Mission Statement

**Mission:** The Academic Advising Center offers new student orientation, mandatory freshman and transfer advising, and advising on General Education and graduation requirements for all students. The Center engages students in a developmental process that helps clarify and implement individual educational plans consistent with their skills, interests, and values. Through individual appointments, group advising sessions and presentations, the professional staff, faculty advisors, and student interns help students understand the university’s academic requirements as well as its policies and procedures. As a result, students are better prepared to take responsibility for their education and persist towards a timely graduation.

Planning Goals

**Goal 1:** Help students learn to take responsibility for their education and persist toward a timely graduation

**Goal 2:** Provide comprehensive first year advising through a three-phase program

**Goal 3:** Provide intrusive advising to students who are academically at risk

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes

**Student Learning Outcome 1**

Students who are on academic probation will score at least 80% on a post-test after participating in the new second year retention program. This program is focused on improving their knowledge of academic support services, academic standing requirements and how to build an academic plan. This learning outcome is paired with Program Objective Number 1 presented later in this document.

*Rationale:* Students who end their first year on academic probation are much less likely to persist than other students. This group of students has a six year graduation rate of only 13%. To begin to help this group of students succeed, a new second year advising program was developed through the Academic Advising Office. The new program requires students to participate in at least two academic advising sessions and either attend a time management or study skills workshop or meet with a career counselor each semester. A hold is placed on their registration if they fail to attend. Staff believe that this type of intrusive advising will help students persist and graduate at higher rates.

*This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goal Number 4-Information Competence.*
Academic advisors asked students to complete a pre-test during their first advising appointment. The purpose of the pre-test is to gage students’ current understanding of academic support services and information critical to their success (i.e. interpreting grades, understanding academic standing policies, and being able to describe where campus resources are located). The test questions and associated subject area are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Post-Test Question Numbers</th>
<th>Subject or Policy Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 and 3</td>
<td>GPA – what is required (Q2 and 3) and how to improve (Q1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 6 and 8</td>
<td>Strategies for Academic Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Second Year Program Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of their second advising appointment, (typically several weeks later), advisors asked students to complete a post-test covering the same information. The pre- and post-test questions and results for fall 2009 and spring 2010 are included in Attachment A.

Results

The results of the pre- and post-test for fall 2009 and spring 2010 are provided in Attachment A.

Fall 2009:

The total number of students who took both the pre- and post-test was 208. During the pre-test, students had the most difficulty with questions 2, 3 and 4. As such, more emphasis was placed on GPA and academic success related material. For the post-test, student scores improved significantly or held steady on all but question 4 (action most likely to improve academic success…). Most students selected “study more” on both the pre- and post-test. Academic Advisors believe that limiting the number of units per term is more likely to increase academic success for students on probation.

Spring 2010:

The total number of students who took both the pre- and post-test was 40. The spring population only included students who had not already taken the pre- post-test in the fall. As such, the number of participants was much smaller. During the pre-test, spring students again had the most difficulty with questions 2, 3 and 4 (the same result that was obtained in the fall). For the post-test, student scores improved significantly or held steady on all questions. The question students still had the most difficulty with during both the pre- and post-test was question 4 (action most likely to improve academic success…). As with the fall, students selected “study more” on both the pre- and post-test. Advisors will review this result in preparation for next year’s program.
Conclusions

Overall the advisors were pleased with the first full implementation of this new program. As stated in the results, it is becoming obvious that students on academic probation may not be well informed about GPA requirements. Additionally, they may need more information about the benefits of temporarily limiting the number of units they take each term until they are back in good academic standing. Advisors will take this information into account while preparing for the 2010-11 program.

In addition, advisors identified two other changes that they intend to make to the program next year. First, the pre- and post-tests were administered using PDAs. Advisors felt it would be more helpful to have the students complete the test on paper. Using paper, the advisor and student will be able to more easily review the results together. Second, advisors decided not to use a pre-test, post-test methodology next year. To get a better understanding of the value of the program for the individual students, a qualitative assessment will be developed to measure student learning. The advisors plan on asking a series of prescribed questions to a sample of the students in both the first and second advising sessions. The notes collected from the sessions will be categorized by themes for analysis.

Special Formatting Note: Normally, student learning outcomes are presented in assessments before program objectives. However, since Program Objective 1 is specifically linked to Student learning Outcome 1, they will be presented together.

Program Objective 1

Students who participate in a new second year retention program will yield a 10% higher retention rate than previous cohorts who did not receive similar advising interventions.

Rationale: After extensive analysis during the spring 2008 term, the University’s Retention Working Team determined that students on academic probation had much lower first year retention rates compared to peers who maintained good academic standing (49% vs. 89% respectively). On average, 22% of first time freshmen were placed on academic probation by the end of their first year. Students on academic probation had much lower six year graduation rates compared to their peers who maintained good academic standing (13% vs. 48%). Based on this information, the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs asked the staff in the Academic Advising Center to develop and implement a new second year retention program for these students to help increase their retention and graduation rates.

Measures

The Director requested retention rates from Office of Institutional Research of those students who were in freshman cohorts from 2001, 2002, 2003. These cohorts of
students were chosen because their six-year graduation rates are available. These “baseline” cohorts also provide a good comparison of students who were in a similar population but did not receive an advising intervention. The baseline cohorts are being compared with the fall 2008 freshman cohort who had a GPA below a 2.0 beginning their second year (fall 2009).

**Results**

The following table shows the comparison cohorts for the end of the third term (end of third semester at Sacramento State):

<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>

The following table shows the Fall 2008 cohort for the end of the third term (end of third semester at Sacramento State):

<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>

Attachments B and C also provide retention results for the Fall 2008 cohort and Fall 2001, 2002, and 2003 cohorts at the end of the fourth term. Cohorts will continue to be compared each term for six years.

**Conclusions**

Preliminary results for our new second year retention program indicate that these efforts are producing positive results. Although the Academic Advising Center staff acknowledges that there are many factors involved in student retention, the preliminary results for students who participated in this program are very positive. What is most promising about the preliminary findings is that fewer students are leaving the University. The fall 2008 cohort only had 16 (4%) of the students voluntarily not return in spring. Compared to the other cohorts, the rate of leaving is much higher (2001 = 44%, 2002 = 47%, 2003 = 46%).

Students who had a GPA below 2.0 at the end of fall 2009 continued in the program through spring 2010 (their 4th semester). For spring comparisons see Attachments B and C.

The preliminary data is very encouraging! The program will be continued in 2010-11 for a new group of second year students who are on academic probation. Each new cohort will continue to be tracked compared to earlier cohorts.
**Student Learning Outcome 2**

Orientation leaders (working as student assistants) will improve their leadership skills as measured through direct observation and focus groups.

**Rationale:** The Orientation Leaders are viewed as having strong leadership skills. The Orientation Coordinator will measure the improvement in their leadership skills through observation of their delivery of campus tours and focus groups at the end of their employment.

This student learning objective supports baccalaureate learning goal Number 3- Communication, Number 4-Information Competence and Number 6-Values and Pluralism.

**Measures**

*Note: Measures describe the methodology and timeframe for data collection. Measures also should identify the population being surveyed and/or tested. Provide materials such as survey instruments, check lists, focus group protocols, etc. in an appendix.*

Professional staff will observe orientation leaders during mock campus tours using a tour evaluation rubric. The professional staff will then repeat the observation using later the same rubric during actual tours. In fall 2010, the Orientation Coordinator will hold focus groups with Orientation Leaders to gather feedback on their experience and suggestions for improvements.

**Results**

*Note: Results include a brief narrative of findings, and/or essential tables or graphs. The results should indicate the extent to which the program objective or student learning outcome was met.*

Results will not be available for this student learning outcome until the end of fall 2010 semester.

**Conclusions**

*Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It should also “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.*

To be added in fall 2010.
Program Objective 2

The first year retention rate for Fall 2008 new freshmen who participate in the First Year Advising program will be at or above 80%.

Rationale: This is the fourth year of the three phase First-Year Advising Program: Orientation (Phase I), Fall advising (Phase II), and Spring advising (Phase III). To date, students who participated in the first three years of this program exhibit an 11% higher persistence rate than students who matriculated in previous years. Advisors will collect this data for at least 5 consecutive academic years to continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

Measures

In fall 2009, the advising center director compared persistence rates received from Office of Institutional Research for students who participated in the program during 2008/2009 with previous years to identify any initial changes.

Results

Students who participated in the First Year Advising program had a one year retention rate of 83% compared to all first year students who had a 78% retention rate. Although the program objective was met, there was only a 5% higher persistence rate compared to last year at 11 percent.

Conclusions

Staff is very pleased with the 83% one year retention rate. The reduction in increased persistence (from 11% to 5%) for students participating in the program is at least partially attributed to changes in the admissions process that have contributed to an overall better-prepared freshman class.

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Beth Merritt Miller, 916-278-6531. merrittmillerb@csus.edu
**Mission Statement**

**Mission:** By offering prospective students outreach education, individual and group admission advising, and accurate, efficient document processing, the Office of Admissions and Outreach increases students’ overall access to higher education. These activities also help the University achieve diverse enrollment in terms of ethnicity, gender, age and geographic region.

**Planning Goals**

**Goal 1:** Facilitate prospective students’ access to higher education by offering outreach education and individual admission advising.

**Goal 2:** Expedite admission processing, so that admission decisions are made and communicated timely and accurately.

**Goal 3:** Partner with California high school districts and community colleges to increase higher education awareness amongst their populations.

**Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes**

**Student Learning Outcome 1**

After participating in pre-admission outreach presentations, prospective students will be able to demonstrate basic knowledge regarding admission requirements and Sacramento State by scoring at least 80% on a post-presentation quiz.

*Rationale:* As a University that serves a large population of first generation college students, Admission Counselors strive to ensure that high school and community college students understand the course work, GPA and standardized test score requirements for admission to Sacramento State.

*This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goal Number 2 Analysis and Problem Solving.*

**Measures**

During spring 2010, student ambassadors provided a pre-admission presentation to prospective students taking campus tours to help improve their understanding of basic admission requirements. Immediately following the presentation, ambassadors asked prospective students to complete a post-presentation quiz consisting of eight questions taken from the presentation (Appendix A). The first four questions of the quiz cover basic admission requirements. The last four questions cover information on Sacramento
State. Ambassadors used PDA’s with Student Voice software to administer the quiz and collect responses.

Results

53 prospective students from three different tour groups elected to take the post presentation quiz.

Prospective students, on average answered questions one through four, relating to basic admission requirements, correctly 82% of the time. The final four questions relate to basic knowledge about Sacramento State. Prospective students answered these questions correctly 86% of the time. This learning outcome was met.

Last year, this learning objective was not met. The Tour Coordinator and Student Ambassadors enhanced the presentation and quiz after evaluating the results and obtaining additional feedback from students. This year, prospective students improved their correct response rates compared to 2008/2009 post-presentation quiz from 76% last year to 84% this year. See Appendix A for complete results.

Conclusions

The Admissions Director, staff, and student ambassadors were all pleased with the improved results obtained during the past year. The Director does want to increase the number of prospective students taking the quiz. This year, only 53 prospective students participated. There are, however, hundreds of students who attend admissions presentations and tours each year.

This learning objective will be updated for the 2010-11 year as the institution moves into a new admission process under impaction. Institutions may become impacted if their demand from new students exceeds their capacity (faculty, physical resources, budget, etc.). Sacramento State will become an impacted campus starting fall 2011. As such, admissions presentations will be updated to add information about impaction, who it affects, and what prospective student will need to know. The quiz content will also be reviewed and new question(s) formulated to test knowledge about admission impaction for 2010/11.

Program Objective 1

Increase the amount and array of admissions related communication to fall 2010 applicants who applied during the initial filing period.

Rationale: The undergraduate applicant pool at Sacramento State is the largest it has ever been in campus history. The vast majority of prospective students in the pool will be eligible for admission. However, the CSU has mandated that all campus’ decrease their overall enrollment for the 2010/11 academic year due to budget constraints. At Sacramento State, the required enrollment reduction is 10.8% of total FTE (full-time
equivalent students), or around 3,000 students. In response to this enrollment reduction, admissions staff will not be able to extend flexibility in some admissions requirements and deadlines that they have in the past. Therefore, it is of great importance that Sacramento State clearly articulate deadlines and the consequences of not meeting deadlines to our applicant pool.

**Measures**

The Director and admissions communication staff will evaluate and update the 08/09 communication plan with respect to the new restrictions being implemented for the 2009/10 recruitment cycle. The majority of communication is sent to prospective students via e-mail. Then, staff will ask a small focus group of students to review the plans and messages and provide feedback on a short assessment questionnaire. The questionnaire will ask students to provide feedback on the quantity, content and timing of e-mails.

This assessment only addresses email messages. During this project, the Director and his staff also evaluated and enhanced phone outreach, direct mail and presentation strategies to reflect new admission restrictions and deadlines.

**Results**

After evaluating all e-mail messages and receiving feedback from students, the Director and his staff reduced the overall number of e-mail messages delivered to prospective students (fall 2010 = 20 e-mails vs. fall 2009= 26). This may seem counter-intuitive as one might think the admissions office should increase the number of e-mails to reinforce changes in the admissions procedure. However, based on feedback from students, the staff realized they were sending too many messages causing many prospective students to stop reading them. Instead of increasing the number of e-mails, staff focused on shifting to a more purposeful tone and reducing the number of messages for fall 2010. A list of e-mails by topics is provided in Attachment B.

In addition to tone, updated messages gave prospective students a shorter turn-around time for response to deadlines. For example, prospective Fall 2009 students were sent multiple emails reminding them of the deadline for their acceptance of admission between March 2^{nd} and June 15^{th}, while Fall 2010 prospects were only sent a couple of emails in March advising them to accept their admission by May 1^{st}. Prospective students who did not respond were sent notices on May 4^{th} that their admission had been withdrawn for non-response.

**Conclusions**

For the first time in the history of Sacramento State, the campus was required to purposely manage enrollment numbers down. As a non-impacted campus (without the benefit of supplemental admissions criteria to reduce the number of new students), one
of the main strategies available to the campus to restrict new students was the strict enforcement of the existing admission deadlines and requirements. Strict enforcement of admission requirements and deadlines is in stark contrast to the historical growth driven recruitment strategies that provided admission counselors with flexibility on most admission requirements and deadlines.

In retrospect, the Director noted that the vast majority of prospective students coped well with the more restrictive recruitment strategy. The admissions staff, however, did not. The Director underestimated the extent of adaptation that would need to occur in the staff culture. Staff expressed a high level of anxiety and discomfort with a more restrictive recruitment strategy. Most of these staff members have spent their entire career bending rules to help prospective students become admitted. The about face in strategy was very challenging to them professionally and personally.

In anticipation of even greater challenges for staff and student ambassadors for the fall 2011 recruitment cycle, the Director will create new learning and program objectives around the implementation of impaction for Sacramento State. In addition to basic information about impaction requirements, the 2010-11 learning and program objectives for the Admissions Office will involve training for communicating bad news and dealing with difficult people (a new experience for many in the Admissions Office).

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Emiliano Diaz, (916)278-7242. diaze@csus.edu
Mission Statement
Note: Departmental mission must be directly aligned with those of the University and the Division. This statement should include approximately 3-5 sentences that identify the name of the department, its primary functions, modes of delivery and target audience.

Mission: Associated Students, Inc. serves as the official governing body of Sacramento State students and through operation and sponsorship of programs and services meets the varied needs of students. ASI provides experiential education, leadership opportunities, student representation, various business and recreational services, campus life programs and activities that support the campus and greater Sacramento community.

Rationale: Associated Students’ primary objective as a student body organization is to provide for the campus student self-government; however, the organization may also provide essential activities closely related to, but not normally included as a part of the regular instructional program of the campus which enhance students’ co-curricular experiences and learning.

Planning Goals
Note: Planning Goals are broad statements that describe the overarching, long-range intentions of an administrative unit. Goals are used primarily for general planning, as the starting point for the development and refinement of program objectives or student learning outcomes (UCF Administrative Handbook, University of Central Florida).

Goal 1: Serve as the representative entity for Sacramento State students.

Goal 2: Provide students with experiential education.

Goal 3: Provide students with leadership experiences.

Goal 4: Provide business and recreational services.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes
Note: The Objectives or Outcomes can be one of two types: program objectives or student learning outcomes. The former are related to program improvement around issues like timeliness, efficiency and participant satisfaction. The latter addresses what a student learns or how a student changes by participating in the program or utilizing the service. Both program objectives and student learning outcomes are measurable statements that provide evidence as to how well you are reaching your goals.
**Student Learning Outcome 1**

Students employed in advanced level positions in ASI programs will exhibit leadership performance scores at the level of “Regularly Meets & Sometimes Exceeds Expectations” or higher at their annual performance evaluation conducted at the end of each academic year.

**Rationale:** ASI provides students with exceptional training and mentoring during their employment in ASI programs that includes progressive development of their leadership and managerial skills. Development of communication, information competence, problem-solving and ethical decision-making skills supports our students' realization of many Sacramento State baccalaureate learning goals.

**Measures**

*Note: Measures describe the methodology and timeframe for data collection. Measures also should identify the population being surveyed and/or tested. Provide materials such as survey instruments, check lists, focus group protocols, etc. in an appendix.*

Collection Date(s): December 2009 mid-year assessment and May 2010 end-of-year assessment

Method: Mid-year – employee and direct supervisor evaluation (Appendix A)
End-of-year – employee, direct supervisor and 3 other sources of feedback for evaluation

Populations: Students employed in advanced level positions in ASI programs (Business & Administration, Government, Student Life & Service, Aquatic Center, Peak Adventures, Children’s Center)

**Results**

*Note: Results include a brief narrative of findings, and/or essential tables or graphs. The results should indicate the extent to which the program objective or student learning outcome was met.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP SKILL</th>
<th>MID-YEAR AVERAGE SCORE*</th>
<th>END-OF-YEAR AVERAGE SCORE*</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN AVERAGE SCORE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Supervision</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance Scale:
1 = Does Not Meet Expectations
2 = Needs Improvement
3 = Regularly Meets & Sometimes Exceeds Expectations
4 = Often Exceeds Expectations
5 = Consistently Exceeds Expectations
### STUDENT STAFF LEADERSHIP SKILLS PERFORMANCE RESULTS
### AVERAGE GROUP END-OF-YEAR SCORE BY PERFORMANCE AREA
### COMPARISON BY YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

N = 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP SKILL</th>
<th>EMPLOYED &lt; 1 YR</th>
<th>EMPLOYED 1 - 2 YRS</th>
<th>EMPLOYED 2 - 3 YRS.</th>
<th>EMPLOYED 3 - 4 YRS.</th>
<th>EMPLOYED &gt; 4 YRS.</th>
<th>AVG. SCORE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Supervision</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance Scale:
1 = Does Not Meet Expectations
2 = Needs Improvement
3 = Regularly Meets & Sometimes Exceeds Expectations
4 = Often Exceeds Expectations
5 = Consistently Exceeds Expectations
### STUDENT STAFF LEADERSHIP SKILLS PERFORMANCE RESULTS

#### INDIVIDUAL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE SCORES

##### COMPARISON FIRST YEAR TO SECOND YEAR

N = 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Length of Employment</th>
<th>First Year Average Score*</th>
<th>Second Year Average Score*</th>
<th>Difference in Average Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>2 - 3 years</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>&gt; 4 years</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance Scale:

1 = Does Not Meet Expectations  
2 = Needs Improvement  
3 = Regularly Meets & Sometimes Exceeds Expectations  
4 = Often Exceeds Expectations  
5 = Consistently Exceeds Expectations

### Conclusions

**Note:** The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It also should “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

Using the revised Student Staff Leadership Skills Performance survey was an overall success. The survey served the following primary purposes:

- Focused on 7 areas of skill or knowledge that we believe enhance leadership development and performance for students in advanced positions
- Provided selected student staff the opportunity to reflect upon and rate their own performance and learning
- Served as a “tool” for supervisors to have focused, individual discussions with their students in advanced level positions regarding their learning experiences and leadership development two times during the academic year

In fall 2009, a total of 33 student employees in advanced level positions in ASI programs were selected by their supervisors as candidates for participation in the
student staff leadership development survey. As a result of feedback from supervisors who utilized the survey in the prior academic year, a scaled-down version was adopted, reducing the skill areas assessed from 14 to 7. Students had reported that they felt overwhelmed by the number of skill areas being assessed. A representative team of supervisors worked to identify the seven skill areas they believed were most reflective of their students’ leadership development in the workplace.

