Part Two: Integrating Assessment into the Everyday Culture

Example:
Student Health and Counseling Services (SHCS)
Overview

• SHCS before a culture of assessment
• Strategic Planning
  o Decide what measurements matter
  o Gather data and set benchmarks
  o Set goals
  o Develop a shared language
  o Communicate results
• Early Assessment Measures
• Recent Assessment Measures
SHCS: Before the Culture of Assessment

- Few, if any, assessment measures in place
- No prioritization of efforts or stated goals
- No culture of process improvement
- No clear understanding of the core standards of AAAHC assessment
- No clear consensus (in practice) that students are the center’s primary stakeholders
Strategic Planning

As part of a more evidence-based culture, a strategic planning process that included the following was launched:

• Performed a SWOT analysis
  o Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats
• Identified and prioritized stakeholders
• Established and published department values
• Revised Mission & Vision to align with University, Division, and Department priorities
• Identified mission-critical programs and services
• Set goals and timetable
• Identified measures to chart progress in reaching goals
What Measurements Matter?

- Number of Patient Visits
- Number of Patient Visits/Providers
- Appointment “No Show” Rate
- Wait Times
- Patient Satisfaction
- Number of clients Left Without Being Seen (LWBS)
- Patient Utilization rates
- Cost of Care
Gather Benchmark Data

After identifying what measurements matter, utilize existing data or begin gathering new data to establish benchmarks to track goals.

• Client satisfaction
• Client satisfaction relative to the CSU
• Utilization rates (number of clients/percentage of population using services)
• Cost per visit
Benchmark Data (cont.)

**2011 Point of Service Survey**
Sacramento State

- 2005: 3.98
- 2006: 3.98
- 2007: 3.71
- 2008: 3.81
- 2009: 4.00
- 2010: 3.78
- 2011: 4.52

**2011 CSU Point of Service Survey**

- Bakersfield: 4.60
- Sacramento: 4.52
- Fullerton: 4.50
- Northridge: 4.50
- San Bernardino: 4.31
- San Jose: 4.23
- SLO: 4.21
- Humboldt: 4.19
- Sonoma: 4.18
- East Bay: 3.97
- San Diego: 3.95
- Long Beach: 3.86
- SF: 3.79
- Chico: 3.63
Set Goals

Examples:

• Improve patient satisfaction scores from previous year’s score of 3.78 to 4.5, and place above the mean

• Improve utilization of unique students users of the health center from 37% to 50% (or by 5% over the previous year)

• Measure cost of care

• Measure number of students Left Without Being Seen (LWBS)
Develop a Shared Language

• Incorporate and relate divisional assessment language to existing industry language

• Examples:
  o Quality and best practices
  o Access to care
  o Standards of excellence
  o Continuous process improvement
  o Accreditation standards
Communicate Results

• Communicate not only in Divisional Assessment Reports, but routinely report results back to all staff and department management

• Acknowledge Points of Pride
  o Successful AAAHC re-accreditation survey awarded until April 2013
  o In Sept 2010, SHCS relocated to its new state-of-the-art facility at The WELL
  o Implemented after hours Nurse Advice and Mental Health Counselor phone triage services
  o Completed integration of SHS and CAPS in terms of physical location, electronic medical record system, and funding
Early Assessment Measures

- Assessment efforts most often involved interventions by Health Educators
  - Workshops, training, presentations
- Often used a pre-/post-test design
- Relied on self-report (indirect) surveys
Behavior change—diet and nutrition outcome:

• Students who successfully complete the SUCCEED program will show 1) an increase in fiber intake by 25%, and 2) a decrease in sodium intake by 25% based on a pre-/post-test analysis

Program Objectives (general):

• Increase the # of students accessing the HornetMD smartphone app to obtain self-care info, use the symptom-checker, and access the audio health library.
Program Objectives (general, cont.):

• Medical providers will screen 90% of patients seen in the Health Center for depression using the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ)-2 and PHQ-9 and make appropriate referrals to CAPS.

• SHCS staff will compare individual student completion of the online tutorial programs for alcohol education and sexual assault prevention to reported alcohol violations and sexual assault incidents.
Part Three: Connecting Assessment and Budgeting
Departmental assessments can be used to demonstrate—in data-driven ways—the value and/or cost-effectiveness of programs, services, and staff. Such verification is important in declining budget times.
Types of data that can influence budgeting decisions include:

- Participation or utilization data
- Workload estimators and productivity data
- Satisfaction data
- Student learning data
- Graduation and retention data
Participation and Utilization Data
Participation and Utilization Data

It is critical (and often the “norm”) for many university departments to know how many students their services serve.

