Stark State College

Bursar’s Office Assessment Biennial Report

Program/Department Name: Bursar’s Office
Individual Completing Report: Denise DeArment
Date: 5/31/15

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 __X___ No _____

2. Outcome Measures

Are direct and indirect outcome measures identified for each goal?

Yes __X___ No _____

3. Research

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

Yes __X___ No _____

4. Findings

Are research results analyzed and interpreted and findings determined?

Yes ___X__ No _____

5. Review Process

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

Yes __X___ No _____

6. Proposed Actions

Are recommendations acted upon?

Yes __X___ No _____

7. Improvements

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

Yes __X___ 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, Noel-Levitz	Yes	No			
Goal 1, ACT SOS	Yes	Yes			X
Goal 1, Mail-out checklist	No	No	X		
Goal 2, Noel-Levitz	Yes	No			
Goal 2, Point-of-service feedback	Yes	No			
Goal 2, State financial statement audit	Yes	Yes	X	X	

Student Service Goals

Goal 1: To provide reliable fiscal guidance and accurate and timely account information to students

Goal 2: To provide high-quality, professional service to students

Summary Narrative

The Bursar's Office is a part of the Business Affairs Division of Stark State College. The Office deals directly with students regarding payments, refunds, and billing. The Office has two main Student Service Goals. Goal 1 is to provide reliable fiscal guidance and accurate and timely account information to students. Goal 2 is to provide high-quality, professional service to students. Several outcome measures are used to measure the success of these goals.

Goal 1 is measured by 3 different outcome measures. The first is the Noel-Levitz SSI, which is conducted every three years. The section which relates to the Bursar's Office asks student satisfaction of Business Office invoicing procedures, convenience of office hours, and convenience of payments. The Office uses the results to better tailor their forms to students' needs. The second outcome measure is the ACT Student Opinion Survey (SOS), which is given in the Fall Semester once every 3 years (note replaced with Noel-Levitz SSI). The Bursar's section asks students to rate the accessibility of its online functions (web account access, payments, etc), and the clarity of payment and withdrawal date information. The Office uses the results to improve its online functionality. The third and final outcome measure is a Mail-Out Checklist. This is an internal function that helps ensure that the Office sends reminders/invoices to students about important due dates (last day to pay, final SIPP date, etc).

Goal 2 is also measured by 3 different outcome measures. The first is the Noel Levitz- SSI, which is conducted every three years. The Bursar's Office section of the Survey asks students to rate the accessibility of online functions. The second outcome measure is the Point-Of-Service feedback, which is given for Fall and Spring Semesters. The Bursar's section asks students about the atmosphere of Business Office staff members by rating timeliness, friendliness/approachability, professionalism, accuracy of information, and helpfulness. The Office uses the both survey results to better train its staff in providing helpful customer service. The third and final outcome measure is the College's annual State financial statement audit. This is an independent, third party review of the College's (including the Bursar's Office's) internal controls over its financial transactions and accounting systems. This audit is conducted every year, and the Office uses any findings to improve its internal control procedures.

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.

Instructions:

Enter the outcome measure in the space provided. Please note that for each goal it is expected that a mix of quantitative and qualitative as well as direct and indirect measures are employed. Mark the term of assessment with an X (for example, if a survey is conducted in the fall term, mark fall for that measure). Provide a brief summary of key findings, either as bulleted points or in short paragraph form. Provide a brief summary on the review committee/ process (for example, Findings are reviewed by the Director and staff on a per term basis and recommendations are forward to the VP for further review). Provide a brief summary of any proposed actions for the next term/ academic year. Please note that not all findings result in actions. Provide a brief summary of any improvements from the previous year (this does not apply to new measures the first year). Finally, Goals and/ or Outcome Measures can be added (or deleted) as needed by copying and pasting.

Goal 1: To provide reliable fiscal guidance and accurate and timely account information to students.

Outcome Measure 1: Noel-Levitz SSI

Terms of Assessment: Summer _____ Fall _X___ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: Stark State College National Community Colleges

Item:	Importance:	Satisfaction:	Performance Gap:	Importance:	Satisfaction:	Performance Gap:
Convenient was to pay bill.	6.33	5.74	.59	6.23	5.67	.56
Convenient office hours.	6.29	5.64	.65	6.08	5.58	.50
Billing policies.	6.32	5.63	.69	6.16	5.56	.60

- Student satisfaction was at or above bench mark (level of validation) for convenience of bill pay. Goal was met.
- Sufficient hours of operation. Goal was met.
- Billing policies are at or above bench marks. Goal was met.

Review Committee/ Process: Review w/Scott Andreani, Comptroller

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Continual improvement on validating student satisfaction within billing policies and accessibility.

Improvements: Find valued data to compare accessibility of online Business Office functions.