At the onset of the fall semester, supervisors met with their students on an individual basis to introduce and discuss the performance survey. In January 2010, each student and supervisor prepared a mid-year evaluation to reflect the student’s performance in the first half of the academic year. The same process was conducted at the close of the academic year (May/June) with an additional component of peer review added to the performance feedback.

A total of 34 students participated in the student staff leadership survey. Of the initially selected 33 students, all successfully completed at least one semester of participation and 28 of the 34 participated for the full academic year. Four students participated in fall semester only, one of which graduated at the midterm and three others that did not continue to work during spring semester. One new student assumed her advanced level position at the midterm, replacing the graduate.

All but one of the 30 students who participated in the end-of-year Student Staff Leadership Skills Performance survey received an overall average rating of 3.0 (Regularly Meets & Sometimes Exceeds Expectations) or higher. One student received an overall average rating of 2.9. All but five of the students received a 3.0 or higher rating on each performance skill area. One of the five students received a rating of 2.0 (Needs Improvement) in Writing Skills and the other students received ratings of 2.0 for Initiative. At the year end, students’ average scores were highest in Interpersonal Skills (4.0) with average scores in the remaining six areas of performance ranging from 3.7 to 3.9. Overall, there appears to be little variance in end-of-year group average performance scores across the seven skill areas.

Of the 28 students who participated in the performance survey at the mid-year and end-of-year, 50% increased their overall average score, 21% had no change, and 29% fell in their overall average scores. For individuals that increased their skill performance average, mid-year to end-of-year, there was a range of variance between +0.1 and +1.0, with an average variance of +0.5. For individuals that had a decrease in their average skill scores there was a modest variance range between -0.1 and -0.6, with an average variance of -0.3. Collectively, the students showed modest increases (+0.1 to +0.3) in each performance skill area from mid-year to end-of-year.

End-of-year average group scores were calculated for students based upon the length of their employment including time prior to holding their advanced position. Three students were employed for less than one year, 10 from 1 to 2 years, 10 from 2 – 3 years, 6 from 3 – 4 years; and one for over four years. When their scores were compared on each skill area by the length of employment, students who had worked for 2 – 3 years appeared to have the highest scores or tied with one other group in most skill areas (Oral Communication, Written Communication, Customer Service, Initiative,
and Problem Solving). Other variances between the employment groups could not be confidently explained since the sample sizes were so small for those working less than one year \((n=3)\) or more than four years \((n=1)\).

There were 11 students who had participated in the Student Staff Leadership Skills Performance survey in the prior year. End-of-year average scores from across the same 7 skill areas were compared between their first year and second year performance surveys. Counter to what would be expected, 7 of the 11 students had a lower end-of-year average score in the second year as opposed to the first year. In at least one case, Student #8, the position held and the direct supervisor differed from the first to second year. The level of variance between the first year and second year did not seem to be directly related to the individuals’ years of employment. The results raise interesting questions with regard to decreasing, rather than increasing performance score averages from one year to the next. Do supervisors increase their expectations; students decrease their efforts, or are there other unrealized factors affecting performance ratings?

Review of this year’s process and analysis of the survey results have validated that the clear majority of students working in advanced positions are able to achieve an average performance score of 3.0 (Regularly Meets & Sometimes Exceeds Expectations) or above by the end of the academic year. Anecdotal information indicates that the most meaningful aspect of the performance evaluation process continues to be the conversations had between supervisors and students. The richness of the “Comments” included in the supervisors’ performance evaluations exhibit the care and thoughtfulness of feedback given to each student, articulating specific details of performance strengths and weaknesses.

We will continue to use the revised Student Staff Leadership Skills Performance survey to facilitate our students’ development and performance while working in ASI. The knowledge and skill performance areas are relevant and useful for both supervisors and student staff. Most importantly, the survey serves as a meaningful “tool” for focused individual conversations twice a year between supervisors and students.

**Student Learning Outcome 2**

Student members of the Associated Students Board of Directors will demonstrate knowledge and/or skill in the prescribed areas of Board Development (i.e. strategic planning, fiduciary responsibilities, parliamentary procedures, legislative process, board reports and board projects) after completion of training and/or “hands on” experiences. Each Board Member will achieve an average score (2.5) or higher on each skill area of the six (6) learning outcomes.

*Rationale:* ASI Operating Rule 300.7 “Board Development” prescribes that the Board of Directors will participate in additional workshops, presentations and/or experiences that will enhance their ability to fulfill their role and responsibilities as an elected student leader; and understand the structure and operation of a private, non-profit corporation. The Board Members will exhibit communication, organizational, collective decision-
making and critical thinking skills in various areas of their role and responsibilities. These skills will support realization of many Sacramento State baccalaureate learning goals.

Measures

Collection Date(s): December 2009, Mid-year self-assessment and evaluators’ assessment
May 2010, End-of-year self-assessment and evaluators’ assessment

Method: Board of Directors’ Learning Outcomes Rubric (Appendix B)

Populations: 2009-10 student members of Associated Students Board of Directors

Results

BOARD OF DIRECTORS LEARNING OUTCOME RUBRIC
EVALUATORS’ COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL STUDENT MEMBERS
Score Ranges & Averages by Learning Outcome and Skill Area
End-of-Year, May 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILL AREA</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Collective Decision-Making</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiduciary responsibilities</td>
<td>2.0 - 3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5 - 3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative process</td>
<td>1.0 - 3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0 - 3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board reports</td>
<td>2.2 - 3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2 - 3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary procedures</td>
<td>2.2 - 3.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0 - 3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board projects</td>
<td>2.0 - 3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0 - 3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective average for skill areas</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rating: 1 = Poor; 2 = Adequate; 3 = Good; 4 = Excellent
Conclusions

The 2009/10 Associated Students (ASI) Board of Directors consisted of sixteen student members: 13 participated throughout the academic year, one in fall semester only, and two in spring semester only. The members were introduced to the Board of Directors’ Learning Outcome Rubric (Rubric) in a group meeting early in the Fall Semester or during their individual orientation. In January 2010, student members were directed to prepare a self-evaluation to reflect their performance in the first half of the academic year. Ex-officio members (Executive Director, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs, Director of Administration & Finance, and University President’s designee) and support staff to the Board (Board Associate and Parliamentarian) prepared evaluations for each student Board member. The Executive Director compiled the six evaluators’ data into one composite evaluation (averaged scores) for each member. The student members were then invited to meet with one of the ex-officio members or support staff to discuss their self-evaluation and the evaluators’ composite ratings on the Rubric. The same process was conducted at the close of the academic year with student members meeting with the same ex-officio or staff member they met with at the mid-year. Five of the six evaluators were able to meet after both the mid-year and end-of-year individual meetings to share feedback from the individual meetings and discuss strategies to support board members’ learning, as well as strengths and weaknesses of the Rubric.

Using the Board of Directors’ Learning Outcome Rubric served the following primary purposes:

- Defined four skill areas within each of six learning outcomes and graduated levels of competence
- Provided student Board members the opportunity to reflect upon and rate their own performance and learning
- Served as a “tool” for ex-officio Board members and support staff to have focused, individual discussions with each member regarding their learning experiences during the academic year

Evaluators’ Rubric scoring

The Executive Director compiled the evaluators’ data into one composite evaluation for each member at both the mid-year (January) and end-of-year (May). The number of evaluators was increased from two (Executive Director and Associate Vice President of Student Affairs) to six (adding two additional ex-officio members and two support staff). Performance scores on each skill area varied among evaluators by no more than 1.0 differential 81% of the time. Interestingly, in the prior year study when there were only two evaluators, all scores were within 1.0 difference with the exception of scoring on one skill area for one student with a differential of 1.5. Variance in evaluators’ scoring of board members’ performance was significantly greater with a larger number of evaluators participating.

In the second year of using the Rubric, a very different picture emerged regarding student board members’ performance in the skill areas and learning outcomes with far fewer student members achieving a composite score of 2.5 or higher on each skill area. The same Rubric was used with the exception of strengthening the skill statements for parliamentary procedures. The end-of-year scores on the Board of Directors’ Learning Outcomes Rubric demonstrated that only 4 of 15 members were able to achieve an
evaluators’ composite score of 2.5 or higher on all skill areas (communication, organization, collective decision-making, and critical thinking) in each of the six learning outcomes (strategic planning, fiduciary responsibility, legislative process, board reports, parliamentary procedure, and board projects). This fell short of the desired outcome for all student members to achieve a 2.5 or higher score for each skill area on all learning outcomes.

Individual member’s total average performance scores across the skill areas and learning outcomes ranged from 1.9 to 3.5 with a group average of 2.6; 9 of the 15 members achieved an overall 2.5 or higher average. Across the six learning outcomes, the greatest number of members (13/15) achieved an average score of 2.5 or higher for performance on board reports. The fewest number of students (4/15) achieved an average score of 2.5 for performance on board projects. Interestingly, 2 of the 15 students had no observable performance in this area. In the remaining performance areas (strategic planning, fiduciary responsibility, legislative process and parliamentary procedure), the majority of students achieved a 2.5 or higher average score.

**Student members’ self-evaluation on Rubric**

A total of 8 members participated in at least one preparation of a self-evaluation during the academic year. At the mid-year, 8 of 14 members prepared self-evaluations and only 6 of the 15 prepared an end-of-year self-evaluation. Of these members, only 5 prepared both a mid-year and end-of-year self-evaluation. Lastly, 7 members did not prepare self-evaluations at either point in time. When comparing members’ self-evaluations with evaluators’ composite scores the differential was typically within a +/- 0.5 range. Evaluators reported that many of the student members expressed that the Rubric made them feel like they were “being graded” and were reluctant to “grade” themselves. On the other hand, most students were very comfortable talking about how they thought they were “performing” in each of the skill areas in each of the six learning outcomes. There were a few incidents in which the student reported that he or she had done the self-evaluation but forgot to print it out or bring it with them to the individual meeting. In these cases, the self-evaluation never got turned in.

**Individual meetings**

A strong majority of the student members (14/16) participated in at least one individual meeting with either an ex-officio member or support staff to discuss their self-evaluation and the evaluators’ composite evaluation. All members engaged in a mid-year meeting other than the two members who began their board membership in the spring semester. These two members also did not engage in an end-of-year meeting. Seven of the members participated in both mid-year and end-of-year individual meetings, with 5 of them completing self-evaluations at each time. Engagement in both mid-year and end-of-year individual meetings did not appear to have any significant relationship to the members’ composite performance scores.

The general consensus among the evaluators was that the Rubric served as a useful “tool” to guide the individual conversations with the student members in regard to the skills they were developing through their experience on the Board. We discovered that
the Rubric is structured to assess performance in primarily formal, structured, whole group meetings. A number of the students expressed in their individual meetings that the “work” that they engaged in outside of the formal meetings (informal individual or small group conversations with other board members, staff, students, and campus faculty and administrators) did not get taken into consideration by the evaluators since they did not necessarily “observe” these areas of activity. When we looked more closely at the individuals’ composite scores that fell below 2.5 in many skill areas, it became very clear that the structure of the Rubric unfairly disadvantaged assessment of members’ knowledge and skill for more reserved and quiet (less vocal) individuals.

As a result of feedback from both evaluators and student board members, we will move away from the Rubric being the primary tool used for framing board learning assessment. The evaluating team has recommended refocusing the structure on individual student development fostered by one-on-one mentoring relationships. The skill areas of communication, organization, collective decision-making, and critical thinking are still valued; however, we need to find a way to incorporate them into individual, small and large group experiences that take into account individual differences in style and personality. Ultimately, we have realized that the formal, repetitive structure of the Rubric and primarily group meeting focus created a “one-size-fits-all” approach that does not serve the optimal learning for our student members.

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Pat Worley, Executive Director Associated Students, Inc. (916) 278-6784. pcworley@csus.edu.
Career Center
2009-2010 Assessment Plan

Mission Statement

Mission: The Career Center provides proactive and comprehensive career services to students through career development, experiential learning, resume development, on-campus recruitment, and employer networking. The professional staff creates a supportive and educational environment where students can actively participate in their own career development within the global work world.

Planning Goals

Goal 1: Create tools to measure the Center’s effectiveness in helping students locate, apply for, and secure career oriented employment.

Goal 2: Provide proactive and comprehensive career services to all students with a special emphasis on graduating seniors.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome

By scoring at least 80% on a post-test, students participating in the Federal Job Search Academy (Federal Foot in the Door) will demonstrate increased knowledge of the federal government job search process. This process includes how to find postings, how to complete the application process, and how to format their resumes for federal positions.

Rationale: As part of the federal “Call to Serve” grant the Career Center received two years ago, the Center encourages students to consider the federal government in their career search. The Federal Job Search Academy will help students with the job search process.

This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goal Number 3—Communication and Number 4—Information Competence.

Measures

All participants in orientation for the Academy series completed a pre-test (Attachment B) before taking part in any other activities. Also during the first workshop, the program coordinator asked each student to turn in an initial resume. After the session, the coordinator evaluated these resume’s using the Federal Resume Evaluation Rubric (Attachment C), and assigned each student a score.

During the next two months, students participated in six workshops (see Attachment A for topics) and were asked to participate in three individual appointments with an
assigned career counselor. At the final workshop, students completed the post-test and submitted a final resume to measure the level of knowledge gained through their participation in the Academy.

**Results**

Eleven graduating seniors participated in the six-session Academy which ran from February 16 through April 6, 2010. One student did not turn in a final resume so only ten students were used in the assessment analysis.

The group score on the pre-test administered the first session was 40%. The group score on the post-test was 76%. Although students showed a 29% improvement in the percentage of correct answers from the pre- to post-test, the group did not achieve the desired 80%.

The program coordinator evaluated the first set of resumes collected and assigned an average rating of 4.8 out of 12 possible points to the group using the Federal Resume Evaluation Rubric. Students provided revised resumes at the final workshop. The program coordinator evaluated the revised resumes using the same rubric. This time, the coordinator assigned an average rating to the group of 9.1 out of 12 possible points (a 4.3 point improvement in average group score). See Attachment D for samples of initial and revised resumes.

As a culmination of the program, participants were recognized and received certificates of completion at the Pathways to Public Service Kick-off (a networking event for students and agency representatives on May 11, 2010). Follow-up was conducted on June 4, 2010 in the form of a placement data survey. At that time, three students reported placements. One student obtained a temporary assignment with the Governor’s Office of Constituent Affairs. Two students were placed in Career Intern (2 year, paid, full-time) positions with the Social Security Administration. Placement follow-up will be conducted again on August 6, 2010.

**Conclusions**

Career Center staff felt that the initial offering of this academy was successful. Informal feedback received from students who participated in the academy has been overwhelmingly positive. Staff brainstormed several possible reasons why the student learning outcome was not met. As a result, several enhancements will be made to the academy for next year as outlined below:

- Provide Initial Resume Feedback - Initial resumes were not returned to students after they were evaluated. As such, students did not know what specific areas to improve. As one example, some students did not include the last four digits of their Social Security Number on their final resume. Although this requirement was discussed at length during the resume review workshop, some students still did not include it. For federal positions, excluding this information will immediately
eliminate students from the application process. Staff believed that students would be more attentive to this issue if they had received direct feedback on their initial resume showing the omission. Next year, initial resumes will be evaluated and then returned to the students by the second session.

- Increase Individual Follow-up - More individual follow-up is needed from career counselors with their assigned students to encourage her/him to attend all three career counseling sessions. The coordinator will follow up with the career counselors mid-way through the academy to make sure further follow up with the students is done.

- Standardize the Workshop Curriculum - A more standard curriculum for workshops should be developed. Trainers were given general direction about what to cover during the sessions and a copy of the assessment. In the future, curriculum will be standardized and approved by the program coordinator to insure consistency. Also, the program coordinator will work to ensure that the sessions are presented with various learning styles in mind (i.e. visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning).

- Improve Student Attendance at Workshops - Students should be strongly encouraged not to miss a group session. If it is inevitable, the participant should be required to watch the recorded webinar on the similar topic and report to the coordinator what he/she believe to be the key points of the training.

- Increase Planned Workshop Time for the Post-test - Some students rushed through the post-test because they thought the last meeting would be shorter and had thus made other plans. In the future, the coordinator will plan to leave plenty of time for the post-test.

This student learning outcome will be continued next year, incorporating the changes listed above.

Program Objective

Provide a 10% increase in the number of experiential education programs offered to each college by spring 2010.

Rationale: The Career Center staff provides general programs to students across all colleges, but is now moving towards targeted experiential education programs for each individual college to better meet the unique needs of their particular students.

Measures

The director and associate director of the Career Center compared the number and types of programs offered in 2008-2009 to the programs that will be developed in 2009-2010. The associate director is working individually with the experiential learning coordinators (co-op coordinators) to develop additional targeted programs.
Results

During the 2008-09 academic year 25 individual programs were offered and 1,243 students attended experiential education programs. During the 2009-10 academic year 38 individual programs were offered and 2,134 students attended programs. This represents a 52% increase in the number of programs offered and a 72% increase in student participation. The program objective was met.

Conclusions

In 2008-09, several changes (including a change in leadership and a physical change of location for the office) impeded the staff’s ability to increase programming. In 2009-10, with the new Associate Director in-place and the office relocation complete, creative efforts and the use of web-based technology allowed the experiential learning coordinators in the Career Center to develop more programs and reach more students at one single time.