However, participation and utilization data for some co-curricular activities may not be tracked on some campuses—or if it is tracked, it is not tracked in a methodical, consistent way.

Why is such data important?
What Budget-Related Questions Can Participation and Utilization Data Answer?

Participation and Utilization data shows how many students or clients are served by a particular service in a particular period of time. Questions it can help answer include these types:

• How many “free” events does the University Union offer each semester? How many students attend those events?
• How many students utilize the Student Health Center? What percentage of the student population is this?
• How many students are served by New Student Orientation?
Research Questions:

• What percentage of Sac State students utilize CAPS?
• How does this compare to the rest of the CSU?
• How does this compare to the rest of the nation?
• How will a proposed fee increase affect the percentage of students who use CAPS?
Example: CAPS Utilization (cont.)

Percentage of Student Users of CAPS

- National: 8
- CSU: 5
- Sac State: 3
- Proposed (with fee increase): 6
Example: The WELL Utilization

Research Questions:
• How many students use The WELL?
• How many students use The WELL per day, per week, or per month?
• How regularly do registered users access The WELL?
Fall 2010 Participation and Membership

- Weekly Average “check-ins:” 10,074
- Weekly High “check-ins:” 15,931
- Daily average “check-ins:” 1,352
- Daily high “check-ins:” 2,809
### Fall 2010 Participation and Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th># of unique member visits</th>
<th>% of unique members with 10+ visits/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>10,406</td>
<td>12.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>9,255</td>
<td>13.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>11.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workload Estimators
How Might a Workload Estimator Be Used in a Budget Exercise?

Workload estimators can help make the case that a certain number of staff or a certain budget is necessary for operation.

Workload estimators show how much time critical processes or appointments take and how many staff are required to meet department needs in a timely manner, e.g.:

• Financial aid packaging, transcript evaluation, etc.
• Academic advising appointments, Health Center patient visits or counseling appointments, etc.
Example: Academic Advising Workload Estimator

- What are the essential functions of the Academic Advising Center (AAC)?
- How many staff hours are needed for each of these critical functions?
- Does the AAC have enough staff to perform its essential functions?
- How will services be affected if the AAC reduces (or increases) its staff?

The data on the following slide helps answers some of these questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Group:</th>
<th>Academic Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Activity</td>
<td>Unit Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Advising</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management-Freshman Advising</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Major Advising</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Nursing Major Advising</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Disqualification Advising</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management-Academic Disqualification</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop in Student Academic Advising</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Workshops</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Program</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions:

• Which units constitute the Enrollment Management area?
• What are the essential functions of those units?
• How many staff hours are needed to perform those functions?
• Do these units have enough staff to perform their essential functions?

The following slide answers some of those questions.
## Summary of Workload Requirement Analysis – Enrollment Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Current Staffing Levels - Full Time Equivalents (FTE)</th>
<th>Total FTE Needed</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>LOA Medical Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Center</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid IS Dept</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletics</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Center</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Processing</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Imaging</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; Registration</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications*</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Functional Support Team</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems Support</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td>122.00</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction Data
How might Satisfaction Data Augment a Budget Request?

Administrators are more inclined to fund programs whose participants have high levels (rather than low levels) of “user satisfaction.”
Example: OGE Satisfaction Survey

Program Objective:

After completing a short online survey (in the late spring) 90% of Office of Global Education’s clients will agree or strongly agree their experience with OGE is positive.

Methods and Measures:

In May/June 2011, OGE surveyed 1,340 students, faculty, staff and alumni using SurveyMonkey.com. OGE received 196 responses: 67% from students/alumni, 32% from faculty/scholars, and 1% from staff.
Findings:

- 91% agreed or strongly agreed OGE provides excellent customer service.
- 90% agreed or strongly agreed the advice they received was helpful.
- 90% agreed or strongly agreed the OGE staff is knowledgeable.
- 90% agreed or strongly agreed the OGE staff is responsive to their needs.
Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Data
How Might Student Learning Data Be Used in a Budget Exercise?

• With increasing calls for **accountability** and **transparency**, administrators should be expected to show the “bang for the buck.”