Outcome Measure 2: ACT SOS

Terms of Assessment: Summer _____ Fall _X (2013) Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings:

			Level of Satisfaction								
				2008			2011			2013	
	Students were asked to select the most appropriate response for each item. Does not apply and blank responses were excluded from satisfaction percentages.		# Respondents	**Pct Very Satisfied/ Satisfied**	Pct Dissatisfied/ Very Dissatisfied	# Respondents	**Pct Very Satisfied/ Satisfied**	Pct Dissatisfied/ Very Dissatisfied	# Respondents	**Pct Very Satisfied/ Satisfied**	Pct Dissatisfied/ Very Dissatisfied
Bursar	Accessibility of online Business Office functions (web account access, payments)		497	**72**	4	597	**65**	5	775	**64**	8
	Clarity of payment and withdrawal date information		519	**71**	5	610	**67**	7	851	**71**	8

The ACT survey includes two questions specific to the Bursar's Office/Cashier's Window. Since the ACT survey is completed every 3 years, 2008 data is also included for comparison purposes. The satisfaction %s declined from 2008 to 201l, however, improvement was seen in clarity of payment and withdrawal dates from 2011 to 2013. The decline reflects a large increase in student population from 2010 to 2012.

Review Committee/ Process: Review w/Scott Andreani, Comptroller

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: None at this time

Improvements: To be determined during the next assessment cycle.

Outcome Measure 3: Mail-out checklist

Terms of Assessment: Summer _____ Fall __X___ Spring _X___ Annual _____

Findings:	Fall 2014		Spring 2015	
	Proposed Date	Date Sent	Proposed Date	Date Sent
Invoices/Reminders sent no later than 7 days prior to Last Day to Pay	August 20, 2014	August 21, 2014	January 9, 2015	January 9, 2015
Email Reminders sent 1 week prior to Last Day to Pay	August 26, 2014	August 29, 2014	January 12, 2015	January 12, 2015
Email Reminders sent no later than 1 day prior to Last Day to Pay	September 2, 2014	September 2, 2014	January 20, 2015	January 20, 2015
Invoices sent 7-10 days prior to 3rd SIPP date	October 8, 2014	October 8, 2014	March 3, 2015	March 4, 2015
Invoices sent 1-2 days after 3rd SIPP date to inform students their account is now on hold	October 17, 2014	October 17, 2014	March 19, 2015	March 20, 2015

Outcome measures show proposed dates to send invoices for Fall 2014 were met for invoicing prior to third payment due date, as well as past due invoices. Spring 2015 shows a one day delay in invoicing prior to third installment payment, and past due balances were delayed by one day. The delay was due to changes within scheduling for future terms, and clarification was needed to address invoice verbiage.

Review Committee/ Process: Review w/Cashiers and Assistant Bursars

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Continue to reevaluate the timing of mailings to students.

Improvements: To be determined during the next assessment cycle.

Goal 2: To provide high-quality, professional service to students

Outcome Measure 1: Noel Levitz-Student Orientation Survey

Terms of Assessment: Summer _____ Fall _X (2011) Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: The Noel Levitz survey includes one question specific to the Bursar's Office. Since this is the first year for Noel Levitz survey, only 2014 data is available. The survey only provides an institutional summary of Stark State College, no data is given by National Community Colleges-Midwestern.

Item:	Importance:	Satisfaction:	Performance Gap:
Accessibility of online functions.	6.34	5.98	.36

- Survey data shows online functions are satisfactory.

Review Committee/ Process: Review w/Scott Andreani, Comptroller

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: None at this time

Improvements: To be determined during the next assessment cycle.

Outcome Measure 2: Point-of-service feedback

Terms of Assessment: Summer _____ Fall _X___ Spring _X___ Annual _____

Findings:

	Fall 2013					Spring 2014			
	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D
Timeliness	88%	6%	6%			94%		6%	
Friendliness/Approachability	94%				6%	100%			
Professionalism	94%				6%	100%			
Accuracy of Info. Presented	94%			6%		100%			
Helpfulness	94%			6%		100%			

	Fall 2014					Spring 2015			
	A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D
Timeliness	66%	34%				91%			9%
Friendliness/Approachability	83%				17%	100%			
Professionalism	83%				17%	100%			
Accuracy of Info. Presented	66%				34%	100%			
Helpfulness	66%				34%	100%			

The results are given as a graded percentage. The results are based on the following data: Fall 2013: 17 responses, Spring 2014: 7 responses, Fall 2014: 6 responses, Spring 2015: 12 responses. We are meeting our targeted goals and measures. In reviewing negative comments we are able to access the need to help students understand the importance of timely payments and invoicing procedures.

Review Committee/ Process: Review w/Cashiers and Assistant Bursars

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: Request cashiers to ask students to complete surveys.

Improvements: Work to ensure sustainable friendliness, professionalism, accuracy, and helpfulness.

Outcome Measure 3: State financial statement audit

Terms of Assessment: Summer _____ Fall _X___ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: For the financial statement audits of both Fiscal Year 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, the College received no findings and internal control failures.

Review Committee/ Process: Findings reviewed w/Scott Andreani, Comptroller, and

Tom Chiappini, VP.

Proposed actions for next term/academic year: None at this time.

Improvements: To be determined during the next assessment cycle.

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 __X___ No _____

Comments:

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

Yes ___X__ No _____

Comments:

Was research conducted and findings determined for each goal?

Yes __X___ No _____

Comments:

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

Yes __X___ No _____

Comments:

Are action steps outlined where applicable?

Yes _X____ No _____

Comments:

Was the self-assessment and action plan completed?

Yes __X___ No _____

Comments:

Was the assessment measures inventory completed?

Yes _X____ No _____

Comments:

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, 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, practica, 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.

<u>Examples of *Indirect* Measures of Student Learning/Services</u>

- **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.]