Advising and Student Engagement Assessment Biennial Report

Program/Department Name: Advising and Student Engagement  
Individual Completing Report: Renee Lilly  
Date: 5/21/15

**Program/ Departmental Self-Assessment Procedure and Action Plan**

Purpose:

To self-identify the status of Program/Department in the outcomes assessment process as well as the action-steps and timetable for the development of assessment processes.

Procedure:

All programs and departments must complete the self-assessment process. Programs which do not demonstrate how the program/department meets each of the self-assessment criteria must submit an assessment plan documenting the proposed action steps and timelines along with the self-assessment form. A follow-up self-assessment report on the implementation of the assessment plan will be due the following academic year. Programs meeting effective assessment standards will be required to submit an assessment report on a biennial basis.

Directions:

Mark the appropriate response to the Yes/No items with an X. Provide a brief summary of action steps to meet the Criteria (for example, the department will meet twice a month over the next term to develop goals). Please note that it is critical that due diligence is given to the development of goals and associated outcome measures. Do not attempt to create goals, identify measures, and implement the assessment plan in the same term!

Assessment Criteria

1. Goals

Does the Department have specific student learning or academic/student service goals which reflect the discipline or service area professional standards?

Yes  No

2. Outcome Measures

Are direct and indirect outcome measures identified for each goal?

Yes  No

3. Research

Is research systematically conducted to evaluate success or failure in achieving outcomes?

Yes  No

If no, what are the proposed action steps to meet the Criteria?

What is the proposed timetable for the action steps?

4. Findings

Are research results analyzed and interpreted and findings determined?

Yes  No

5. Review Process

Are findings are discussed and reviewed by appropriate groups and individuals and recommendations made for action?

Yes  No

6. Proposed Actions

Are recommendations acted upon?

Yes  No

7. Improvements

Have actions result in documented improvements in student learning or academic/ student services?

Yes  No

## Assessment Measures Inventory

Purpose:

To identify benchmarked outcome measures and the benchmarking level (internal, state, national, etc.).

Instructions:

Enter the appropriate response for each question. Place an X in the box that corresponds to the level/type of benchmarking data that is available for each measure. The table can be appended as needed by adding or deleting rows.

Assessment Measures for Goals (Outcome measures from assessment report)	Is trend data available for the measure? (Yes or No)	Has a performance benchmark(s) been identified for the measure? (Yes or No)	Type of performance benchmark (check all that apply)		
			SSC (Internal)	State-level (OACC, OBR, etc.)	National (Professional Org., accrediting group, etc.)
Goal 1, Orientation Survey	Yes	No	X		
Goal 1, Noel Levitz SSI (items #59, 75)	No	Yes			X
Goal 1, ACT SOS Additional Items survey	Yes	No	X		
Goal 2, Case Studies	No	NA			
Goal 2, Noel Levitz SSI (items #1, 28, 36, 55)	No	Yes			X
Goal 3, SAP Appeals	Yes	NA			
Goal 3, Utilization statistics	Yes	No	X		
Goal 4, CCSSE	Yes	Yes			X
Goal 4, Advisor Evaluation	Yes	No	X		

## **Student Service Goals**

Goal 1: To provide a meaningful orientation experience that will prepare new students for successful transition to college and promote academic success

Goal 2: To provide comprehensive advising services that assists students in developing an educational plan and achieving their educational goals.

Goal 3: To provide effective intervention programs to promote student success.

Goal 4: To be student-centered and to evaluate our processes regularly to better serve students.

## **Summary Narrative**

The Advising and Student Engagement Department (ASE) provided services designed to increase student engagement, retention, student satisfaction, and degree and certificate attainment. The Department provided academic support services including new student orientation, academic advising, personal counseling, and intrusive advising for students who are at risk of not achieving their educational goals. The Department worked collaboratively with Academic Affairs and was responsible for developing intervention programs for students on academic probation, dismissed students, and students who fail to meet standards of academic progress.