Programs dedicated to experiential learning mainly consist of panels, information sessions, workshops, and other career related events for the colleges. In addition to the use of web-based technology noted above, this significant increase in program development and number of students served was also achieved by reducing the amount of time for standard individual appointments (to increase the number of students served) and more efficient utilization of staff to coordinate, develop and deliver special programming. These changes gave staff more time to network, plan and create new employer contacts. In addition, the Associate Director implemented tracking mechanisms to measure progress and project outcomes. Through this process, the experiential learning coordinators have dedicated themselves to program development within their respective colleges and have gained a renewed sense of how to better serve students with this model.

This program objective will become a student learning outcome for 2010-11. Two of the larger programs, Science and Engineering Professionalism Seminars and the Sutter Volunteer Program, will be highlighted. The counselors will track the students and conduct assessments of effectiveness of the experience, measured by placements and translating theory to practice.

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Beth Merritt Miller, 916-278-6231. merrittmillerb@csus.edu.
Mission Statement

**Mission:** The Enrollment Operations Support office provides technology services to Admissions & Outreach, Registrar’s Office, Career Center, Academic Advising, Student Athlete Resource Center, Testing Center, Veterans Service Center and the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. The department supports enrollment operations by: 1) providing electronic imaging services for all student documents including workflow and archiving; 2) developing and maintaining technology-based solutions that directly support student services; and 3) uploading of applications, transcripts, test scores and other incoming data files.

Planning Goals

**Goal 1:** Provide efficient and effective technology support that assists Student Affairs professionals in providing direct services to students, faculty, staff and external constituents.

**Goal 2:** Insure that all incoming student record data is imported and processed in an accurate, timely and secure manner.

Program Objective or Student Learning Outcomes

**Student Learning Outcome 1**
After participating in a standardized training session, IT student assistants will demonstrate basic knowledge and skill in web site design and development, PC setup, maintenance and troubleshooting by correctly answering at least 80% of questions on an exam, and by scoring at least 70% on an observed competency test.

*Rationale:* The training that students receive while working in Student Affairs aids in their professional development and may increase their chances of obtaining employment after graduating from the university.

*This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goals Number 1- Competence in the Discipline; Number 2- Analysis and Problem Solving; and Number 4- Information Competence.*

Measures

Increased competency for student assistants will be measured using the following methods:

- **Short Answer Exam** - Students are expected to correctly answer at least 80% of questions on this exam (Appendix A)
- **Observed Competency Test** – Students are expected to achieve at least a 70% minimum competency score based on a standard grading rubric (Appendix B)
The Director of Enrollment Operations Support will provide training during the 2010 spring semester. Student assistants will then be assessed by the Director and complete the short answer exam.

Results

Two new students became part of the technical support group and were among the four student assistants that completed training by the end of the spring 2010 semester. The Director assessed these four student assistants in spring 2010. Students scored an average of 87.5% on the exam and an average of 90% on the observed competency test (Appendix C). All four students scored above the minimum score requirements on both the exam and observed competency test.

Conclusions

The IT student assistants consistently achieved successful results utilizing this training method during the past two years. A total of six students have graduated since the training was implemented and were able to obtain competitive jobs in technology firms. The Director, while serving as a reference for the students during their job application process, is consistently told by employers that the experience and skill sets these student assistants gained while employed in Student Affairs contributed to their successful candidacy. Based on these results, the Director will continue to conduct this training program and assessment each year.

Program Objective 1:

By August 2010, Enrollment Operations staff will design and implement a training and assessment module for faculty and staff who will become regular consumers of student data reports. Faculty and staff will be trained on privacy issues, different types of student data that can be requested (both confidential and non-confidential) and considerations for secure use and transmission of confidential student data.

Rationale: The Student Affairs Operations Support Team regularly provides student data reports to many departments across campus. Student data is confidential and it is critical that faculty and staff who receive such data develop a thorough understanding of FERPA and campus policies on the use of student data before they are granted access.

Measures

The training will be available to staff who request access to standard data warehouse reports or who wish to develop their own data warehouse reports. Training will be provided in-person or on-line (i.e. using SacCT). The trainer will ask participants to complete a pre-test to determine their current knowledge of FERPA, institutional policies and general precautions regarding the use of student data. After participating in the training program, participants will be asked to complete a post-test. Pre- and post-test scores will be assessed to determine the effectiveness of the training module. In order
to be approved for access to the data warehouse, participants must correctly answer at least 90% of post-test questions. Participants who do not correctly answer at least 90% of post-test questions will be required to complete additional training.

Results

As a result of the University’s organizational changes, data reporting is being consolidated across campus and moving to a new office in IRT. As such, the assessment plans will be reevaluated with the manager of this new unit.

Conclusions

N/A

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Tejeshwar Chowdhary, Director of Enrollment Operations Support. (916) 278-7846. tsc@csus.edu
Financial Aid
2009-10 Assessment Plan

Mission Statement

Mission: The Financial Aid Office helps students (and in many cases their families) to identify, apply, receive and maintain eligibility for various types of financial assistance. Financial aid education is offered through individual counseling, campus-wide informational campaigns and group presentations. Staff research and resolve individual student issues as needed, striving always to facilitate timely and accurate processing that complies with all federal, state, and university regulations.

Rationale: The Financial Aid Office (FAO) helps students and their families to understand the financial options available to assist them in paying for higher education. Whether students are on a full-ride scholarship, must work while attending classes, and/or are only eligible for educational loans, the FAO provides informational opportunities, supported by efficient processing activities that help ensure that students are able to successfully apply for and retain financial aid.

Planning Goals

Goal 1: Teach students how to apply for and retain financial aid, ensuring that they understand critical deadlines and academic requirements.

Goal 2: Help students develop a comprehensive financial aid plan which supports their timely progress towards graduation.

Goal 3: Design efficient business operations which facilitate timely and accurate financial aid processing and disbursement.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome 1

Students who are placed on financial aid probation (due to unsatisfactory academic performance and/or a low course completion rates) will demonstrate basic understanding of the Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) policy and the requirements that must be met to retain their financial aid eligibility (Appendix A) by correctly answering at least 80% of questions on a SAP quiz directly following completion of a SAP tutorial.

Rationale: To maintain ongoing financial aid eligibility, students are required to make Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) towards their educational degree or certificate. Students who initially fail to meet SAP requirements may be placed on financial aid
probation. Increasing students’ understanding of SAP requirements should help them retain their eligibility for financial aid in future terms.

This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goal Number 2: Analysis and Problem Solving.

**Measures**

In 2009/10, the FAO required students on financial aid probation to complete a short online tutorial regarding SAP requirements. At the end of the tutorial, students were required to complete a “SAP Quiz” (Appendix B) correctly answering at least 80% of questions within three attempts. The quiz includes five questions covering the most important information from the tutorial. Students who fail to earn a score of 80% after three attempts are required to meet with a financial aid counselor and sign a SAP contract as a condition of their continued financial aid eligibility. The SAP quiz was provided in February to allow students the opportunity to learn the requirements and improve within the spring semester. Instructions and consequences were explicitly communicated to encourage increased participation.

**Results**

In February 2010, Financial Aid staff identified 1,453 students who were on financial aid probation for the spring term. As such, these students were required to take the SAP training course on SacCT (online course delivery system) and pass the subsequent quiz (within three attempts). If they did not take the course, or failed the quiz on their third attempt, their future financial aid was placed on hold unless they came in to see a financial aid counselor or returned to satisfactory academic status at the end of the spring term.

In 2008-09, 56% of students identified on probation for spring 2009 participated in the SAP course. To improve the participation rate for spring 2010, a team of FAO staff enhanced the communication strategies used for these students. Staff sent My Sac State messages with distinct key words (e.g. “mandatory”), explicit and concise directions, and explanations of the explicit consequences students would experience if they failed to correctly answer at least 80% of questions on the quiz within three attempts.

Within the first two weeks of the initial messaging campaign, 48% of enrolled students had passed the quiz. Staff believes this positive result was largely due to the enhancements to the direct messaging campaign through My Sac State.

As of August 1, 2010, out of the original 1,453 students identified, 1,284 (88%) have completed and passed the SAP tutorial; 33 (2.3%) students have not yet passed, but still have at least one more attempt to pass the quiz available; and, 136 (9.4%) students have not yet attempted to take the SAP tutorial.
The FAO staff was very pleased with the SAP quiz pass rate of 88% for spring 2010. This percentage represents a significant improvement over the previous spring’s pass rate of 56%.

**Conclusions**

Feedback provided by students confirmed that the one thing that influenced them the most to take the SAP tutorial was communicating that a financial aid hold would be placed on their record if they didn’t complete the tutorial and quiz.

Staff relayed many positive interactions with students who took the SAP quiz. Students also noted that the earlier timing of the communications in February/March of 2010 was very effective because it gave them a chance to understand the implications of SAP early enough to improve their academic standing before the end of the semester.

For future years the FAO plans to start this process even earlier. Rather than waiting until spring, students on SAP probation will be identified in November/December and required to complete the SAP tutorial and pass the quiz or risk having holds placed on spring disbursements in January.

**Program Learning Objective 1**

Immediately after attending a 30 minute SAP seminar, faculty and staff advisors will score 80% on an online post-quiz that tests their basic understanding of SAP policies and the potential impact of drop/add and registration on general financial aid eligibility.

*Rationale:* Many faculty and staff advisors indicate that they do not fully understand the SAP policy and the possible impact of certain advising recommendations. Thus, they may advise students to take academic actions without understanding the possible negative consequences of those actions on the student’s financial aid.

**Measures**

Financial Aid staff will invite faculty and academic advisors to complete a 30 minute on-line tutorial regarding Satisfactory Academic Progress and financial aid eligibility. At the end of the tutorial, a “SAP Quiz” will be offered to the participants. The quiz includes five questions covering the most important information from the tutorial. To exhibit basic understanding of SAP, Financial Aid staff expects advisors to correctly answer at least 80% of questions on the SAP Quiz immediately after completing the on-line tutorial. The SAP quiz will be provided in February to correspond with the timing of the students’ SAP quiz. To increase participation, Financial Aid staff will increase communication and awareness about the significance of this tutorial.
Results

During the 2009/10 academic year, 64 staff members (comprised of Financial Aid Staff, EOP Advisors, and Academic Advisors) enrolled in the SAP training course using SacCT (on-line course delivery system).

In order to improve the 27% participation rate from 2008/09, FAO staff enhanced communications with the staff by sending personal emails. These e-mails encouraged them to learn the SAP process in order to better counsel students.

Of the 64 staff who participated in the tutorial, 52 (81%) completed and passed the SAP training.

Conclusions

The number of staff taking and completing the SAP tutorial increased over the previous year. However, the FAO staff would like to increase the participation rate to more than 90% of those staff and faculty invited. One challenge continues to be a lack of resources in the FAO to provide the tracking and follow up with invited staff and faculty. FAO staff believes that if more follow-up was done, the completion rates would improve. FAO resources were more limited in 2009-10 due to state budget cuts and staff furloughs combined with increased work load.

FAO staff will attempt to increase the completion rate for the 2010-11 academic year.

Program Objective 1

Increase the number of students who file financial aid applications by the March 2\textsuperscript{nd} priority deadline and complete the specific actions required to ensure that their financial aid is disbursed early in the fall semester.

Rationale: As a University that serves a large population of first generation college students, Sacramento State must provide additional assistance to students and their families to help them better understand how to successfully navigate the financial aid process. Students who complete their FAFSA before March 2 and provide all their required financial aid documents by June 1 are much more likely to have all their financial aid disbursed early in the fall semester.

Measures

During the spring 2010 semester, Financial Aid staff offered the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Annual Financial Aid Awareness Campaign. The goal of this campaign is to increase the number of financial aid applications filed prior to March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2010. With increased awareness of the financial
aid process in its entirety, Financial Aid staff expects an increase in the number of students who submit financial aid documents before June 1, 2010. To support that objective, the FAO will offer FA Document Workshops and initiate a document deadline campaign (Get your docs done by June 1!).

**Results**

The numbers of FAFSA Applications (ISIR’s) submitted by the priority deadline of March 2, 2010 was 32,879 compared to 26,923 on March 2, 2009, an increase of 5,956 FAFSAs and 22.12%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>March 2, 2008</th>
<th>March 2, 2009</th>
<th>March 2, 2010</th>
<th>% change from 09/10 to 10/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAFSA Applications (ISIR)</td>
<td>Unable to Obtain</td>
<td>26,923</td>
<td>32,879</td>
<td>22.12% Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Due to staff turnover, the Director was unable to get the number of FAFSA’s received by March 2, 2008.

This year, the FAO staff added a “Get Your Docs Done by June One!” component to the awareness campaign. Since this is the first year measuring this data, there is not a comparison point. For the first year, 17,210 students met the June 1 document deadline.

As a result of the increased number of students who completed their FAFSAs by March 1, the FAO has significantly increased early fall financial aid disbursements (see below). There was more financial aid disbursed in August 2009 than for any previous August in Sacramento State history, breaking the record set from last year’s disbursement. The FAO believes that they will again achieve a record disbursement for fall 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>August 2008</th>
<th>August 2009</th>
<th>August 2010</th>
<th>% change from 08/09 to 09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid disbursements</td>
<td>$41,456,569</td>
<td>$60,587,250</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>46.15% Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

This is the third year the Financial Aid Office has designed and delivered a financial aid awareness campaign to students in February. Staff offered four workshops for students to help teach students how to complete their FAFSA in time for the March 2nd priority deadline; 409 students attended. Of these, 301 (73.5%) were able to complete their FAFSA on site. Others needed additional information in order to complete the FAFSA.
on their own, but reported they had learned enough to feel comfortable finishing the application.

This is the first year the Financial Aid Office has done a secondary campaign to encourage students to submit their verification documents by June 1. Staff hosted two verification document workshops to teach students how to accurately complete their documents.

Of the 173 students who attended the verification document workshop, 171 (98.8%) rated the workshops as “Excellent” (132) or “Good” (39). 100% of the students answered “Yes” when asked “Do you think you have learned how to apply for financial aid and the steps you need to take to receive your financial aid funds?” Feedback from both students and parents indicated they were pleased with the hands-on approach of the workshops. The positive comments from attendees noted the workshops were “well organized, excellent, no improvements needed.” Comments indicating areas for improvement parents included statements such as “more signage to direct us to the workshop” and “offer more workshops.”

The FAO staff is very pleased with the continued success of the annual awareness campaign and the new document completion workshops. Both efforts will be repeated and improved next year.

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Craig Yamamoto, Financial Aid. (916) 278-6980. 
craig@csus.edu.
Mission Statement

Note: Departmental mission must be directly aligned with those of the University and the Division. This statement should include approximately 3-5 sentences that identify the name of the department, its primary functions, modes of delivery and target audience.

Mission: The Sacramento State Housing and Residential Life department provides on-campus residents a safe, well-maintained, attractive, and affordable living learning environment. In addition to the facilities, the department offers a myriad of academic support programs, recreational and social activities, and responsible decision making workshops that promote student success and retention.

Rationale: Mission statement should embrace not only the institution’s mission and goals but also standards and guidelines contained within the ACUHO-I (Association of College and University Housing Officers International) Standards for College and University Student Housing as well as CAS Standards (Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services Development Programs) and professional organizations such as American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and National Association of Student Affairs Professionals (NASPA).

Planning Goals

Note: Planning Goals are broad statements that describe the overarching, long-range intentions of an administrative unit. Goals are used primarily for general planning, as the starting point for the development and refinement of program objectives or student learning outcomes. (UCF Administrative Handbook, University of Central Florida).

Overall Goal:

Goal 1: Educate residents about the dangers of high – risk drinking and potential harm associated with these behaviors.

Goal 2: Provide a comprehensive experience which enhances the growth and development of Resident Advisors.

Goal 3: Provide a safe and secure residential environment for students.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes

Note: The Objectives or Outcomes can be one of two types: program objectives or student learning outcomes. The former are related to program improvement around issues like timeliness, efficiency and participant satisfaction. The latter addresses what a student learns or how a student changes by participating in the program or utilizing the service. Both program objectives and student learning outcomes are measurable statements that provide evidence as to how well you are reaching your goals.
Student Learning Outcome 1

Residence Life Alcohol Education Class

By December 2009 residents participating in the Choices Level One Alcohol Education Class will demonstrate the following:

A. 50% of referred residents will be able to cite at least one information item they learned from the class and have incorporated into their drinking behavior that has reduced the risk associated with their drinking (reduction in how much or how often the student drinks, increase in use of protective behaviors).

B. 80% of referred residents will be able to cite at least one additional potential consequence of drinking (compared to pre-interview with RLC).

C. 100% of referred residents will be able to cite at least one reason why they drink without prompting from the interviewer.

D. 75% of referred residents will not have had another alcohol incident/documentation.

E. 50% of referred residents will report a reduction in the amount of alcohol consumed.

F. 50% of referred residents will report a reduction in the number of occasions in which they consume alcohol.

G. Increased knowledge of laws and policies associated with alcohol use and symptoms of alcohol poisoning.

Rationale: The importance of educational sanctions for alcohol policy violations has been demonstrated by national trends demonstrating the effectiveness of consistent policy enforcement on college student drinking behaviors.

Measures

Note: Measures describe the methodology and timeframe for data collection. Measures also should identify the population being surveyed and/or tested. Provide materials such as survey instruments, check lists, focus group protocols, etc. in an appendix.

Measure 1:
Residents who are documented for alcohol violations through the Housing and Residential Life Department and found responsible during the judicial process are referred to Choices Level 1 Alcohol Education Class which is coordinated and overseen by the Student Health Services Alcohol Education Program. Residents who are referred participate in an initial survey which occurs during the judicial hearing, a pretest when they arrive at the Choices Level 1 Alcohol Education Class, immediate post test after the Choices class; and the secondary post test which takes place two weeks to one month after attending Choices Level 1 Alcohol Education Class in a one-on-one meeting with a Peer Health Educator. Surveys assess increased and retained understanding of moderate drinking practices and laws and policies associated with alcohol and drug use as well as self-reported resident drinking behaviors.

Results

*Note: Results include a brief narrative of findings, and/or essential tables or graphs. The results should indicate the extent to which the program objective or student learning outcome was met.*

Eighty-one students were referred to the Choices Level 1 Alcohol Education class fall semester 2009. Of those eighty-one students, sixty-three completed the class by December 2009. Of the sixty-three students who attended the class twenty-eight Residence Life Alcohol Interviews were completed before the students attended the class, sixty-three pre- and post-tests were completed by students immediately before and after the class, and twenty-one follow-up questionnaires and Peer Health Educator Interviews were completed two weeks to thirty days after students attended the class. Eight students completed all five assessment tools. Following are the findings related to the six objectives for the class.