• In this environment, funds are likely to go to programs that augment or facilitate student learning and add value compared to those that are either “feel good” programs or those that don’t show a value-added.
Student Learning Outcome

Students who complete the Registrar’s “How to Graduate Soon” workshop will demonstrate that they understand how to apply to graduate, and what they need to complete (and by when) in terms of GE or major requirements.
Methods and Measures

Staff evaluators from the Registrar’s Office offer eighteen graduation workshops throughout the academic year. Upper-division students (80+ units) are encouraged to attend three graduation workshops and complete a pre- and post-test assessment.
Findings

The Learning Outcome was met. In 2010-2011, students demonstrated an understanding of graduation application processes and graduation requirements by increasing their pre-test scores (average of 74%) by 12% (average post-test score 86%).
Program Objective

First-time freshmen who live on-campus will be more likely to persist to their second year of college than first-time freshmen who live off-campus.

*Note: we are not necessarily claiming a cause and effect relationship here.*

Methods and Measures

Review first-year retention data collected by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) to see if there are differences between first-year residential and first-year commuter students.
### Residence Life Retention Data (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year enrolled</th>
<th>Persistence – On-campus residents Freshmen year to Sophomore Year</th>
<th>Persistence – Off-campus residents Freshmen year to Sophomore Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>Fall 01 = .79</td>
<td>Fall 01 = .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>Fall 02 = .80</td>
<td>Fall 02 = .75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>Fall 03 = .78</td>
<td>Fall 03 = .75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>Fall 04 = .82</td>
<td>Fall 04 = .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>Fall 05 = .82</td>
<td>Fall 05 = .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>Fall 06 = .75</td>
<td>Fall 06 = .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Fall 07 = .77</td>
<td>Fall 07 = .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Fall 08 = .80</td>
<td>Fall 08 = .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Fall 09 = .80</td>
<td>Fall 09 = .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Fall 10 = .79</td>
<td>Fall 10 = .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Fall 11 = (Not available at time of data run)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Average 79% persistence</td>
<td>Combined Average 76% persistence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Academic Advising Retention Data

Departmental Program Objective:

Students on academic probation who participate in a new second-year retention program will achieve a 10% higher retention rate than those students who did not receive a similar advising intervention.

Method/Measures:

Review the historical data that OIR has collected for earlier cohorts of this population (those on academic probation) for whom the intervention was not available. Compare the retention rates of those who did not go through the program (earlier cohorts) with those who completed the intervention.
Academic Standing Data for those who did **not** experience the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (N=)</th>
<th>Good Standing</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Disqualified/Dismissed</th>
<th>Withdrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 (n=433)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 (n=511)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 (n=501)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Standing Data for those who **did** experience an intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (N=)</th>
<th>Good Standing</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Disqualified/Dismissed</th>
<th>Withdrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 (n=389)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Objective:
The first-year retention rate for those freshmen who complete all three FYE advising session will be considerably higher than those who do not complete all three.

Method/Measures:
Review the first-year retention data collected by OIR and compare rates of “completers” with “non-completers.”
First-to-second year retention rate for “completers.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FYA Cohort</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>1st Term GPA</th>
<th>2nd Yr Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First-to-second year rate for “non-completers.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All FTF</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>1st Term GPA</th>
<th>2nd Yr Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Activities, Fall 2012

• Provide each student with information about the cost of his or her visit (i.e. the value of the service they receive for their mandatory fee)

• Design and deliver a campaign to promote students asking questions and providing information to their medical provider to improve care and communication
ASSESSMENT REPORT
SAMPLES
**MISSION**

3 – 4 sentences describing departmental mission.

**GOALS**

2 – 3 bullet points delineating departmental goals.

**POINTS OF PRIDE**

2 – 3 bullet points describing departmental points of pride (described later).

**ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome 1 / Program Objective 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome or Program Objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methods and Measures**

Summary of assessment methods and measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome 1 / Program Objective 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome or Program Objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods and Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of assessment methods and measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of conclusions and/or ongoing status, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome 2 / Program Objective 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copy and paste to create and fill out as many boxes as necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods and Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following is an example of a completed assessment report ready for publication.
MISSION

The PRIDE Center offers advocacy and outreach services to the LGBTIQQA community on campus. Through classroom panels, Safe Zone Trainings, and other educational and celebratory programs and events, the PRIDE Center advocates for the respect, inclusion, and safety of all members of the campus community.