Several different instruments and methods of assessment were used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Advising and Student Engagement Department over this assessment period. The ACT Student Opinion Additional Items Survey (2013) and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Survey (2014) were administered, and a student satisfaction survey developed by the Advising and Student Engagement office was administered in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. In addition the following assessments were used to measure the effectiveness of services offered: New Student Orientation Survey, (Summer 2014, Fall 2014, and case studies (3.) Results of these assessments were reviewed and served as a foundation for improving and expanding the services offered.

The overall satisfaction with the department's services was high with a noted increase in providing quality point of service satisfaction increasing from 90% grade of A to 99%. Students who attended (NSO) indicated that the program was effective in preparing them for their first semester at SSC and were highly satisfied with the program.

The case studies provided evidence that the department is providing comprehensive advising services. The students included in the studies represent the diverse nature of our students and their needs. Requested services included academic advising, person counseling, financial aid, budgeting, and time management.

The overall satisfaction with the department's goal to be student-centered and to evaluate processes regularly was rated as high by students. The point of service survey revealed that students were extremely pleased with the assistance they received as evidenced by the 99% Grade "A" scores. The CCSSE and Noel-Levitz SSI survey results also supported this finding. A noted strength was the department's commitment to be student centered, provide excellent customer service, and to evaluate our processes as we strive to fulfill our mission.

## Assessment Results Report

Purpose:

The report is a summary compilation of key assessment methods, findings, review processes, actions, and improvements related to the academic/ student service or learning goals of the department/ unit on an annual basis. As a historical record of assessment activities, the report provides for and supports the systematic assessment of academic support outcomes.

**Goal 1:** To provide a meaningful orientation experience that will prepare new students for successful transition to college and promote academic success

Outcome Measure 1: Orientation Survey

Terms of Assessment: Summer  Fall  Spring  Annual

Findings: The following outlines the overall sentiments of survey respondents pertaining to specific New Student Orientation survey questions. On average, 89 % of the respondents agreed that the New Student Orientation program welcomed them to the Stark State College community, provided useful information, increased awareness of student support services, and helped them feel prepared to be successful students.

	<b>Summer 2014</b>	<b>Fall 2014</b>
Number of respondents	342	266
Orientation presentation provided useful info	75%	95%
Understanding of campus resources	76%	96%
Confidence in attending classes	64%	89%

Review Committee/ Process: Information was reviewed with department, Director of Institutional Research and Planning and posted on the college portal.

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: As part of the institutional reorganization New Student Orientation was moved to the Enrollment Management and Student Services Division effective January 2015.

Outcome Measure 2: Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (items # 59, 75)

Terms of Assessment: Summer  Fall  Spring 2014  Annual

Findings: Two items were on the survey pertaining to New Student Orientation. For item #59, "New student orientation services help students adjust to college", the mean satisfaction rating was 5.50/7.00, indicating students were satisfied with the level of support. The mean score met the benchmark for Midwestern colleges. For campus item #75, "Helpfulness of Orientation activities", the mean satisfaction rating was 5.69/7.00.

Review Committee/ Process: The results were reviewed with the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment.

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: As part of the institutional reorganization New Student Orientation was moved to the Enrollment Management and Student Services Division effective January 2015.

Improvements: N/A

Outcome Measure 3: ACT Student Opinion Survey Additional Items Survey

Terms of Assessment: Summer \_\_\_\_\_ Fall \_\_\_\_\_ Spring 2013\_\_ Annual \_\_\_\_\_

Findings: The ACT Student Opinion Survey was administered every three years, with the initial administration occurring in 2008. The Additional Items Survey was comprised of college-specific items on the back of the ACT SOS form which were sent out to students separately in 2013. The 2013 survey indicated that a small percentage (31%) of the respondents utilized the service however, 64% were satisfied or very satisfied resulting in a mean score of 3.9 which meets but does not exceed the norm.

Review Committee/ Process: Results were reviewed with Advising and Student Engagement Counselors.

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Effective Fall 2014 the Advising and Student Engagement Department was eliminated as part of an institutional reorganization.

Improvements: N/A

**Goal 2:** To provide comprehensive advising services that assists students in developing an educational plan and achieving their educational goals.