**Outcome A**

50% of referred residents will be able to cite at least one thing they learned from the class and have incorporated into their drinking behavior that has reduced the risk associated with their drinking (reduction in how much or how often the student drinks, increase in use of protective behaviors)

Assessment of this objective was derived from pre-test and follow-up questionnaires as well as the Peer Health Educator Interviews conducted two weeks to thirty days after a student took the class. Of the twenty-one students who were interviewed after the class, twelve (57%) had consumed alcohol at least one time since taking class while 43% had not consumed any alcohol in that time.

Pre-test and follow up assessment asked students the following question:

*During the last 2 weeks if you partied/socialized, how often did you:*

*Alternate non-alcoholic and alcoholic beverages?*
Set a drink limit?

Choose not to drink?

Pace drinks to one per hour?

Volunteer to be a sober driver?

Of these five protective behaviors only two increased among students who completed both the pre-test and follow up and consumed alcohol in the two weeks to one month after taking the class (n=16) - Setting a drink limit (pre-test 2.44, follow up 2.69) and volunteering to be a sober driver (pre-test 2.13, follow up 2.31). Results, however, were not statistically significant to indicate a change in behavior.

Additionally, all twenty-one students were asked the following question at the end of the interview:
In looking back on the class, what impact would you say attending the class has had on your alcohol consumption?

Of the twenty-one people who completed the PHE interview, seven (33%) cited one impact the class had on their alcohol consumption. Some student comments included:

“Open eyes as to why I drank. Learn to take action when someone has reached a lethal limit.”

“Keeping your drinks in moderation. Understanding the dosage. Space your drinks over time.”

“I'm going to drink less.”

“I really liked when they said to alternate alcohol with water. So you can still get your buzz on, but not act a fool.”

“I have a better idea of what alcohol poisoning looks like. So, I think I can help my friends out who drink too much.”

“Learning how alcohol hits the bloodstream and affects your brain is really interesting. It’s like a whole new perspective.”

Five of the twenty-one students indicated that the class had no impact on their drinking. All five reported that they had consumed alcohol at least once since the class.
Outcome B

80% of referred residents will be able to cite at least one additional potential consequence of drinking (compared to pre-interview with Residence Life Coordinator)

Eight students completed both the Residence Life Coordinator (RLC) and Peer Health Educator (PHE) interviews before and after taking the class respectively. During the RLC interviews 100% of the students were asked what they do not like about drinking. During PHE interviews only those who had drank since the class were asked what they do not like about it. Individual students cited approximately eleven consequences of drinking during RLC interviews including:

“After effects”
“Hangover”
“General negative attitude toward drinking”
“Family history” and
(The) “emotional side of it”.

The four students who had consumed alcohol since taking the class and were asked what they don’t like about drinking answered ten consequences of drinking, including:

“Hangover”
“Tasting it the next day”
“When other people drink and drive, start a fight or act stupid” and
“Out of control emotions”

Comparing the answers of the four students who answered both questions during the RLC and PHE interviews they cited nine consequences of drinking during the RLC interview and a total of ten consequences during the PHE interview. However, 75% (3 out of 4) of these students cited at least one additional, specific consequence during their post-interview with Peer Health Educators

Outcome C

100% of referred residents will be able to cite at least one reason why they drink without prompting from the interviewer.

Peer Health Educator Interviewers were directed to write down exactly what interviewees said in answer to the questions. Of the twenty-one students who were interviewed by Peer Health Educators the twelve who cited that they had consumed alcohol at least one time since taking the class were asked “Why do you drink/What do you like about drinking?” Of the twelve students 100% gave at least one reason why they drink. Some answers included:

“I'm more sociable and relaxed.”

“Escape, relieve stress.”
“It loosens me up in social situations and makes everything more fun.”

“Its fun, fun environment when its safe”

“Like the feeling, allows me to be more social.”

Out of the twelve people asked this question, seven answers indicated that drinking was “fun”, six indicated that it enhanced their sociability/decreased their social anxiety and three mentioned it helped them relax/relieve stress.

Outcome D

75% of referred residents will not have had another alcohol incident/documentation.

Of the twenty-one students who completed the Peer Health Educator Interview two weeks to one month after attending the class, twenty (95%) had not been documented for another alcohol or noise violation since the original incident that resulted in them being sent to the class. Some reasons students cited for not having receive further documentations include:

“Learned from mistake. Making better decisions.”

“Have not been around alcohol since taking the class.”

“I haven’t partied at the res halls since taking the class.”

“I stopped drinking in the res halls.”

“Learned lesson and I don’t want to get in trouble again.”

“First one was enough.”

“I’m not foolish. I am going to follow the rules.”

Outcome E

50% of referred residents will report a reduction in the amount of alcohol consumed.

Pre-test and follow up instruments ask the following question: How many standard alcoholic beverages do you typically drink when you party/socialize? A standard drink equals 12oz. beer, 4oz. glass of wine, or 1 oz. of liquor.

The Peer Health Educator Interview asks students the following:
(If you have consumed alcohol since taking the class) how much did you drink, on average, each occasion?

The eight students who completed the RLC interview, pre-test, follow up and Peer Health Educator Interview indicated the following average drink consumption:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Average # Drinks Pre-Test</th>
<th>Average # Drinks Follow-Up</th>
<th>Avg # Drinks PHE Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to a separate analysis with an n=16 the average number of drinks consumed per occasion reported on the pre-test by the sixteen students who completed pre-test and follow-up instruments was 4.06. The average number of drinks consumed per occasion reported on the follow-up was 3.88. This difference was not found to be statistically significant.

Outcome F

50% of referred residents will report a reduction in the number of occasions in which they consume alcohol.

Pre-test and Follow Up Instruments ask the following question: Over the past two weeks on how many days did you use alcohol? The Peer Health Educator Interview asks the following question: (If you have consumed alcohol since taking the class) On average how often have you drank per week?

The eight students who completed the RLC interview, pre-test, follow up and Peer Health Educator Interview indicated the following number of occasions they drank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th># Days Used Alcohol Past Two Weeks Pre-Test</th>
<th># Days Used Alcohol Past Two Weeks Follow-Up</th>
<th>How Often Drank/Week Since Class PHE Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to a separate analysis with an n=16 students completing the pre-test and follow up indicated an average of 3.06 and 2.50 days of alcohol use over the past two weeks respectively. This difference was not found to be statistically significant.

**Outcome G**

*(Students will demonstrate) Increased knowledge of laws and policies associated with alcohol use and symptoms of alcohol poisoning.*

Sixty-three class participants completed pre- and post-tests before and immediately after the class in fall 2009 and twenty-one class participants completed follow up questionnaires two weeks to thirty days after they had taken the class.

Questionnaire results follow:

*Figure One*

*Name two symptoms of alcohol poisoning.*

![Figure Two](image-url)
Which of the following are violations of the campus and/or residence halls alcohol policy?

Public Intoxication on Campus.

Figure Three
Possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages by persons under 21 on campus.

Figure Four
Possession of a beer bong.

Figure Five
Consumption of alcohol by a person over 21 in the residence halls in the presence of person under 21.

Figure Six
Display of alcohol containers by persons under 21.

Conclusions
Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It should also “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

During summer 2009 the decision was made by Residential Life and Student Health Services staff to track individual residents who had been referred to the Choices Level One Alcohol Education Class for alcohol policy violations during fall 2009. The students provided unique identifiers that would protect their anonymity for the purpose of the study. The intention was to be able to compare student’s drinking behaviors with their attitudes throughout the adjudication and sanction process. Unfortunately, due to technical errors with Student Voice and non-compliance of referred to students to schedule final interview appointments, only eight students were able to be tracked throughout the entire process. Although the first issue was solved by having Residence Life Coordinators conduct interviews and take notes on paper that were then given to Health and Wellness Promotion student staff to input into Student Voice, the second
issue continued to be unresolved during the spring semester. Even though students were offered incentives (a $5 Jamba Juice gift card or complimentary personal pizza from Round Table) most still refused to reply to Peer Health Educators’ attempts to contact them to schedule an appointment. However, during the fall twenty-one Peer Health Educator interviews were completed, which was one-third of the students who had attended the class in the fall so we feel that continuation of the program assessment is of value to the program.

Quantitative analysis of the data shows that the desired outcomes were not achieved in most of the objectives, especially regarding a reduction in the quantity and frequency of alcohol use by referred residents. This was not unexpected. Studies conducted throughout institutions of higher education consistently demonstrate that educational interventions do not impact student drinking behaviors. However, analysis of the qualitative data does show that information learned in the class was retained, and in some cases, incorporated into student drinking behaviors (i.e. alternating water and alcoholic beverages). Additionally, in analyzing the data, there seems to be a correlation between students not incorporating risk-reducing behaviors and continuing to consume alcohol after attending the class. When considering only the students who continued to consume alcohol after the class the percentage of those incorporating protective behaviors that they learned from the class is much lower than if one were to include those students who did not consume alcohol after taking the class. Unfortunately, the data collection procedure instructed Peer Health Educators to only ask those who had continued drinking after the class the question about what they learned and had incorporated from the class. If we consider the students who did not consume alcohol after taking the class as incorporating at least one protective behavior (abstinence) the percentage of those incorporating this behavior increases significantly. This is an issue that will be considered for the collection of data in fall 2010.

Additionally, in reflecting on whether the class had a positive effect on student behavior, if one considers the quantitative and qualitative data cited for Objective D, that residents will not have had another noise or alcohol violation in the residence halls, the sanctioning of students to the class did have an impact. 95% of students had not received another violation and most of them indicated that being held accountable was a reason why. This raises the question about the intention of the sanction—although it would be desirable to positively impact student drinking behavior, ultimately the adjudication process is designed to reduce the incidence of policy violations, which was achieved.

Finally, the analysis of data for this project proved quite difficult. Challenges included the fact that students did not understand the last part of the unique identifier (the date of the day you were born) thinking that we were asking for their actual birth date, which would compromise their anonymity. The team also observed some confusion in answers that should have only been letters but were reported as numbers (the first letter of the city you were born in). The birth date issue has been resolved by asking students for the last four digits of their cell phone number, although, this too has some concern around the protection of their identity. Additionally, although Student Voice staff had said that matching all of the reported data with each individual participant would be
simple, this was not the case. The team actually spent a lot of time going through each report by hand to match up the data.

As we implement this assessment for 2010-2011 we will be reviewing and evaluating the assessment tools that were utilized and will be working more closely with Student Voice to determine whether there is a more streamlined process to compare all of the data given by individuals. We will also consider how to increase our student participation for PHE interviews and follow up questionnaires.

**Student Learning Outcome 2**

Educate the Resident Advisor (RA) staff about the purpose of live-in staff, common issues associated with residents, and reoccurring themes linked to residents. After reading the designated RA textbook and participating in a two-week RA training, the RA staff will demonstrate their knowledge of the RA position, common issues associated with the position and reoccurring themes linked to residents by scoring 80% or better on the post test.

*Rationale*: Before the Resident Advisors arrive to campus for the school year, the RA textbook should be read. For the 2009-2010 school year, the RA textbook has been identified as the sixth edition of *The Resident Assistant* by Gregory Blimling. The textbook will provide insight on the history of residence halls and the RA position, offer tips on balancing school and the RA position, explore topics residents often experience, offer techniques on managing commonly encountered situations, and ultimately gain a better understanding of student development. After reading the book, the RA will be administered a 50-question, multiple choice test. The test will be administered on two different occasions. The first occasion will be on the first day of Resident Advisor Training; the second will take place in late September. The RAs will start with the knowledge obtained from reading the book, have the opportunity to complete training, gain one month of job experience, and retake the test for improvement. This Outcome is in alignment with the Baccalaureate Learning Goal of Analysis and Problem Solving, specifically to analyze complex issues and make informed decisions.

**Measures**

**Measure 2:**

Resident Advisors will be administered the test in August during the first day of Resident Advisor Training and then again in September. The pre-test and post-test will be comprised of 50-multiple choice questions.

Collection Dates: The pre-test was administered August 12, 2009 and the posttest was administered September 30, 2009.
Method: Pre-test and post-test administered as part of the Resident Advisor Training.

Populations: First year and returning (second and third year) Resident Advisors hired for the 2009-2010 academic year.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>August 12, 2009</th>
<th>September 28, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year RAs</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning RAs</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All RAs</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the results show, scores of the First Year Resident Advisors increased 25 percentage points. The scores showed substantial increase from the initial scores taken before Resident Advisor training, and the second set of scores taken after Resident Advisor training and a few weeks of on-the-job training. Results also showed a substantial increase for Returning Resident Advisors with an overall average of 23 percentage points.

The greatest percentage point improvement for an individual First Year Resident Advisor was 56 percentage points, and the greatest percentage point improvement for an individual Returning Resident Advisor was 44 percentage points. Of the thirty-eight Resident Advisors involved in the assessment, two individuals decreased in scores by 2 percentage points, which is the equivalent of answering one question incorrectly on the post-test.

Conclusions

Reading the Resident Advisor textbook and attending August Resident Advisor Training proved to be successful. Test scores showed a 23% improvement from pre-test to post-test. The data indicates an increase in job knowledge. The 23% improvement is higher than the 8% 2008-2009 test results. The 80% goal was met, thus making the Resident Advisor textbook Resident Advisor training essential components of the Resident Advisors position.

Two factors can be attributed to the successful increase in post-test scores. Last year, the test was based on the presentations throughout Resident Advisor training. Based on feedback, presentations were not consistent with the test. This year the test was based solely on the Resident Advisor textbook. The second factor to consider is last year the department had two Residence Life Coordinators (RLCs) to focus on all details related
to Resident Advisor training including the test. This year there were four RLCs to equally divide training responsibilities. In addition, RLCs had the opportunity to meet with hall staffs to discuss the pre-test scores and review test material during staff meetings. The staff benefited from reviewing the test and having the opportunity to ask clarifying questions to actually understand the material.

In conclusion, the test was a successful assessment instrument as the Resident Advisor textbook provided insight into the position. In addition, Resident Advisor training helped to enforce material covered in the textbook. Finally, the RLCs covering the material with the Resident Advisors also had a positive influence on the successful increase of posttest scores. This assessment will not be conducted for the 2010-2011 academic year.

**Student Learning Outcome 3**

The Housing and Residential Life Resident Advisors and Community Assistants will demonstrate a 10% reduction in content, mechanical and objectivity errors between August RA Workshop and RA Class (November 4).

*Rationale*: RAs and CAs must be able to write objective, accurate, and concise incident reports during their tenure as a Resident Advisor or Community Assistant. *This Outcome is in alignment with the Baccalaureate Learning Goal of Communication, more specifically in expressing ideas and facts in a variety of written and quantitative formats and to a variety of audiences in discipline-specific, work place, and civic contexts.*

**Measures**

**Measure 3:**

During the August RA Workshop, the Resident Advisors and Community Assistants will participate in an incident report writing session receiving instruction on how to properly write incident reports. A video portraying a typical incident in the residence halls was shown, and the RAs and CAs were asked to write an incident report. A rubric is used to evaluate and score the writing samples. In November, the video will be shown again, and the RAs and CAs will write a second incident report. These incident reports will also be evaluated using the same scoring rubric.

**Collection Date(s):** First writing sample was collected during the RA Workshop in August. The second writing sample will be collected in November 2009.

**Method:** The writing workshop held in August, defined for the RAs and CAs what information should be included in an accurate, concise and objective incident report. After they were given writing instructions, each staff member observed a filmed
“incident” which they were then asked to document. Each RA and CA’s writing was then evaluated (using a rubric) and will be returned. A second writing opportunity will be provided to them on November 4, 2009.

To receive an optimum score; content, mechanics and objectivity, were to be rated and plotted onto the rubric.

---

**Results**

The IR writing assessment was scored on a 0-12 point scale by each of the five Residence Life Coordinators. Each RA could score a maximum of 60 points total. The average overall score increased over two points, from 46.86 to 48.97.

Of the 37 RAs who participated in the first incident report writing assessment exercise, the highest score was 56 while the lowest was a 34.

The results of the November 4 writing exercise showed an increase of just less than one point for the RAs who were returning the position after previously holding it for a semester or more. The average score increased from 49.61 to 50.44. The results of the new RA scores were more dramatic. The average increased by over three points, from 44.26 to 47.58.

The second exercise showed an increase of the lowest score to a 41, and the highest score was improved to a 58. Of the 37 RAs who participated in both writing exercises, only 5 showed a decrease in the two scores. Seventeen of the scores improved and five others remained consistent. Four RAs showed an increase of over 10 points between the two exercises.

These findings indicate that this was a valued added assessment in the process of learning how to properly write an incident report.

---

**Conclusions**

This training was very successful. Both first time and returning RAs scored well during the first exercise and the majority improved when tested again. None of the RAs had any problem understanding how to correctly document the situation, many of the discrepancies were in grammar and the details provided in their description of the incident.

A new filmed incident was used this year which seemed to cause less confusion for many of the RAs.
The 10% reduction in error goal will remain the same for the upcoming August training. The percentage goal should remain the same because the majority of the staff will be new hires.

The pre-writing exercise should continue to be scheduled for August training with the post-training to be scheduled for later in the semester. This gives a sufficient amount of time for the tests to be returned to the RAs so that they can see their mistakes and learn from them. In the future it would be better to share the scores of the first exercise with the RAs earlier in the semester so that it helps in their on-the-job IR writing. This assessment will not be conducted for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Michael Speros, Housing and Residential Life. 916-278-6655.
msperos@saclink.csus.edu
Multi-Cultural Center
2009-10 Assessment Plan

Mission: The Multi-Cultural Center at Sacramento State supports the needs of diverse communities by providing educational programs and a welcoming space that helps students learn about themselves and others. By partnering with multiple campus and community entities to co-create diversity and social justice initiatives, the MCC is committed to responding to student needs, building bridges for fostering social awareness and cultural understanding, and taking action on important issues and concerns for our communities.

Planning Goals

Goal 1: Develop a sustainable and thriving Multi-Cultural Center program.

Goal 2: Improve and provide an outstanding intern development program grounded in diversity and social justice, leadership, and wellness.

Goal 3: Continue to cultivate a welcoming environment that helps retain and graduate all students, especially those from historically under-represented or under-served communities.

Intern Leadership Program: Student Learning Outcome 1

Background

The purpose of the Multi-Cultural Center Intern Program is to cultivate student leaders by providing training, curriculum, project assignments, experiential learning, and mentorship. Given the success of the first year of the program we were excited to take on the challenge of improving areas of the program for the second year. Some of the growth areas consisted of more training in; program planning, conflict resolution, and most importantly identity development and social justice education. To address these needs we increased the summer training from one day to five days, included a group project (fall semester) in addition to their independent project (spring semester), and altered the supervision model so that each supervisor advised no more than two interns. The supervisors established goals, challenged and supported the interns to facilitate their personal and professional development specifically in the areas of wellness, leadership and social justice and diversity (the three pillars underpinning the MCC). We were also able to reclassify the Administrative Support Coordinator position to a Student Support Services/Program Coordinator position which allowed for more focus on the development of the intern program. These changes, as well as more creative mentorship and supervision throughout the year, set the foundation for a more structured experience compared to the previous year. The intern program purpose statement and syllabus are available in Appendix A.
About the Internship Program

This year we were able to provide six intern opportunities that supported the success of the center; two Programming Interns, a Social Justice Art Intern, an Academic and Outreach Intern, a Newsletter and Media Intern, and a Graduate Assistant Intern. Each intern had a specialized focus. For example, the Social Justice Art Intern worked specifically on coordinating art related exhibits, community projects, and faculty collaborations.