GOALS

- Execute programs and events that raise awareness of LGBTIQQA issues and provide educational opportunities for all members of the University community.
- Provide classroom panels and safe zone trainings for all members of the University community at no cost.

POINTS OF PRIDE

- In May 2010, the Associated Students, Inc. fully funded the PRIDE Center as a separate grantee from the Women’s Resource Center for the first time in Sacramento State’s history.
- In November 2010, 98% of all 277 students participating in a Student Life Survey agreed that PRIDE Center staff and programs were helpful and barrier-free.
POINTS OF PRIDE

- In May 2010, the Associated Students, Inc. fully funded the PRIDE Center as a separate grantee from the Women’s Resource Center for the first time in Sacramento State’s history.
- In November 2010, 90% of all 277 students who participated in a faculty-hosted classroom panel agreed that student-led panel presentations were a valuable classroom experience.

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES 2010-11

Learning Outcome 1
75% of PRIDE Center student employees will indicate that their leadership skills have improved as a result of their employment in the office and will be able to describe the skills used and how they applied those skills.

Methods and Measurements
[Example] Near the end of Spring 2011 semester, all PRIDE Center student employees will be asked to complete the Student Affairs Student Employee survey which asks them to reflect on the ways their employment has affected their leadership skills through Likert-style responses, as well as fill-in-the-blank open-ended questions. The results of the surveys will be recorded by PRIDE Center Staff.

Findings
[Example] According to the Student Employee Surveys administered to student employees in the PRIDE Center, 100% of students reported that their leadership skills had increased, and each student additionally identified at least one way they applied those skills.
Conclusions / Status
While these results are highly encouraging, the PRIDE Center management is ready to investigate the kinds of learning our student employees gain from their involvement more deeply. PRIDE staff plans to further refine and develop assessment; asking students to describe their experiences more thoroughly will likely not only yield more thorough, nuanced results, but be a form and learning in and of itself. Collecting and assessing portfolios of student employee work is a possibility as well.

Program Objective 1
The PRIDE Center will collaborate with faculty to provide an additional ten panel presentations in Spring 2011, and thus reach out to an additional 300 Sacramento State students.

Methods and Measurements
[Example] The PRIDE center reached out to faculty in several disciplines to seek volunteers for new panel presentations in Spring 2011. Panel presentations are scheduled via a calendar available on the PRIDE Center website, and utilization is tracked by PRIDE member staff via a headcount on the day of the event; similar data exists for AY 2009-10 for comparative purposes. Panel presentations were offered on various days of the week and at various times to give students more chances to attend.

Findings
[Example] The PRIDE Center scheduled twelve panel presentations in Spring 2011, seven more than the five presentations in Fall 2010. 635 students attended the twelve presentations in Spring 2011, an increase of 324 over the total 211 students who attended the five panel presentations in Fall 2010. Overall average attendance numbers increased as well, from 42 per panel in Fall, to nearly 53 in Spring. The PRIDE Center missed its goal of providing ten more panel discussions, but met its goal to serve at least 300 more students. (See Attachment 1 for detailed data.)

Conclusions / Status
[Example] Ultimately, the PRIDE Center would like to offer a panel discussion nearly each week of the academic year.
The PRIDE Center missed its goal of providing ten more panel discussions, but met its goal to serve at least 300 more students. (See Attachment 1 for detailed data.)

Conclusions / Status

[Example] Ultimately, the PRIDE Center would like to offer a panel discussion nearly each week of the semester, for a total of 15 – 16 presentations. Good progress was made in Spring 2011 in terms of discussions offered, and even better progress was made in terms of students served. The Center is especially pleased with the overall attendance increasing which demonstrates that PRIDE Center programming is reaching many more students overall, and is hopefully having a positive impact on students and the Sac State community as a whole. Efforts to expand the panel discussion programs will continue, and the PRIDE center plans to begin assessing student learning outcomes associated with the discussions as well.

PLANS FOR THE COMING YEAR

TBA

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1—PRIDE Panel Discussion Attendance
Attachment 2—Student Affairs Student Employee Survey
Attachment 3—PRIDE Center Student Employee Survey Results
Part 4: Audience Response

Questions?
Comments?
Thank you very much.

Please visit the Sacramento State Student Affairs website for more information:

http://saweb.csus.edu/students/assessment

(Google “Sacramento State Student Affairs Assessment)