Outcome Measure 1: Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (items # 1, 28, 36, and 55)

Terms of Assessment: Summer \_\_\_\_\_ Fall \_\_\_\_\_ Spring 2014 Annual \_\_\_\_\_

Findings: Four items were on the survey pertaining to Advising and Student Engagement. For item #1, “Most students feel a sense of belonging here”, the mean satisfaction rating was 5.37/7.00, which met the benchmark for Midwestern colleges, indicating students were engaged similarly to peer institutions. For item #28, “It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus”, the mean satisfaction rating was 5.67/7.00, which met the benchmark for Midwestern colleges. For item #36, “Students are made to feel welcome on this campus”, the mean satisfaction rating was 5.77/7.00, which met the benchmark for Midwestern colleges. For item #55, “Academic support services adequately meet the needs of students”, the mean satisfaction rating was 5.37/7.00, which met the benchmark for Midwestern colleges. Overall, the Department met benchmarks for all four items.

Review Committee/ Process: Information was reviewed with the Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment.

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: As part of the institutional reorganization New Student Orientation was moved to the Enrollment Management and Student Services Division effective January 2015.

Improvements: N/A

Outcome Measure 2: Case Studies

Terms of Assessment: Summer \_\_\_\_\_ Fall \_\_\_\_\_ Spring \_\_\_x\_\_\_ Annual \_\_\_\_\_

Findings: During the Spring 2014 semester, a case study assessment was performed on 3 students using the Personal Growth and Responsibility Rubric developed by SSC’s Retention Counselor/Facilitator. Each student was served by the Advising and Student Engagement Department. The value of using the rubric was that it provided a frame of reference to gauge areas of improvement or difficulty. The case studies revealed that students are seeking assistance for a variety of support services including academic advising, personal counseling, financial aid, and career development. The case study results confirmed that the department is meeting our goal of providing comprehensive advising services and assisting students in achieving their goals.

Review Committee/ Process: Results were shared with department.

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Effective Fall 2014 the Advising and Student Engagement Department was eliminated as part of an institutional reorganization.

Improvements: N/A

**Goal 3:** To provide effective intervention programs to promote student success.

Outcome Measure 1: SAP Appeals and interventions

Terms of Assessment: Summer   x        Fall   x        Spring   x        Annual       

Findings: Intrusive advising and restricting students to part-time status are effective strategies for helping students meet Standards of Academic Progress. Measuring the success of this specific intervention program proved to be difficult due to the sheer volume of appeals received and limited window of time between semesters. Reviewing appeals is time consuming and requires careful analysis of the student’s academic record as well as supporting documentation. In addition, the volume of appeals is greatest 3 to 4 weeks prior to the beginning of the next term making it difficult for counselors to meet individually with students to develop a formal recovery plan. In reviewing our processes it is evident that improvement is need in the areas of goal setting and documentation of individual student outcomes.

Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
518 Appeals Reviewed	877 Appeals Reviewed	972 Appeals Reviewed
364 Approved	684 Approved	713 Approved
117 Denied	137 Denied	149 Denied
27 Incomplete	56 Incomplete	110 Incomplete

Review Committee/ Process: Financial Aid Staff

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Effective Fall 2014 the Advising and Student Engagement Department was eliminated as part of an institutional reorganization. SAP appeals reviews and interventions were assigned to the Financial Aid department.

Improvements: N/A

Outcome Measure 3: Service utilization statistics

Terms of Assessment: Summer             Fall   x        Spring   x        Annual   

Findings: Overall utilization of services was found to be consistent through fall 2014. A significant decrease was noted for spring 2015 academic advising appointments in comparison with Spring 2014. This decrease is consistent with the overall decrease in enrollment. Usage of services offered in Connection Central has shown a steady increase which may be attributed to increased student awareness of resources and services available. Service utilization for personal or mental health counseling was found to be consistent. Students who utilize personal counseling services in the fall generally continue to receive services in the spring as well.

Service	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
Advising				
• Auxiliary Advising	775	786	756	415
• Academic Advising Appointments (ASE Counselors)	200	247	225	N/A*
Personal Mental Health Counseling	120	90	N/A*	N/A*

Appointments				
Connection Central	400	373	525	TBD

Review Committee/ Process: Data is shared with ASE staff, VP of Student Services and Enrollment Management

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Effective Fall 2014 the Advising and Student Engagement Department was eliminated as part of an institutional reorganization. The Student Support Counselor responsible for Personal Mental Health Counseling was reassigned and no longer part of the Advising and Student Engagement Department effective Spring 2014.