During the first semester, interns read curriculum focused on the three pillars (leadership, wellness, social justice and diversity), learned about themselves as related to being and becoming agents of social change, and attended leadership and one-on-one meetings with supervisors. Leadership meetings were designed to emphasize the interconnectedness of leadership, wellness, and social justice and diversity using readings, exercises, and guest facilitators. Through leadership meetings interns learned more about specific issue areas and were able to learn critical skills and information from a variety of campus staff leaders. Among other things interns gained specific knowledge in: Safe Zone training (Jackson Harris, PRIDE Center), community collaboration (Brendan McVeigh, Community Engagement Center), and proposal writing (Hellen Lee-Keller, English). Ultimately, through this process interns gained greater skills and knowledge and with help of their supervisor were able to demonstrate what they learned by creating and executing projects that aligned their passions with the needs and goals of the Multi-Cultural Center.

Learning Outcomes & Methods

By May 1, 2010 all six paid student interns will have:

- Increased knowledge and vocabulary on issues of diversity, social justice, and leadership
- Completed one intern project and one group project
- Created a resume for the purpose of career development
- Shared internship experiences through written reflections and a focus group dialogue
  a) Sub-learning outcomes from the focus group dialogue include:
     ▪ Interns will demonstrate knowledge of acquired leadership skills, personal wellness enhancements, and awareness of social justice issues.
     ▪ Interns will reflect on their growth and transformation as individuals and as a cohort.

We will measure increased competency for interns using the following methods:

- Short answer paper to demonstrate increased knowledge and vocabulary (25% from pre-assessment individual baseline to post-assessment paper)
- Resume (80% or higher based on grading rubric)
- Semester reflections
- Participation in a year-end focus group
Collection Date(s):  September 2009 and May 2010  
Method:  Short Answer Questionnaire, Paper, Resume, and Focus Group  
Populations:  Multi-Cultural Center Student Assistants (paid interns)  

Results: Increased Knowledge in Leadership, Social Justice, and Wellness

*Leadership Begins Here … at the Multi-Cultural Center.* As a cohort, all interns did an outstanding job in understanding their own multiple identities, developing programs that infused their areas for growth (and curiosities) with MCC program needs, and cultivating a student leader community. For this assessment, we thought it was important to reflect each intern’s journey. These results will give voice to their stories of growth in the intern program. We used information from the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), the Relational Leadership Model, and Social Justice Education philosophies (Adams & Bell, et al, 1997) to inform our learning outcomes.

The first day of the internship all interns were required to write essays on their understanding of wellness, leadership, and social justice and diversity, as it related to their experience and knowledge. The pre-internship essays demonstrated their awareness of “others.” Generally, they defined social justice as solely being about helping others and being respectful toward other cultures. The majority of the essays focused on appreciating diversity on a surface level. Many of their thoughts centered around two concepts – namely, respect and equality. While this was a great place for them to start, the second level of understanding “self in relation to others” was not explored as much in their essays (CAS). A few people talked about their most salient identities, but not necessarily their areas of improvement, or areas of privilege. These assessments were later used by each interns’ respective supervisors, and together they determine appropriate professional and personal goals to assist in growth for each area.

Additionally, interns filled out a Developmental Outcomes Inventory and a Self-Assessment that surveyed their perceptions of their leadership skills. Pre-assessment: The majority of the interns indicated that they were somewhere along the range between “improvement needed” and “above expectations” for each area. Almost all did not mark “exceptional,” which was the highest mark for this scale. However, post-assessment, some of the interns expressed that they only marked the highest score because they thought that is what we expected from them, not where they actually saw themselves. At the end of the internship several interns expressed that they now have a more realistic understanding of their skill sets and competencies.

After the first semester, it was clear that there were some areas of improvement for interns. All came into the internship needing improvement on understanding how to promote diversity, feeling confident in their capacities as leaders, becoming conscious of wellness practices, initiating projects, and planning and coordinating programs. We developed leadership plans with each intern to focus on specific areas of growth through projects and assignments.
Social Justice and Diversity

Similar to CAS and the definition of *social justice education* by Adams and Bell, we wanted students to expand their notions of diversity to become more comprehensive. In short, this required students to challenge their preconceived beliefs and values, understand their blind spots, and learn about histories and dynamics of power, privilege, and oppression in this society, and lastly, to become better social change agents (by assisting all communities to be well and full participants in society).

By the end of the internship, all students improved in their own learning continuums of diversity and social justice. Many mentioned that their understanding of privilege, power, oppression, empowerment, and social justice concepts were enhanced by events hosted by the center, readings, and their own project processes.

The following excerpts taken from intern post-assessment papers share their increased knowledge of social justice and diversity concepts:

I’ve learned to recognize, listen to, and appreciate others’ experiences, no matter how different they may be from my own. **It’s still a process, and I sometimes still find myself struggling to accept an alternate truth, and for me this is an important part of the journey.** I have been challenged to see the need for programs that foster inclusion in higher education. – *Newsletter Editor and Marketing Intern*

“Before, my time at the MCC, Social Justice meant I was the *helper*, never taking an introspective look at my own oppression as a young Latina woman in higher education. I always understood I had a different outlook on life being me, but at the MCC I learned to dissect these parts of me, embrace them and put them into social justice terms. I learned about the intersectionality of the many parts of my identity… At the MCC, I also learned the true meaning of *allyship*. While, I was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Outcomes Inventory</th>
<th>Self-Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Skills</td>
<td>• Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality and Productivity</td>
<td>• Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiative and Innovation</td>
<td>• Conflict Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Facilitation of Meetings/Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resourcefulness</td>
<td>• Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teamwork and Collaboration</td>
<td>• Teambuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Punctuality and Accountability</td>
<td>• Providing Constructive Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal and Professional Goals</td>
<td>• Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting Diversity and Social</td>
<td>• Event Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>• Event Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforcing Policy and Disciplinary Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentoring New Leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Justice and Marketing

Enforcing Policy and Disciplinary Action

Social Justice and Diversity

Similar to CAS and the definition of *social justice education* by Adams and Bell, we wanted students to expand their notions of diversity to become more comprehensive. In short, this required students to challenge their preconceived beliefs and values, understand their blind spots, and learn about histories and dynamics of power, privilege, and oppression in this society, and lastly, to become better social change agents (by assisting all communities to be well and full participants in society).

By the end of the internship, all students improved in their own learning continuums of diversity and social justice. Many mentioned that their understanding of privilege, power, oppression, empowerment, and social justice concepts were enhanced by events hosted by the center, readings, and their own project processes.

The following excerpts taken from intern post-assessment papers share their increased knowledge of social justice and diversity concepts:

I’ve learned to recognize, listen to, and appreciate others’ experiences, no matter how different they may be from my own. **It’s still a process, and I sometimes still find myself struggling to accept an alternate truth, and for me this is an important part of the journey.** I have been challenged to see the need for programs that foster inclusion in higher education. – *Newsletter Editor and Marketing Intern*

“Before, my time at the MCC, Social Justice meant I was the *helper*, never taking an introspective look at my own oppression as a young Latina woman in higher education. I always understood I had a different outlook on life being me, but at the MCC I learned to dissect these parts of me, embrace them and put them into social justice terms. I learned about the intersectionality of the many parts of my identity… At the MCC, I also learned the true meaning of *allyship*. While, I was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Outcomes Inventory</th>
<th>Self-Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Skills</td>
<td>• Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality and Productivity</td>
<td>• Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiative and Innovation</td>
<td>• Conflict Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Facilitation of Meetings/Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resourcefulness</td>
<td>• Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teamwork and Collaboration</td>
<td>• Teambuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Punctuality and Accountability</td>
<td>• Providing Constructive Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal and Professional Goals</td>
<td>• Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting Diversity and Social</td>
<td>• Event Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>• Event Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforcing Policy and Disciplinary Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentoring New Leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Justice and Marketing

Enforcing Policy and Disciplinary Action

Social Justice and Diversity

Similar to CAS and the definition of *social justice education* by Adams and Bell, we wanted students to expand their notions of diversity to become more comprehensive. In short, this required students to challenge their preconceived beliefs and values, understand their blind spots, and learn about histories and dynamics of power, privilege, and oppression in this society, and lastly, to become better social change agents (by assisting all communities to be well and full participants in society).

By the end of the internship, all students improved in their own learning continuums of diversity and social justice. Many mentioned that their understanding of privilege, power, oppression, empowerment, and social justice concepts were enhanced by events hosted by the center, readings, and their own project processes.

The following excerpts taken from intern post-assessment papers share their increased knowledge of social justice and diversity concepts:

I’ve learned to recognize, listen to, and appreciate others’ experiences, no matter how different they may be from my own. **It’s still a process, and I sometimes still find myself struggling to accept an alternate truth, and for me this is an important part of the journey.** I have been challenged to see the need for programs that foster inclusion in higher education. – *Newsletter Editor and Marketing Intern*

“Before, my time at the MCC, Social Justice meant I was the *helper*, never taking an introspective look at my own oppression as a young Latina woman in higher education. I always understood I had a different outlook on life being me, but at the MCC I learned to dissect these parts of me, embrace them and put them into social justice terms. I learned about the intersectionality of the many parts of my identity… At the MCC, I also learned the true meaning of *allyship*. While, I was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Outcomes Inventory</th>
<th>Self-Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational Skills</td>
<td>• Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality and Productivity</td>
<td>• Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiative and Innovation</td>
<td>• Conflict Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>• Facilitation of Meetings/Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resourcefulness</td>
<td>• Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teamwork and Collaboration</td>
<td>• Teambuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Punctuality and Accountability</td>
<td>• Providing Constructive Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal and Professional Goals</td>
<td>• Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting Diversity and Social</td>
<td>• Event Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>• Event Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforcing Policy and Disciplinary Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Time Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentoring New Leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintained the attitude of “I am open-minded,” the MCC taught me that allyship means a lot more than that. For me allyship does not mean to just to ‘support’ a community you may not necessarily be a part of, but it means to acknowledge your privileges and support communities with sincerity and genuine intention. As allies, we must realize that although at times our intentions are good, they may not always be appropriate, and it is at these moments when we truly show our allyship by accepting our privilege.” – Social Justice Art Intern

Social Justice to me now means a continuous fight for the right to be. It means that as long as we don’t understand that differences among people are valuable to enrich our experiences, we won’t achieve equality. Two of the events that impacted me the most were the film screening of “Mirrors of Privilege” and the talk that Tim Wise gave about making whiteness visible. Not only the events themselves were inspiring and powerful to me, but the experiences that came with promoting the events gave me a deeper insight on the challenges we are facing today regarding race... the fight for social justice means being proactive, it implies recognizing where I stand in the world to recognize my oppressions and the scope of my privilege so that I can acknowledge others. It means seeing the differences in humanity not as an obstacle, but as a tool to create unity and bring peace. – Academic and Outreach Intern

Even though we have come far to understand cultural diversity to an extent, we still have to work on seeing the disadvantages and advantages that still exist in class, race, education, ability, and age. For example, from the event on white privilege presented from Shakti Butler, I learned about micro level racism (internal and interpersonal) and macro level racism (institutional, structural). It gave me a better understanding of how racism is hidden and weaved in all aspects of society, and why some people see it and others don’t. I realized that someone from another culture or class may not think the same way; even someone who is of the same age or culture as me may have different experiences and thoughts from me. – Programming Intern

Leadership
Our main hopes for leadership development were that interns would be able to 1) articulate their leadership style; 2) work cooperatively and seek feedback from others; 3) become a strong leaders for the MCC; 4) have an awareness of group dynamics; and 5) excel in their own personal and professional leadership goals.

Although each intern had a different understanding of their leadership style, all learned through the internship that leadership is not simply hierarchical or positional and that it requires social justice and wellness to be at the core of their leadership ethic. While not all decisions were made through consensus within the team, the MCC staff team was committed to making appropriate interventions when conflict arose, and cultivated the team through trust building exercises in order to “model the way” for the students, demonstrating that they all were important stakeholders in the team. Some examples of team building exercises we employed were group dialogues, identity development
exercises, and feedback sessions. Students shared that the leadership inventories helped them chart and make meaning of their growth.

The following excerpts are taken from the intern post-assessment papers and the focus group dialogues:

Today, leadership is infused in all other aspects of my life. Instead of being a robot that only passes commands from in a vertical model, a leader understands others and encourages others as one unit. In other words, working together to create connections between people is as important as learning how to teach and guide others through a process to attain a particular goal. With this, community building begins to arise. But I have learned through the MCC that the journey to build community can become difficult and treacherous. This journey I speak of takes me through learning how to overcome my own stereotypes, prejudices and of course, discrimination, whether it is internal or external. To become a better leader, I know that I must continue learning about the power dynamics in our society that cause disadvantages or privileges and exclusion or inclusion of people. – Programming Intern

… and even to have interns or the community directly or indirectly challenge me to grow. The thing that I’ll get to use in the future… [is that] I do have the leadership qualities to build community with folks where most folks may not feel that community is happening… to allow folks to build community so that they can help each other, help one another, and themselves. And that’s the thing that’s been most valuable to me: that I am capable of building community amongst a group of folks to the point where they do, or they will grow themselves, and grow into a sense of belonging and family, that “family,” which the MCC for most folks is like a second home. – Graduate Assistant

The change had to start within me… it really is my responsibility… As an individual I have the power to change. And, I have the responsibility to change. So, I have grown a lot, so much through all that… – Programming Intern

Wellness
Health and wellness seemed to have been a relatively new concept to all interns, or if not a new idea, certainly a place of growth and improvement. While we acknowledge the multiple models for wellness, our goal was to help interns stay on track with healthy choices as students first. We hoped that through this experience interns would better understand and practice the following:

- Acknowledging the relationship between wellness and accomplishing goals
- Being mindful of mental, emotional/social, mental, physical, and spiritual wellness
- Balancing school, work, and personal workloads,
- Practicing respectful behavior, and,
- Encouraging healthy relationships (interpersonal and group).

While wellness as a pillar was the most challenging area to master (for both the students and staff), we did see growth in emotional and mental wellness throughout the year. The most notable behavioral growth for students was being able to cultivate
healthy work relationships by encouraging honesty with self and with the group. Similarly, interns expressed that some of their projects enabled positive and healthy identity development that nurtured both their emotional, mental, and soul needs for wellness.

Certainly this is an area that we need to continue to work on. We theorize that our constrained ability to model wellness for students is connected to our unsustainable workload and staffing resources. However, despite these challenges, we continue to emphasize the importance of this dimension because we know we must first be well before we can tackle anything else.

The following excerpts are taken from the intern post-assessment papers and the focus group dialogues:

Before the MCC, I thought wellness was all physical. Now, I have a holistic way of looking at it. Wellness is about mind, spirit, soul, feeling, hope as well as physical. I may not have perfected wellness (who really can!), but I was able to learn about myself on a very deep and personal level. I always knew who I truly was, but the MCC helped me share it with others. My struggle often related to my inability to talk about myself to others (I often thought my experience was not as valid as other experiences), but this changed as I found that others were interested in what I had to say and genuinely cared. I found that the more I shared my feelings the more empowered I felt. To me this is wellness! **This experience, especially the second semester of this internship, was a healing experience. I was able to do things that I thought I was not capable of doing. I was able to speak my truth, heal, get angry, then happy. I learned how to express all these!** For me wellness this year was about getting to know who I was, expressing it, embracing it, and loving it. Loving myself; that was I truly gained this year and that is what wellness is all about for me! – Social Justice Art Intern

Wellness, for example, is important for leaders, who need to be role models. When a role model is crazed and frantic, others may feel that they can be the same without consequences. This is one of the pillars that I have the most trouble with, especially in relation to work life. **The MCC’s emphasis on wellness is still amazing to me sometimes, because I’ve never had a job where staying home when sick is encouraged.** I’m used to, in a way, “spending” my wellness on getting things done; that is, productivity at the expense of wellness. This manifests in late nights studying, not being able to say “no”, taking on overwhelming tasks, and sometimes even neglect of interpersonal relationships in favor of getting things done. **What is important for me here is finding a balance.** – Newsletter and Media Intern

The Interconnectedness of Wellness, Social Justice, and Leadership
One of the pleasant yet unintended surprises included intern’s abilities to embrace and articulate the interconnectedness of the three pillars. Our trainings, projects, and curriculum attempted to show the connection and relationship between these great values. We also identified these complexities as **intersectionality**, meaning the
intersections between our multiple identities, and the places of interconnectedness with various thoughts and philosophies of wellness, social justice, and leadership. We asked the interns to continue to be mindful about the interconnectedness of wellness, social justice, and leadership practices, and the following quotes showed us that they made meaning of interconnectedness in their own ways.

Everything is so interconnected. I’ve just grown basically to have more passion and thought. And I think things through more than just a second. It’s like I already have an opinion. And, like what one of my fellow interns said, I want to think things through before thinking that I already know that answer. You know, I don’t always have to know the answer, right away. I could ask the question, like, “hey, I don’t know that answer.” – Programming Intern

Everything I have mentioned here is an example of the intersectionality of all the social justice issues alive today. Throughout the year, each topic or issue has built upon each other for me to understand about the relationships we have with each other on a personal and societal level. Social justice is not a ‘thing to do’ it is not a project, it is not an event, it is not ‘something they do,’ it is something we live and face every day of our lives whether we want to deal with it or not. What is important is not its definition, but how it is manifested by all of us. – Programming Intern

All the activities allowed me to realize that I can’t be committed to something if I am not well first. I cannot lead if I am tired, sick or stressed because my energy will affect the group work; I cannot educate, inspire or generate change if I am not grounded and recognize my emotions; I cannot give love to others if I don’t love myself first- and loving myself requires that I take care of my body, my soul and my spirit. One of the most important things I learned about wellness is the collective aspect of it. Knowing that in order to help balance the wellbeing of the community I first need to know myself and recognize my needs represents a milestone for my understanding of wellness. Being able to see myself as part of a whole and as an agent whose actions affect the dynamics my immediate social circles, makes me think about what I can and what should not do in order to foster harmony with those I interact with. – Academic and Outreach Intern

Growth and Transformation

This experience for me is… if I had to sum it up in two words, I would have to say is a, powerful transformation. I can’t think of any other opportunity or way that I could have gotten the experience that I have gotten. – Graduate Assistant

In the focus group session interns talked a lot about their own personal and professional transformations. Some talked specifically of their individual skill set growth, but all talked about their emotional and cognitive improvements around ethical leadership,
trusting the process, learning about their own identities, misconceptions, areas for growth, and strengths.

At the beginning of the year, we encouraged students to consider this experience as a process. We taught students that the journey is just as important, if not more important, than the destination. “Relational leadership is about process” and requires leaders to engage collaboratively not competitively, with a conscious commitment to reflection and self-exploration (Komives, 2007). And these values contribute to developing a socially just society where are groups can fully participate in society and are psychologically and physically well (adapted from the Social Justice Training Institute). This includes making a conscientious effort to understanding and serving the needs of underprivileged groups on a cultural, individual, and institutional level.

My number one goal at the beginning of the year was gaining self-confidence in myself, in my abilities to complete projects… to go after my dreams, and not second guess myself, and to really believe in who I am, and my abilities – and to stand up. I think that I’ve grown so much… I am really starting to truly believe in my abilities to complete projects, to be a good friend, to believe in myself. – Social Justice Art Intern

The Multi-Cultural Center (MCC) is my home at Sacramento State…it is a place where I have the privilege to smile, laugh, communicate and build community. On the other hand, the MCC has challenged me to look within myself. At times, I felt frustrated, angry, misunderstood and even defensive. Nonetheless, the MCC (Charlene and Jeanette) through the internship program have presented new “mind” tools to help me understand my thoughts and feelings. – Programming Intern

Further evidence of their own transformations occurred in the evaluations of their projects. The heart of the MCC Internship Program lies in the opportunity for interns to create Self-Initiated Projects and commit to self-reflection and growth. Each component of the program builds upon each other and is a constant process. For instance, weekly one-on-ones with supervisors were intended to challenge and support the students in developing their toolkits in the above learning outcomes. Additionally, interns with help from their respective supervisor were able to create comprehensive projects that allowed for their growth and development.

All interns successfully completed group and individual projects. All of which included but not limited to a proposal, timeline, budget, execution, and evaluation of their programs. Even with assorted obstacles, each intern produced stimulating projects that were congruent with their own social justice passions and aligned with the Center’s mission and values.

**Group Projects: (Appendix B)**
- I Can Do: A Mixer for Students with Disabilities
- “Rising to the Dream: Supporting the Success of AB540 Students”
- Connecting Our Voices: Women of Color Open Mic
Self-Initiated Projects: (Appendix C)

- This is Who I Am: Voices of Asian American Women at Sacramento State and Beyond, a mini-anthology
- Mujer: Asi Soy Yo: Thoughts from Chicana/Latina Women at Sacramento State, a mini-anthology
- My Privilege: Change Starts with Me, a process of investigation and workshop on male privilege
- Mixed Heritage Week, programs highlighting the multiracial experience
- Women of Color: Confronting Feelings about Racism, Sexism, and Cultural Expectations, programs focused on empowerment and understanding
- Queer People of Color (QPOC): Community Building Series, programs and events

Conclusions

Similar to last year, we initially created the assessment using a quantitative methodology to measure the growth of the interns and the program. However, mid-way through the year, we realized that it was best to measure the growth of the interns qualitatively using narratives and excerpts from their essays, reflections, and focus groups to adequately represent their knowledge gained. As a result this assessment truly captured more of the “heart and soul” and affective development of the interns. This type of flexibility allowed us to be more creative with our learning outcomes and employ stronger interventions for success throughout the program.

The leadership intern program has been an invaluable enhancement of the Multi-Cultural Center this academic year. In addition to all interns exceeding the learning outcomes, their participation and effort as part of the MCC team has greatly improved the Center’s visibility and commitment to being student-centered. We found that cultivating each intern’s leadership path and providing them with essential training and tools, helps to connect them with their purpose, and demonstrates that linking purpose with passion can happen, especially in a work setting. It is also equally impressive to see that this leadership internship met its goals in teaching leadership skills, encouraging the personal growth of student leaders, equipping students with tools to effectively support MCC programs, building a community of leaders, creating opportunities for interns to initiate projects, increasing awareness in the areas of identity development and social justice, and lastly, to increasing collaboration and partnership on campus.

The results of this year indicate that students learned through their self-guided learning and leadership meetings, one-on-one meetings, and self-initiated projects, among a host of other programs and opportunities. We are also clear that students walked away with more than improving their vocabulary, finishing a project, and enhancing their resumes. In their exit meetings, interns expressed the deep appreciation they had for opportunities to learn leadership through practice and be exposed to the kinds of programs and initiatives we provided at the center. Additionally, all expressed their desire to continue participating with the center and community, regardless of their
positional status. Thus, this shows the impact of this internship, as students truly find that *leadership does begin here*.

In addition to individual and collective leadership and personal growth, we acknowledge the impact of interns' leadership for the greater campus community. We have received letters and feedback from student affairs administrators, faculty, and other students who have shared their appreciation for interns and their various contributions. More specifically, we have heard that they are having a positive impact in the classroom, in student organizations, and in campus-wide decision making. For instance, in a recent letter, Aya Ida, professor in the Sociology Department, expressed her high regard for Monica Barba (2008-2009 intern), a former MCC intern who made a significant impact on leadership development for a newly created peer mentoring program in her respective academic department. Ida stated, “As a coordinator, her incredible organizational and interpersonal skills were well known among the student and faculty members. I believe that the MCC has played an important role for her in gaining and fostering such skills… This is a good example of how an intern at the MCC has grown into a leader not only at the center, but in a great community on campus.”

Aside from the assessment data and results, there have been separate initiatives led independently or in collaboration with the Center that demonstrate the positive effects of the intern program. For an interactive example, visit [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gZanhnOr-ZQ] to view a video created by a former intern, Yeimi Lopez about the Multi-Cultural Center. Also, few podcasts are now available on [http://www.csus.edu/mcc/aboutus/program_review.stm] from former student interns, and staff and community members who talk about their experiences with the center, created by Felix Barba.

Future areas of development for the internship program that deserve our attention include:

1) While the intern program has proven to be a rewarding program for the interns and campus, it is extremely labor intensive. Thinking ahead, we are concerned about the sustainability of the program, especially without the support of additional staff.

2) Ultimately, we believe this program inherently enhances campus-wide co-curricular leadership opportunities, supports students in achieving graduation, and helps to close the achievement gap; however, we would like to consider ways in which we can demonstrate this more clearly, and would need more resources to be able to be more effective in this area.

3) The intern program had developed into a highly competitive program and requires that students be able to manage their course loads prior to entering the internship. This poses as a dilemma for many students who do not meet the minimum GPA requirement of 3.0. We would love to be able to explore the possibility of developing an alternative program, however, this would also require more staffing and resources.
4) Since the internship requires students to develop projects in addition to their given position workloads, the supervisors have to pay close attention to the work and development of each intern. This year we employed a two intern per supervisor (maximum load) to mitigate the previous year’s workload problems. This setup has worked well for us, however, since we were not able to secure a Graduate Assistant position to supervise for the next academic cycle, we will only be able to take on an intern load of four students.

References and Resource List

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS)
Social Justice Training Handbook
UC San Diego Cross-Cultural Center, Intern Program Model. http://ccc.ucsd.edu/

Making Whiteness Visible Workshop: Learning Outcome 2

Background

At the Multi-Cultural Center we focus on fostering community and promoting our three pillars; leadership, wellness and social justice and diversity. Our primary constituency is to serve the student population first. However, during the 2008-09 academic year we received several requests from staff and faculty to host trainings around diversity. A handful of faculty and staff specifically requested workshops to educate and bring awareness to the dynamics of white privilege. As a result, we initially hoped to engage students, staff, and faculty in one workshop held in the fall semester. At that point the intended audience was open to any campus community member who could commit to the three hour time slot. We had intended to host the workshop and film in the MCC for thirty people.

We chose to bring Dr. Shakti Butler because of her work in the field of understanding white privilege. Dr. Butler is a multiracial African-American woman (African, Arawak Indian and Russian-Jewish) who has been working in the field of social justice for over 20 years. She is a producer and director of a handful of documentaries which include the film we brought to campus, Mirrors of Privilege: Making Whiteness Visible. She is a highly regarded inspirational facilitator, trainer and diversity scholar. Given her
background and experience we were confident that she would be the perfect facilitator for this program.

However, due to an unforeseeable time conflict, we were forced to reschedule the event for the spring semester. Though it did not seem like it at the time, this problem actually turned into a great opportunity. Ultimately, it gave us the time to reconsider the original format since our requests for the workshop exceeded our capacity. We decided to host two separate events. The first event was a film screening of *Mirrors of Privilege* (March 17, 2010, held in the Hinde Auditorium) followed by a question and answer session open to the public. The second day event was an opportunity for faculty and staff to “go deeper” with a smaller group, in a three hour workshop setting held at the Center.

It is important to mention that the workshop program was not articulated as a “train the trainers” type of session. Rather we advertised it as an opportunity for people to “deepen their personal work around racial justice and privilege” where participants would have the opportunity to analyze themselves in a supportive environment.

In order to capture the most information possible we not only conducted a paper survey to be able to capture people’s feelings right after the event, but also hosted audio interviews a few months later.

---

**Learning Outcomes & Methods**

In November 2009 we hoped to draw 30 participants (students, staff, and faculty) for the *Mirrors of Privilege: Making Whiteness Visible* workshop facilitated by Dr. Shakti Butler.

At the end of the program, participants will have:

- Built community with other participants
- Increased knowledge of the experiences of white women and men (in the film) who challenge notions of racism and white supremacy in the United States
- Learned more about their own personal stories through reflection and dialogue
- Completed a program evaluation for future program enhancement

**Rationale:** The MCC recognizes the importance of providing opportunities for the campus community to enhance their awareness of social justice education. Students, faculty and especially staff at Sacramento State have expressed interest in White privilege topics and associated issues of power and oppression. We intend to host this workshop as a response to requests for issue area training workshops. This learning outcome is intended for staff and faculty, as well as students. Learning Outcome 2 translates into the following area of the Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals:

- **Competence in the Disciplines through understanding the interconnections of diversity and social justice in their respective fields.**
- **Analysis and Problem solving through the ability to solve complex problems in their projects.**
- **Values and Pluralism through the**
  - recognition of the moral dimensions of decisions and actions
  - willingness to accept individual responsibility
ability to work collaboratively with those who come from diverse cultural backgrounds

For all participants we will request a:

• Pre-assessment to capture participant demographics, needs, and levels of exposure to workshop content and material
• Post-short answer questionnaire to demonstrate increased knowledge and vocabulary

For 3 participants:

• Post-event we will administer a personal interview with a student, staff, and faculty member to capture feedback, reflections, and personal growth.

Results: Film Screening Surveys - March 17, 2010

We had over 150 people attend the film screening and we received 40 surveys. The scale was 1-5 (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) and 87% of the responses were at a 4/5. The comments posed were; “Overall the film was great and I strongly recommend it to others; after watching this film, I am now more aware of the experiences of white women and men in the film who challenge notions of racism and white supremacy in the United States; I would like to know more about issues of institutionalized racism, privilege and oppression because of this program; I would like to see more films and/or programs like this one.” Below are some of the comments/reflections made by students;

This film screening made me reflect more about…

“My part with what I may have taken advantage of with my white privilege”

“About my own experience and the way I interact with others.”

“My own privileges and personal and social identities.”

“My own benefits of my invisible privilege as a light-skinned person of color.”

“The power of silence.”

“My privilege, challenges, how I can bring these topics to others in my school and work place”

“Great experience I have been craving more information about this topic.”

“Why I need to work more with white folks even though (or because) they/we are more difficult.”

Suggestions, comments, or feelings about the film screening and discussion:

“We NEED MORE EVENTS that make people question themselves!!!
“Take group into adjacent room to break into smaller groups for discussions or offer follow up discussions- Next day.”

“It really moved me.”

“The film touched me deeply! Thanks for showing it!!”

“Dr. Butler was extremely insightful.”

“The film was great. It should be screened again so that others can see it.”

Results: Workshop Surveys - March 18, 2010

There were 13 faculty and staff participants and 85% of the responses on the survey were a 5 of strongly agree and the rest were at a 4 with only one response filled at a 3 (scale 1-5, 1 being completely disagree and 5 being completely agree). Unfortunately, we were not able to give the participants much time before the session was over which could explain why there were not as many comments. We also imagine that people may have still been processing information at that point. Below are some of the responses from the participants;

The film screening made me reflect more about…
“what can I do, how I can recognize what I can do”

“privilege-ones I have and others I don’t have.”

“My own roles and feelings about racism and white privilege.”

“What needs to be done to combat racism at CSUS.”

“The layers of history and societal oppression that are mixed into racialization. We can ‘swimming’ in embedded assumptions, etc.”

“educating children. They are the most impressionable.”
“My perceptions and experiences. How I can work on incorporating change in everyday life.”

“Implementing changes in my current workplace, reflecting on how I can make changes now; work w/ group members to impact structural change.”
“The silent impact that privilege has on everyone.”
“Privileges I take for granted and strategies for working against systemic racial inequalities.”

Suggestions, comments, or feelings about the film screening and discussion:
“More time for workshops like this, expand to 4-5 hours even (or 2 days!)
“Thank you for bringing Shakti to our campus!”
“I would love follow-up discussions on how to create institutional and structural changes”
“Start a group on campus.”
“this is so valuable- should be required for all staff.”
“Needed more time for discussion.”
“I liked how the complexities of oppression was simplified by the graph.”
“Need 1 more HOUR!”
“What a wonderful start of the day! Powerful images and stories. I would love to engage in a longer retreat style workshop to continue the discussions…”

Results: Interview Feedback

We planned to interview a student, staff, and faculty member for the initial assessment of the program. Ultimately, due to the reconfiguration of the program, a student interview was not applicable for this portion of the assessment. Three interviews were conducted; one person self-identified as a faculty member and woman of color, and two people identified as Caucasian and staff members in the Division of Student Affairs. Also, interviews were conducted a few months after the program so that participants had ample time to process the experience.

While we acknowledge that each interview depended on the fluidity of the conversation, we wanted to highlight a few dominant themes that came up in all of the interviews. Some of these themes included, self-reflection in “diversity-work” as key to the learning process, high regard for Shakti Butler as a facilitator/filmmaker, excitement for workshops like these, and lastly, the importance of sensitivity and awareness education being emphasized from “the top” or from the administration or from supervisors.

Self-Growth and Self-Reflection
All participants mentioned that the workshop affected them personally and deepened their own personal work around their areas of privilege. They also mentioned their appreciation for having been able to attend a more accelerated training, rather than one that simply stayed on the surface or was simply “intellectualized,” or simply talked about the “other.” Further, though these three interviewees all stated that they have “done lots of training in the past” they had not ever engaged in anything quite like this workshop at Sacramento State. Even if they were uncomfortable during the session they indicated that it was a healthy tension and that it was positive that they were able to lean into their learning edge. These learning edges included getting in touch with their unconscious biases, privileges, preconceived notions, and empathy for students etc… Most shared that this workshop was a humbling experience in that they were able to fully engage with either the material or the other participants in the workshop, even despite learning style differences in more feeling oriented versus rational types of settings. Here are a couple of comments from the interviewees on their personal epiphanies:

“It also makes clear to me that some things we just keep having to relearn. So, the way that racism operates is something we need to relearn, all the time. You never just master it and then you’re good to go - because it’s around us all the time. Where it has its affect on you… that if you’re not hyper vigilant, you can slip into one position or another that you don’t necessarily want to be in. And that helps me think about where are students are, especially when they are
confronting really difficult and challenging tests and concepts. You learn how resistant people can be. And that resistance is mostly fear, fear of the unknown. So, institutively I want to say that [this experience] has made me more empathetic with students.”

“I think the whole sub-conscious aspect of racism, and bigotry and bias towards the other, whatever the other is… where even though I’ve actively sought to be more evolved and more conscious in my in relationships with diverse populations, there is still probably parts of me that reacts to certain people of color, or people that look a certain way… I’d probably have a reaction to it that I don’t even sometimes know.”

Professional Impact
All participants discussed the impact this workshop had on their professional development and believed that workshops like these help them become better at their jobs as faculty or staff. The faculty member discussed that this opportunity brought herself and another faculty member who attended the workshop closer together. Even though they work in the same department and share similar notions of social justice, they had never discussed the complexities of their own identities and the impact these dimensions have on their work. She attributed this deeper conversation to the shared experience of having attended this workshop together. Other impacts and observations from this experience are articulated below:

“I was able to participate in this workshop with my supervisor and key people in leadership roles so it fired people up in a good way. And it pushed people to incorporate diversity training in places where they hadn’t necessarily thought about it. It gave them tools and helped them apply it. This workshop helped set the wheels in motion. As a result we implemented five one hour sessions in our own department.”

“I think trainings like these are critical, I think they are essential [for people in student affairs] especially for white people, for the dominant culture. I think it’s important to be reminded that not everybody’s experience is equal and this is not a post-racial society. As they were talking about in the workshop, and just because we have a Black president now doesn’t mean we don’t need to worry about equal opportunity and social justice and affirmative action… especially when you’re working at an institution with such a diverse population as we have here at Sac State.”

Accountability and Institutional Prioritization
Participants shared that they would like the administration to place a more direct effort into institutionalizing and supporting diversity education so that it is accessible and ongoing for staff and faculty to engage in. They articulated the need for this to be infused at all levels and held accountable through performance evaluations, supported by supervisors and Human Resources, and modeled by administrators. Many ideas were shared about entities other than the Multi-Cultural Center to provide comprehensive trainings that support the goal of multicultural competency in a more systematic way.
Some ideas that interviewees had include: hosting semester retreats with follow up workshops, innovative programs and mentorship etc.

Two of the three participants spoke about the budget crisis and how that often allows diversity initiatives to take a back seat. Participants shared that one “easy” remedy is to emphasize the inherent link between retention/graduation efforts and diversity/inclusion education. However, ultimately they shared that it is the responsibility of the administration and institution to provide leadership for educational efforts so that all staff and faculty are adequately trained and supported. Here are a couple of notable reflections about Sacramento State and diversity education:

“Well, there’s diversity on the surface, or in numbers – that doesn’t mean people have understanding. Just because you have a lot of people thrown together in one space doesn’t mean that there’s any kind of empathy or understanding among the different groups. And this workshop kind of forced that issue. We can all live side by side, or we can be a community. And I think that’s a huge difference because I think Sac State has lots of different kinds of people here, but are we necessarily a community? Or, are we a bunch of tiny siloed communities that don’t really speak to each other? And, as much as I don’t like saying this, I think it’s the latter here. Places like this which actually require us to confront ourselves and confront one another will help build a community, even if it’s not very harmonious to begin with at least there’s a place of understanding.”

“One of Gonzales’ goals [in his public performance evaluation] is to do better in diversity education area. He needs to put the resources together to do that.”

Gratitude for Shakti Butler
Last, yet certainly not least, all interviewees mentioned their gratitude for Shakti Butler and her skilled facilitation technique and style. While all were stretched in their comfort zones when talking about personal issues within the group, all mentioned that it was this kind of environment where they learned the most about themselves. And, that it takes a “warm and trustworthy” facilitator to be able to create an environment where people can be vulnerable. Another person described being affected by Shakti’s heart-moving film, a mechanism that gave voice to the complexities of identity and white privilege in a way that this person had never thought about. Finally, when an interviewee was asked if they had any last thoughts she stated, “When is she coming back? – that’s my final comment.”