Improvements: N/A

**Goal 4: To be student-centered and to evaluate our processes regularly to better serve students.**

Outcome Measure 1: CCSSE Survey

Terms of Assessment: Summer \_\_\_\_\_ Fall \_\_\_\_\_ Spring 2014 Annual \_\_\_\_\_

Findings: The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Survey uses a set of five benchmarks of effective educational practices. These benchmarks serve as a guide for institutions to gauge and monitor their performance and compare their performance with other colleges of similar size. Benchmark 5: Support for learners is one of the most consistently highly rated benchmarks for SSC. As the charts below indicates, our percentage of students who are Somewhat/Very Satisfied with the Student Services area of Advising and Student Engagement varied slightly between the 2011 and 2014 surveys. Equally important the college established and exceeded the goal of scoring in the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Student Services Summary Data 2014

Student Service	Very Important	Rarely/Never Use	Somewhat/Very Satisfied
Academic Advising/Planning	70%	34%	86%

Student Service Summary Data 2011

Student Service	Very Important	Rarely/Never Use	Somewhat/Very Satisfied
Academic Advising/Planning	63%	42%	86%

Review Committee/ Process: N/A

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Effective Fall 2014 the Advising and Student Engagement Department was eliminated as part of an institutional reorganization.

Improvements: N/A

Outcome Measure 2: Advisor (point of service) evaluation

Terms of Assessment: Summer \_\_\_\_\_ Fall x\_\_\_\_\_ Spring x\_\_\_\_\_ Annual \_\_\_\_\_

Findings: A total of 48 surveys were completed by students utilizing Advising and Student Engagement services over a period of two terms (Fall 2013, Spring 2014.) The survey consisted of 5 questions designed to provide feedback regarding their satisfaction with the service they received, wait time, friendliness of staff, and

overall experience. The survey included 6 areas of services and asks the respondents to grade their interaction with the counselor or office staff member. The six areas included: courtesy, quality of advising, ease of resolving concerns, competency level of counselor, respect and dignity, and overall experience. Based on average scores the department received the following grades 98% A, 1% B, 1% C, and 0% D. The results indicate that improvement was noted in comparison to Spring 2013 (not shown) with an increase of A grade from 90% to 99% for the 2013-14 academic year.

<b>Fall 2013</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
Courtesy & helpfulness	26	0	0	0	0
Quality of advising information received	26	0	0	0	0
Ease of resolving concerns	25	0	1	0	0
Competency level of counselor	26	0	0	0	0
Respect and dignity show from counselor	26	0	0	0	0
Overall experience with office	25	1	0	0	0

<b>Spring 2014</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
Courtesy & helpfulness	21	1	0	0	0
Quality of advising information received	22	0	0	0	0
Ease of resolving concerns	22	0	0	0	0
Competency level of counselor	21	1	0	0	0
Respect and dignity show from counselor	22	0	0	0	0
Overall experience with office	22	0	0	0	0

Review Committee/ Process: Assessment results are reviewed with the Advising and Student Engagement staff and Vice President of Student Services and Enrollment Management at the end of each term.

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Effective Fall 2014 the Advising and Student Engagement Department was eliminated as part of an institutional reorganization.

Improvements: No longer applicable

**Assessment Report Review Rubric**

Purpose:

A rubric is a guide that differentiates between levels of development in outcomes assessment. The rubric is designed to clearly show departments/ units how the assessment report will be evaluated and where further action may be needed.

Directions:

Mark the response to each item. If any item is not completed in its entirety the appropriate response is No. An Assessment Report review committee will use the same rubric to evaluate your assessment report.

Are the goals for the department/ service area measureable?

Yes  No

Is a mix of quantitative and qualitative measures used to assess outcomes for each goal?

Yes  No

Was research conducted and findings determined for each goal?

Yes  No

Is there a review process in place for the department/ service area?

Yes  No

Are action steps outlined where applicable?

Yes  No

Was the self-assessment and action plan completed?

Yes  No

Was the assessment measures inventory completed?

Yes  No

## Key Assessment Terms

Competencies/Goals are clear, meaningful statements of purpose or aspirations for the academic program or support service. Programs and services typically have several goals.

Outcome Measures are direct or indirect measures of student learning or of support services. Direct measures provide evidence of actual learning, e.g. paper, exam, and artistic performance. Indirect measures provide evidence about characteristics associated with learning, e.g., student perception surveys, focus group interviews, alumni surveys. See below for detailed examples.

Research is the systematic collection and evaluation of outcomes data.

Findings are the results of research.

Review Process is the method(s) by which findings are discussed and reviewed by faculty, staff, and administrators.

Proposed Actions are the result of the review process and are based on findings.

Improvements are positive changes in student learning or support services as noted through the assessment process. It takes at least two iterations of the research and review process to document systematic improvement.

## Examples of *Direct Measures of Student Learning/Services*

- **Scores and pass rates on standardized tests** (licensure/certification as well as other published tests determining key student learning outcomes)
- **Writing samples**
- **Score gains** indicating the “value added” to the students’ learning experiences by comparing entry and exit tests (either published or locally developed) as well as writing samples
- **Locally designed quizzes, tests, and inventories**
- **Portfolio artifacts** (these artifacts could be designed for introductory, working, or professional portfolios)
- **Capstone projects** (these could include research papers, presentations, theses, dissertations, oral defenses, exhibitions, or performances)
- **Case studies**
- **Team/group projects and presentations**
- **Oral examination**
- **Internships, clinical experiences, practical, student teaching, or other professional/content-related experiences** engaging students in hands-on experiences in their respective fields of study (accompanied by ratings or evaluation forms from field/clinical supervisors)
- **Service-learning projects or experiences**
- **Authentic and performance-based projects or experiences** engaging students in opportunities to apply their knowledge to the larger community (accompanied by ratings, scoring rubrics or performance checklists from project/experience coordinator or supervisor)
- **Graduates’ skills in the workplace rated by employers**
- **Online course asynchronous discussions** analyzed by class instructors

Whenever appropriate, scoring keys help identify the knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions assessed by means of the particular assessment instrument, thus documenting student learning directly.

## Examples of Indirect Measures of Student Learning/Services

- **Course grades** provide information about student learning *indirectly* because of a series of reasons, such as: a) due to the focus on student performance or achievement at the level of an individual class, such grades do not represent an indication of learning over a longer course of time than the duration of that particular class or across different courses within a program; b) grading systems vary from class to class; and c) grading systems in one class may be used inconsistently from student to student
- **Grades assigned to student work in one particular course** also provide information about student learning *indirectly* because of the reasons mentioned above. Moreover, graded student work in isolation, without an accompanying scoring rubric, does not lead to relevant meaning related to overall student performance or achievement in one class or a program
- **Comparison between admission and graduation rates**
- **Number or rate of graduating students pursuing their education at the next level**
- **Reputation of graduate or post-graduate programs accepting graduating students**
- **Employment or placement rates of graduating students into appropriate career positions**
- **Course evaluation items related to the overall course or curriculum quality**, rather than instructor effectiveness
- **Number or rate of students involved in faculty research, collaborative publications and/or presentations, service learning, or extension of learning in the larger community**
- **Surveys, questionnaires, open-ended self-reports, focus-group or individual interviews** dealing with *current students'* perception of their own learning
- **Surveys, questionnaires, focus-group or individual interviews** dealing with *alumni's* perception of their own learning or of their current career satisfaction (which relies on their effectiveness in the workplace, influenced by the knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions developed in school)
- **Surveys, questionnaires, focus-group or individual interviews** dealing with the *faculty and staff members'* perception of student learning as supported by the programs and services provided to students
- **Quantitative data**, such as enrollment numbers
- **Honors, awards, scholarships, and other forms of public recognition earned by students and alumni**

[Adapted from Maki, P.L. (2004). *Assessing for learning: building a sustainable commitment across the institution*. Sterling, VA: AAHE; and Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*. San Francisco, CA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.]