Conclusions
What initially began as a simple program assessment has quickly evolved into an inspirational movement and charge for the campus to provide more opportunities like these for staff and faculty. We continue to hear from students the impact of intensive workshops we have hosted like these that challenge dominant frames. At the end of the day, the results prove that participants were able to create community, learn something new, challenge themselves, and reconnect to their own stories.
An unintended yet welcome outcome was the concrete feedback from staff and faculty about the role the university and administration should play in providing workshops and experiences like these. As a university that appreciates diversity, as reflected by some of the participants, it is now time to take the celebration of diversities to the next level. A level that supports the development of multicultural competency skills, of mentoring and leading with conscious attention to inclusion and equity, and of authentic dialogue when it comes to issues of diversity and social justice.

Another unexpected outcome was that we realized how much energy and enthusiasm staff, faculty, and students actually have for confronting difficult topics and dealing with challenging notions of privilege and power. We initially thought more people would be apprehensive to these discussions, and perhaps there is still that level of resistance, however, it has been encouraging to witness people wanting to “go there” especially when the process challenges them.

Lastly, it made sense to restructure the program at the last hour. By breaking up the constituency groups so that staff and faculty could engage in a more intentional workshop worked out wonderfully for all participants to engage. Similarly, the film screening offered the general public and more students a rare opportunity to engage with the filmmaker in a more open environment. Month’s later participants of both events continue to inquire about the film and its availability. The MCC hopes to maintain providing these types of programs; though with the uncertainty of budget and sustainability issues we can only promise to do our best.

**Resource List**


Welcoming Environment: Program Objective 1

Background

Welcoming spaces are very important for educational institutions for a variety of reasons; a widely known reason is that when students feel a sense of belonging on a campus that has been proven to be positively correlated with retention rates. Our purpose for assessing if the MCC has achieved a welcoming environment is threefold;

1) One of the initiatives for the center according to the report written by the “Multicultural Center Task Force” in 1989 was to “produce an environment that makes individuals feel welcome at this University.” (pg 3)

2) According to the Observational Assessment: Multi-Cultural Center Sacramento State University written by Dr. James R. Kitchen in 2007 the “MCC ‘had’ lost its identity and direction. Students, faculty, staff and community ‘felt’ alienated and isolated from the MCC. The greatest impact has been on students” (pg 4). Therefore, we wanted to bring back the focus on students.

3) Given the previous two points Charlene Martinez, Director of the MCC modified the mission statement to be intentional of a “welcoming space.”

What does “welcoming environment” mean and how did we cultivate a new way of being? In order to embark on this intentional philosophy of providing a welcoming environment we focused on four areas; physical space, programs/events, intern program, and student centered philosophy.

- While to some it may seem mundane, one of our core changes was to create a physical space that exhibited a more welcoming environment. For example, we committed to creating a clean, free from clutter space, more comfortable studying space with the addition of couches, while insuring that it was also a space for leisure for conversations, or for students to read, study and just be. We even purchased a white erase board and posted questions of the week that pertained to students. Some were questions were thought provoking, while others were more fun or social, for example; what did you do for spring break? What gives you strength? What do you do to de-stress? (Appendix D). These transformations helped to create more engaging environment.

- Insuring that programs and events are not only educational in nature but are tailored towards creating a space that allows primarily students to “learn about themselves and others”. A welcoming environment for us is aligned with creating programs and events that are about and for students (particularly focusing on our mission to provide education about historically under-represented groups).

- The intern program is an important component to cultivate a welcoming environment; while professional staff plans programs and events that are beneficial to students, we recognize and believe that students know how to outreach to students best. Which is why the interns are critically involved with creating programs and events for their peer groups. In this way students can truly feel that this is a student-centered space and be fully engaged in their learning because the programs directly speak to them.
We also adopted a student-centered service model. This meant training interns and staff to understand and lead with a social justice infused student service model. This includes confronting difficult situations, being respectful in the space, and being open to understanding the needs of all of the various groups of students who utilize the space. Despite staff and resource limitations, we feel it is necessary to focus on students first. And we do this by challenging and supporting them to the best of our abilities. (Appendix E)

Given that we had over 35 events/programs with over 2,000 participants in order to assess a “welcoming space” we will highlight two programs each semester, draw from key questions related to “welcoming space” from our online StudentVoice survey, and extrapolate some information from the intern focus group.

**Program Objective and Methods**

We continue to cultivate a welcoming space that provides opportunities to better retain historically under-represented students at Sacramento State. Starting fall semester we will assess the needs of the students and implement programs and or/events during the spring semester reflecting those needs. A final assessment will be conducted at the end of the year to see if some of the students’ needs were met.

By the end of the academic year students will have received programs and/or events that they felt were necessary.

*Rationale:* The mission of the Multi-Cultural Center is to provide educational programs a welcoming space and also a commitment to responding to the needs of the students. By assessing the needs of the community this can therefore inform our current programs, events offerings as well as our strategic plan in order to increase student satisfaction and create a more meaningful and effective program.

The following Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals that are addressed in Program Objective 1 include:

- **Values and Pluralism through the**
  - willingness to accept individual responsibility
  - valuation of service as a component of active citizenship
- **Communication through the ability to communicate orally in one-on-one and group settings.**

Collection dates: Between November and May

Method: Surveys with Leichardt scales and short answer questionnaires, head count, and two focus groups

Population: Multi-Cultural Center student users and interns/volunteers
Results: A Snapshot of MCC Programs

This year we made a deliberate effort to insure that we had surveys for almost all events. We also built in enough time so the participants could give us as much authentic feedback as possible. Given the intentionality behind the surveys, each survey had some questions that were slightly different based on what we wanted to find out about what the participants learned and/or captured from the event. Most surveys had between 5-6 statements with a Leichardt scale ranging from 1-5 (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree). The general statements used were: this was a great workshop/program overall, I feel that the presenter was knowledgeable on the subject, I feel that this workshop/event/program was beneficial to me, I learned more about (grad school, women of color, leadership, etc…) through this workshop/program, I would strongly recommend workshops/events/programs like this to peers or students.

The chart below illustrates for each event the number of participants as well as how many of those filled out a survey. Along with the description of the event there are some comments taken directly from the surveys. It is important to note that the number of participants is based on the sign in sheet; however, the actual number of attendees is actually higher given that there were several people who came in late and/or failed to sign in or return surveys.

| Fall 2009 | De-mystifying Grad School  
(Staff initiated event) | Women, Culture and Media  
(Staff initiated event) |  
|---|---|---|  
| 29 participants - 22 surveys  
97% of responses fell into the 4-5 
Leichardt scale most of them being a 5. | 19 participants - 19 surveys  
100% of the responses were between a 4-5 with the majority being a 5. |  
| Description: A *hands-on discussion* exploring the *unwritten rules* of applications, the *secrets* of getting funding, and the *nuts-and-bolts* of what it means to be a graduate student (master’s and PhD). Participants will have a chance to learn from successful and unsuccessful applications, with an emphasis on humanities and social sciences. | Description: Sac State McNair Scholars presented their research which focused on women and culture with relation to the media in two different cultural groups. Both students were affiliated with the Multi-Cultural and Women’s Resource Centers. |  
| Comments:  
• “This was a great event and gave me opportunity to learn about the program rather than having to rely entirely on myself.”  
• “Not only knowledgeable but explained it very well, Life changing. I want to go to Grad School. Yes, definitely recommend” | Comments:  
• “Excellent presentation- both speakers were well prepared!”  
• “Good to have the opportunity to provide support for our McNair scholars”  
• “Have more presentations about this topic of women.”  
• “Allowed me to learn more about the focus of the presenter’s
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Express Yourself!</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Intern Project by Jessica Castellon)</td>
<td><strong>Decolonize! Workshop and Exhibit</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Staff initiated event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants 20, 16 surveys 5 questions with a 100% of the responses at 5</td>
<td>Participants 17, 13 surveys 4 questions with 94% of the responses being 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: A workshop targeted toward women of color (though it was an open event) where they could share their thoughts and feelings, engage in a discussion about personal struggles with racism, sexism and cultural expectations in a welcoming environment.</td>
<td>Description: An interactive workshop facilitated by Mahader Tesfai, an artist from the Bay Area that allowed students to express themselves via art as well as build community with each other in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • “this event was empowering and encouraging”  
• “this experience was a big relief, to be in a safe environment where I realized that our stories are connected.”  
• “it was great space to talk about concerns and experiences that cause me anxiety”  
• “thank you. I've come to understand myself in a different way.” | • “More Art/music/theatre/poetry events like this!”  
• “Great lecture by Mahader, a nice way to get away from school and work”  
• “I learned… to be expressive and be yourself”  
• “The Malcolm X handout really had me thinking.” |

We were very pleased with the outcome of all of our events and although it is difficult to capture the excitement or the transformations that occurred during these events enough people experienced these events and continue to inform others. A full listing of 2009-2010 events is available in Appendix F.

**Results: Student Voice Survey**

While we were collecting information from the individual events we really wanted to capture information about how people felt about the MCC comprehensively, not just their feelings about a specific event. We also wanted to be able to assess where we need to do the most work on and figure out whether or not we were meeting our mission and vision. We therefore conducted an anonymous survey via Student Voice with 81
either questions, statements, and comment sections. Our initial goal was to have at least 30 people fill out the survey, given that the 30 is the lowest number to be able to not only complete statistical analysis, but to have it actually be truthful in representing a population. We received 89 respondents and 70 of those people actually completed the survey in its entirety 81% of them were students. The rest were comprised of staff, faculty and community members. Below are some of the questions from the survey that relate to a welcoming environment. Given that there is a tremendous amount of data, we only chose to show some of the responses with questions related to a welcoming environment.

**How easy has it been to meet new people at the MCC?**  
75% said it was either very easy or somewhat easy and 7% said it was difficult or very difficult.

**How has the MCC helped retain you at Sac State? (Qualitative responses)**

“Connect with my peers and the community, as well as be comfortable and confident with my studies.”

“It has certainly helped me feel at home. The environment at the MCC is one in which I can talk about anything and everything”

“It has helped me find a welcoming community, where I can get involved. I look forward to coming to campus on a daily basis”

“MCC has fostered a sense of community that allows you (as an individual) feel that your needs are being addressed”

“People at the MCC are very supportive and motivate me in my studies”

“The center is always there to support events and causes that pertain to various communities that exist in our campus. The staff along with students and volunteers makes the center a place where everyone feels welcome and included. Thus, it’s very important to many students on campus who know that there’s a space on campus that attends to diversity needs.”

“MCC provided me a place to meet new people, connect with friends and above all a welcoming place where one can be themselves without judgment.”

“The Multi-Cultural Center has helped me by developing and maintaining an accessible team of genuinely benevolent people that work to provide community education and exploration support of my personal interests and endeavors in my communications studies discipline specialty of multimedia technology development, and additionally providing a venue that is affirmative of community integration.”

**The MCC is a welcoming space.**  
94% said they strongly agree or moderately agree and 3% said they strongly disagree or moderately disagree while the rest said they neither agreed nor disagreed.
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: The Sac State campus is welcoming.
59% said they strongly agree or moderately agree and 15% said they strongly disagree or moderately disagree while the rest said they neither agreed nor disagreed.

Comments provided about MCC staff:
“Always reliable and helpful. Just chatting with the MCC staff is always a learning experience.”

“The staff are very welcoming and in developing personal relationships with them I have strengthened my commitment to being a part of the MCC”

“Went to an event and was highly impressed with their student assistants, staff and director.”

“They have been supportive and are highly competent. They understand the complexities of identity. They create an environment that is welcoming.”

“They are great people to work with as well as hard workers. Very dedicated, responsible and true to their mission toward everyone who visits the center. Even though they don’t have much staff, they are still making the center run as if it had more staff, thus, that’s an example of commitment to campus communities.”

How does the MCC differ from other places on campus?
“It is a place that makes me feel important, that I am perfect the way I am.”

“It is welcoming. It is one of the few places on campus where students can go and feel appreciated and comfortable to express who they are.”

“Sometimes you can't even describe it. It’s like magic. It’s the people, the events, the locations, and everything else. It’s unique within itself, and I find that no place on campus comes close.”

The feedback received through this survey came somewhat of a surprise. Although the survey was long it was evident that people put a lot of energy into their responses. The majority of the responses were very positive and powerful and if read in its entirety demonstrates the affect that the MCC has had on a large group of people. Words like; leadership, social justice, wellness and welcoming space where common throughout the survey and this demonstrated the effectiveness of our mission and vision as well as showing that there is/has been a commitment put forth by staff to follow the mission and vision.

Results: Intern Focus Group

Overall, while we had intended on assessing two focus groups, one comprised of students and another one of interns, given the time and coordination constraints we
were only able to complete the Intern focus group. However, given the feedback given by the student voice survey it might have been somewhat redundant to have also done a focus group on students. Below are some of the comments taken from the intern focus group data set. Only the paid interns participated, the program coordinator and director were not present when the recording took place. There were a series of 5 questions for the interns to answer and all questions were open-ended such as “What does the MCC mean to you?” The questions were given to them in advance to encourage dialogue and conversation (we wanted to keep it as natural and fluid as possible). Below are some of their comments;

“For me the MCC community has been a space for me to empower myself grow as an individual as a community as a Sac State student… I get to take what I have learned at the center and apply it outside the center…. its meant love, support and encouragement… for me the MCC has been all about community”

“The MCC is like my home at Sac State… it’s my haven… I just know this place is a place where you can be authentic you can be yourself… you can feel comfortable to talk about anything that people on the outside feel like they have to whisper… here students, staff and faculty can openly dialogue… search for their own self empowerment… can also inspire others it’s like a Sac State family”.

“Just that idea that the MCC being that one place that I can go to and feel supported… even before the internship when I came I felt welcomed and that someone was there for me… now I feel that I need to perpetuate that… the MCC has been a place where I have grown as a person… really come and talk about whatever you want to talk about… can’t compare to any other place in the University.”

“My personality has always been the same …. but my internal fears have been challenged at the MCC I think that I have grown so much my number one goal in the beginning of the year was to gain self confidence in myself… complete my dreams… not second guess myself… I am really now starting to believe in my ability… total difference and this has transcended to every aspect of my life from academics to person to personal life…”

“To learn how to have passion… I’ve grown to have passion for things that I would in any other circumstances I would say ‘Oh it’s not my problem it’s not my issue” I just move on. To have feeling to think about the things I do… I thought it wasn’t my problem… if I was in my cocoon nothing would hurt me …but everything is so interconnected… I have more passion and thought and think things through more… I want to think things through before thinking I have the answer”
Conclusions

While the notion of a welcoming environment is truly relative and based on perspective we still feel based on the feedback given by the surveys we have generally made huge improvements in the area. In an ideal situation we would have had enough time to capture thoughts in a focus group setting from general student community members of the MCC. We acknowledge in the future to be more realistic with our assessment intentions. Just the 81 question survey alone could be its own dissertation study. However, all in all, we received overwhelming data that supports that we are doing what intended to accomplish with creating a more welcoming environment at the MCC. We understand that there is rich data to continue to extrapolate from the recent survey, and these findings will help to inform next year’s assessment questions.

There were a few students and some faculty who indicated feeling alienated from the MCC. Truth is the MCC (since the implementation of the new Director, Charlene Martinez) has grown dramatically and taken a drastic shifts in a short period of time. Given these changes some people may not be comfortable with the process and there are misunderstanding (as expected) that came along the way. We continue to address these concerns all the while knowing that we cannot satisfy everyone. One solution to mitigate the 3-7% of our constituents who feel isolated is to engage the community in difficult conversations around establishing “community agreements” so that everyone is on board moving forward. Yet, despite these challenges we want to affirm our successes and continue working on co-creating a welcoming environment because as the Kitchen report says “The challenge for the modern transformation of the MCC and its relationship with the University is communication across all constituents and a renewed level of trust and faith in the common goals of the University and the MCC” (pg 5). A culture of distrust that has been created will take many years to undo, however, it is not impossible, and we take this challenge very seriously. We know things can get better because they already have from our perspective. It also seems most constituents are very pleased with the direction of the center and that gives us hope.

The MCC means many things to many people. As a community center with little space, it has been encouraging to see community come together to co-create the very thing we desire to be on campus: an inclusive and vibrant campus. While we know there will always be struggles, we are proud of how far we have come, and where we are going.

To listen to an audio clip of Gloria Montgomery-Walters’ (Pre-doc Intern, faculty-in-residence) experience and participation in Multi-Cultural Center, click here [http://www.csus.edu/mcc/aboutus/program_review.stm ].

Resource List

Center Service Model. UC San Diego LGBT Resource Center Handbook.
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Mission Statement

Mission: The Student-Athlete Resource Center (SARC) provides Division I student-athletes with support to develop as independent and successful young adults, the skills to achieve their academic goals and persist to graduation, and to meet all NCAA eligibility requirements. The SARC provides admissions, advising, tutoring and mentoring, NCAA rules compliance and eligibility education, financial services support, and life skills programming to Sacramento State’s Division I athletes. SARC’s services and programming are provided in an assortment of ways, including: individual advising, orientations, group and team meetings, coaches’ compliance and rules education workshops, freshmen seminar classes, and various student development and academic workshops.

Rationale: SARC staff helps student-athletes navigate through many of the campuses’ academic procedures and policies, understand NCAA rules compliance and eligibility requirements, and provide services that place student welfare and the development of the whole student as a top priority. In addition, the SARC assists athletic coaches, staff, faculty, and administration in achieving overall integrity and success within our Division I athletic program.

Planning Goals

Goal 1: Provide student-athletes with support to develop as independent and successful young adults and with the skills necessary for achieving their academic goals.

Goal 2: Plan, implement, and assess student athlete retention programs.

Goal 3: Provide rules education, eligibility certification and compliance monitoring on NCAA and affiliated conference rules and requirements for students, coaches, staff and the external community.

Program Objective or Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome 1
After viewing the Compliance 101 video during the Athletic Compliance pre-season team meetings, 80% of new student-athletes will demonstrate a good understanding of basic NCAA compliance requirements and bylaws by scoring 80% or higher on a post-test. This learning outcome continued the SARC’s 2008-09 efforts to measure student-athletes’ knowledge of basic NCAA academic requirements and other non-academic-related compliance requirements. Video link: 
http://www.csus.edu/sarc/compliance_video.htm

Rationale: Helping to ensure new students’ understanding of NCAA regulations is a primary role of the SARC.
This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goals Number 4—Information Competence; and Number 2—Analysis and Problem Solving.

**Measures**

Note: Measures describe the methodology and timeframe for data collection. Measures also should identify the population being surveyed and/or tested.

After new student-athletes attended various pre-season team compliance meetings, the SARC staff tested 241 fall 2009 participants to determine their understanding of basic NCAA bylaws. The student athletes completed a five-question post-test which included multiple choice and true/false (Appendix A).

**Results**

Note: Results include a brief narrative of findings, and/or essential tables or graphs. The results should indicate the extent to which the program objective or student learning outcome was met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Athletes</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>All Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>238/241=9 9%</td>
<td>238/241=9 9%</td>
<td>207/241=8 6%</td>
<td>145/241=6 0%</td>
<td>227/241=9 4%</td>
<td>1055/1205=87.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 80% of new Student-athletes demonstrated good understanding of basic NCAA compliance requirements and bylaws as evidenced by answering questions 1-3 and 5 correctly. Question 4, however, was only answered correctly by 60% of new student-athletes. This question dealt specifically with NCAA regulations regarding complimentary admission for home contests.

In the review of overall scores for individual sports teams, only women’s tennis, with a score of 78%, scored below the predicted 80% score (Appendix A).

**Conclusions**

Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It also should “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

Overall, new student-athletes scored well on the NCAA Rules 101 video quiz. Since the post-test had only five questions, the overall team results were impacted by question #4’s lower success rate. The SARC staff will review how information about
complimentary admissions for home contests is presented and will spend additional
time in the summer 2010 meetings emphasizing this rule. Staff will also consider
expanding the questions on the post-test from 5 to 10. Thus, any one question will have
less effect on the overall post-test results.

Women’s tennis scored below the desired 80% level. As such, SARC staff will work
more directly with that individual sport to improve rules education activities.

**Student Learning Outcome 2**

After participating in an information session on the NCAA Academic Performance
Program, student-athletes will score at least 70% on an Academic Performance Rating
(APR) quiz.

**Rationale:** Over the past five years, the NCAA’s Academic Performance Program and
its Academic Performance Rate (APR) have impacted Sacramento State athletic teams,
coaches and administrators in both positive and negative ways. Based on recent APR
penalties, coaches have invested significant time in learning and understanding how to
manage their teams to improve APR scores. Beginning in summer 2008, SARC staff
provided an overview on the APR to new student-athletes during orientations. Coaches
and athletic administrators are also expected to cover this information with athletic
teams. SARC staff were interested in whether increasing student athlete understanding
of APR would have a positive effect on coaches ability to increase their scores.

In 2008-09 the SARC’s Assessment Plan included testing coaches on APR information.
The SARC staff will use the results of the student athlete APR quiz to determine if more
time and energy should be spent educating student-athletes on this topic, as was the
case with coaches last year.

This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goals Number 4—
Information Competence; and Number 2—Analysis and Problem Solving.

**Measures**

Individual advising sessions were mandatory for all student-athletes. These advising
sessions included information about the APR. Immediately after their advising session,
student-athletes were asked to participate in a short, eight-question APR quiz. The quiz
was made-up of seven multiple-choice questions and one true/false question. The quiz
was administered using PDAs and the StudentVoice website.

**Results**

Overall, students performed poorly on the APR quiz. Student athletes only answered
two of eight questions correctly more than 50% of the time. Only one question came
close to the desired 80% correct response rate; Question 6 – What represents a perfect
APR score. Student Athlete performance on each question is provided in Appendix B.
Conclusions

SACR staff were not surprised by the results. APR information is relatively complex and most student athletes are not directly affected by APR. As such, many students questioned the applicability of this information to their day to day academic and athletic lives. Based on the results, the SARC staff plans to recommend to coaches and athletic administration that APR information only be covered generally in orientation and advising sessions. Further, that more specific APR information be presented by coaches during team meetings, especially in cases where individual sports are in jeopardy of not meeting the required minimum team score. The SARC staff believe that learning outcomes for student-athletes should focus on eligibility and academic policies that more directly impact their athletic status and individual student athlete responsibilities. Increasing student athlete understanding of basic NCAA regulations should have a positive impact on APR without having to educate students about the specifics of this rating system. As such, the SARC does not plan to assess this topic as a student learning outcome in the future.

Program Objective 1

To determine the reasons new student athletes transferring to Sacramento State in previous semesters chose not to attend orientation.

Rationale: Although transfer orientation was not mandatory for all transfer students prior to 2010-2011 academic year, athletic administration expected all new athletes to attend orientation sessions. However, a small population of student-athletes chose not to attend. Beginning summer 2010, transfer orientation is mandatory for all incoming transfer students. The SARC staff would like to identify reasons transfer student-athletes chose not to attend orientation in the past to better assist all student-athletes in meeting the new mandatory orientation requirement.

Measures

The SARC staff will work with the campus Orientation Coordinator to identify fall 2009 transfer students who did not attend orientation. All of these student-athletes will be contacted and interviewed via phone, email or in-person to determine the reason they chose not to attend transfer orientation.

Results

The SARC staff identified the 47 new fall 2009 transfer student-athletes and determined that 16 (34%) of those transfers did not attend transfer orientation during the summer. Those 16 students (from five different sports) were interviewed using seven standard questions including the reason for not attending orientation (see Appendix C). The most common responses student athletes provided for not choosing to attend included: 1) being enrolled in a summer class; 2) living too far away to attend; 3) being admitted late; 4) not knowing about orientation; and 5) being told by their coaches that they were not required to attend orientation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Reason for not attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Admitted late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>In summer class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>In summer class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Playing baseball in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Admitted late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>In summer class (Sac State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Coach said I did not need to attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Too far to travel (Santa Rosa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>In summer class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>In summer class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Too far to travel (Chico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball-International</td>
<td>In summer class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball-International</td>
<td>Too far to travel (Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>In summer class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Soccer</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Track/Field</td>
<td>Did not know about it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

Since the start of this program objective in fall 2009, Sacramento State has mandated orientation attendance for all incoming fall 2010 students. The SARC staff will review the results of this program objective with coaches and the athletic administration to help them understand why student-athletes chose not to attend in light of the new mandatory orientation policy. Incoming student-athletes enrolled in summer classes are still expected to attend orientation. For those student-athletes (out-of-state, international, etc.) who have legitimate concerns related to travel costs, etc. the SARC staff will work with the Orientation staff on offering an on-line option with one-on-one advising assistance.

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Paul Edwards, Student-Athlete Resource Center. (916) 278-7796. edwardsp@csus.edu.
Mission Statement
Note: Departmental mission must be directly aligned with those of the University and the Division. This statement should include approximately 3-5 sentences that identifies the name of the department, its primary functions, modes of delivery and target audience.

Mission: The Office of Student Conduct broadly serves Sacramento State students and faculty by interpreting and disseminating information about student conduct policies and procedures. The office directly engages students who allegedly violate the aforementioned polices in structured, timely, and educationally-based judicial process.

Rationale: The Student Conduct program is assigned the responsibility of administering Title V, the Student Code of Conduct. This responsibility is stated in Executive Order 1043 which emphasizes the educational nature of the process and procedures outlined in the mandate.

Planning Goals
Note: Planning Goals are broad statements that describe the overarching, long-range intentions of an administrative unit. Goals are used primarily for general planning, as the starting point for the development and refinement of program objectives or student learning outcomes. (UCF Administrative Handbook, University of Central Florida).

Goal 1: Educate students, faculty and staff on policies and procedures related to student conduct, academic honesty, and behavioral expectations both within and outside the classroom and the campus.

Goal 2: Administer a judicial review process that is timely, fair, and educationally purposeful.

Goal 3: Collaborate with campus and community colleagues to provide innovative outreach programs that are relevant to collegiate issues today.

Goal 4: Promote student success by reinforcing the academic, behavioral and legal standards stated in University and civil codes.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes
Note: The Objectives or Outcomes can be one of two types: program objectives or student learning outcomes. The former are related to program improvement around issues like timeliness, efficiency and participant satisfaction. The latter addresses what a student learns or how a student changes by participating in the program or utilizing the service. Both program objectives and student learning outcomes are measurable statements that provide evidence as to how well you are reaching your goals.

Student Learning Outcome 1
Accused students who are involved in the judicial process will acknowledge the violation of University policy alleged in their particular case and describe how and why their
behavior will improve by the date listed on their written notice or within six weeks, which ever time is less.

Rationale: To make the student conduct process an educationally purposeful one, students must understand the policies and procedures at hand; be able to identify when their behavior violates the various codes of conduct; take responsibility for any wrongdoing that occurs; and be willing to improve their behavior to avoid future violations. This outcome applies to Learning Outcome Goal Values and Pluralism which focuses on students making moral judgments related to conduct.

Measures

Note: Measures describe the methodology and timeframe for data collection. Measures also should identify the population being surveyed and/or tested. Provide materials such as survey instruments, check lists, focus group protocols, etc. in an appendix.

Students who admit to or are found to be in violation of a University policy will submit a reflective essay that describes how their behavior violated the code of conduct. Students must score a 4 (out of five) to demonstrate their awareness of existing policies and their strategies for improving their behavior and ameliorating the situation. These scores are measured against a rubric developed for this purpose. Lower scorers will rewrite the essay until a passing grade is achieved. (See Appendix 1A)

Results

Note: Results include a brief narrative of findings, and/or essential tables or graphs. The results should indicate the extent to which the program objective or student learning outcome was met.

A review of the reflective essays submitted during the spring semester 2010 indicated that the majority of students demonstrated an awareness of policies, how their behavior was in violation of policy and stated that they would not be in violation in the future.

A total of 9 essays were submitted and were reviewed. An additional 4 essays are due by the end of June and have not been included in this report. For the spring term 2010 all students scored over the desired score of 4.0, averaging 4.10 on a 5.0 scale. No student scored below the requisite 4.0, with a high score of 4.40 but the average dropped by .37; we must review why this has happened and whether there is any significance. (See exhibit 1B)

Conclusions

Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It also should “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

Prior studies have supported our efforts as indicated by the previous cycle. In this study, taken over four semesters (fall 2008- spring 2010), the data continues to support the conclusion that the rubric can assist in making some critical determinations. Further the
use of reflective essays as measured by the rubric makes a greater and more lasting impact on those students scoring at the desired level. No student scoring at the desired level or above has had a second occurrence of a violation.

In the future we will continue to:

1) re-evaluate any student scoring below 4 in any category on the reflective essays, and decide whether further intervention is necessary or desired; upon review further educational sanctions may be assigned until we are clear that the student is appropriately aware of their responsibility and is aware of policy.
2) further review data to use in presentations or to provide feedback to faculty about student’s interpretation of class assignments
3) gather data for an additional year in order to amass a larger sample cohort and greater reliability in the information

Student Learning Outcome 2
Students who participate in academic integrity workshops will understand 1) what constitutes plagiarism, 2) how to be a fair and productive participant to group assignments, and 3) how to fairly give and receive feedback from peers.

Rationale: Academic integrity is recognized as fundamental to a community of scholars, teachers and students. It is expected that students understand the rules that preserve academic honesty and abide by them at all times. The University is obligated to certify that students have demonstrated a high level of knowledge acquired through academic rigor and that degrees conferred by the University have value. This outcome supports baccalaureate Learning Goal of Analysis and Problem Solving which addresses a student’s ability to identify and diagnosis problems and develop effective solutions.

Measures
Student participants in academic integrity workshops will be expected to successfully complete an assignment or exercise (e.g., plagiarism quiz; reflective essays; and academic integrity quiz) that tests their understanding of the presented materials. Results will be evaluated at the end of the semester and posted during the summer 2010.

Results
There were no workshops offered for spring semester 2010 as initially projected. This is largely due to the fact that it was not possible to pull together a critical number of students to make this effort worthwhile. Approximately 7 students were individually assigned to write one pages essays or complete a quiz. These efforts are not yet evaluated.

Conclusions
Due to the fact that it is not practical to address this group by offering a workshop the director of student conduct has determined that this measure should be reconsidered before the beginning of fall semester 2010.
**Student Learning Outcome 3**
In collaboration with Housing and Residential Life, students referred to Student Conduct for unacceptable behavior will acknowledge their poor decisions, complete assigned sanctions, demonstrate improved behavior and pledge to abide by university and housing policies. There will be an 80% compliance/success rate with students involved with this process.

**Rationale:** In addressing inappropriate student behaviors three category of student behavior have been identified as being of particular concern: 1) Students who are non-compliant: a) those that fail to respond to notices from staff to meet and discuss their violations; b) those that meet with staff but fail to complete their assigned sanctions. 2) Students who are repeat offenders: a) students who continue to violate the same policy repeatedly, i.e. alcohol; b) students who continue to violate policies in different campus setting. 3) Students who exhibit violent or angry behavior toward self and/or others. It is expected that collaboration between the Housing staff and Student Conduct will identify problem behaviors and will engage students in an educational process meant to discourage inappropriate behavior to assist them in addressing their behavior. This objective supports the baccalaureate learning goals of Values and Pluralism which seeks to have students apply ethical standards with respect to individual conduct and citizenship.

**Measures**
Student participants are expected to respond to official notices that they have violated university policy; to acknowledge the violations; complete any and all assigned sanctions; demonstrate an ability to make decisions which provide them with healthy alternatives to poor behavior choices. Student’s behavior will be measured by staff during one-on-one interviews, and documented completion of assigned sanctions including receipts, attendance sheets, etc. A rubric has been developed to assist in measuring the outcomes. (See exhibit 2A)

**Results**
Approximately 70% (11/15) successfully completed the process after referral to the Student Conduct office. Once student were made aware of the seriousness of the matter they were less inclined to continue with their behavior and understood that they needed to comply with their sanctions. The 4 students who failed to make the necessary adjustments all had challenges in their personal lives including alcohol/drug dependence, mental health problems or a combination of these. Two were suspended, one has never made contact with this office, and one is in jail awaiting trial for a serious criminal act. (See exhibit 2B)

**Conclusions**
This semester was the first semester in which we have had a process in place to address students who were non-compliant. As students begin to understand that they will be held accountable for their behavior Student Conduct would hope for fewer referrals. Additionally, that vast majority of student behavior problems were handled internally by the Residence Halls staff and there was no need for Student Conduct
involvement other than to review an infraction which may have implications for the greater university, such as threatening behavior.

At present there is no anticipation that the percentage will change significantly from the present level of 70% due in large part to environmental factors which are largely out of the control of the university. It will be interesting to see if the fall semester 2010 supports this conclusion.

Edited June 30, 2010

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Leonard Valdez, Director of Student Conduct. valdezl@csus.edu.
Mission Statement

Note: Departmental mission must be directly aligned with those of the University and the Division. This statement should include approximately 3-5 sentences that identify the name of the department, its primary functions, modes of delivery and target audience.

Mission: As advocates for students, the office of Student Organizations & Leadership contributes to learning, development, and retention by providing opportunities for involvement, leadership, and empowerment through a wide variety of organizations and programs. These experiences nurture campus pride and student success to advance an inclusive and equitable community.

Planning Goals

Note: Planning Goals are broad statements that describe the overarching, long-range intentions of an administrative unit. Goals are used primarily for general planning, as the starting point for the development and refinement of program objectives or student learning outcomes. (UCF Administrative Handbook, University of Central Florida).

Goal 1: Facilitate positive campus life experiences through involvement, engagement, and leadership development opportunities.

Goal 2: Plan and implement Phase I of a comprehensive multifaceted student leadership initiative.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes

Note: The Objectives or Outcomes can be one of two types: program objectives or student learning outcomes. The former are related to program improvement around issues like timeliness, efficiency and participant satisfaction. The latter addresses what a student learns or how a student changes by participating in the program or utilizing the service. Both program objectives and student learning outcomes are measurable statements that provide evidence as to how well you are reaching your goals.

Student Learning Outcome 1

Students who complete the Nuts and Bolts Workshop evaluation will correctly answer eighty percent of the knowledge-based questions administered immediately following the presentation.

Rationale: This assessment will help Student Organizations & Leadership discern what students comprehend after their participation in the Nuts and Bolts workshops. This workshop is designed to help student leaders understand and navigate Sacramento State’s various policies, procedures and operations. Participants are asked a short series of knowledge-based questions as part of the program satisfaction evaluation conducted at the end of the workshop. Most of the questions include target information
items emphasized by the Chancellor’s Office. Results from the evaluation will also allow Student Organizations & Leadership to revamp its teaching methods if concepts are not understood. This is a continued Learning Outcome goal.

This learning outcome aligns with the Baccalaureate Learning goal of Communication. Specifically students will be challenged to comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and oral presentations. The students will also be required to interpret, analyze, and evaluate ideas presented in a variety of creative formats, including written, verbal and visual.

### Measures

Note: Measures describe the methodology and timeframe for data collection. Measures also should identify the population being surveyed and/or tested. Provide materials such as survey instruments, check lists, focus group protocols, etc. in an appendix.

Collection Date(s): This workshop is offered multiple times throughout the academic year.

Method(s): Evaluations are administered at the conclusion of every Nuts and Bolts workshop.

Most of the questions are ‘satisfaction’ based. There are three knowledge acquisition-based questions included in the instrument (See Appendix A for the workshop instrument).

Population: During the 2009-10 academic year we anticipate 1000 students will complete the assessment instrument after the workshop. The workshop is open to all students but is required of all presidents and treasurers at least once in the academic year.

### Results

Note: Results include a brief narrative of findings, and/or essential tables or graphs. The results should indicate the extent to which the program objective or student learning outcome was met.

SO&L hosted 34 Nuts & Bolts workshops in the 2009-2010 academic year and more than 1100 students participated representing Cultural, Greek-Letter, Honorary, Recreational, Sport, Religious, Special Interest, Departmental and Professional organizations and clubs were represented in these workshops. Nearly 100% of the 591 students reported that they understood that their respective clubs and organizations
could not hold off-campus bank accounts; 98% recognized that only Sac Students could be officers of clubs and organizations; and 85% understood that hazing is illegal. Nearly 93% of students understood the reservation services available to them when working with Event Services and while only 43% understood the distinction between ASI and SO&L.

Conclusions

*Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It should also “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.*

Overall, students participating in the Nuts & Bolts workshops were able to report that they left the workshop understanding the services available to them and the expectations the University holds them to as officers of clubs and organizations. However, we would like to see 100% of the students who attend Nuts & Bolts understanding the dangers and legality of hazing. We intend to update Nuts & Bolts for the coming academic year to ensure that students understand the expectations and consequences related to hazing. In effort to eliminate confusion, we will also update the workshop so that it clarifies the distinction between ASI and SO&L.

**Student Learning Outcome 2**

Student leaders who participate in the fraternity and sorority New Member Education Workshop assessment will demonstrate knowledge attainment at the workshop’s conclusion. The average score of students completing the posttest should improve 25% over pre-test scores.

*Rationale: This workshop is offered in collaboration with the Alcohol Education Program, the PRIDE Center and the Sexual Assault Network. This workshop educates fraternal students around issues of collective responsibility, responsible alcohol management, sexual assault prevention, LGBTIAQQ issues and hazing. It is important that the students leave with a better understanding of the issues and laws surrounding membership in fraternal groups. We expect approximately 300 students to participate in this workshop in the 2009-2010 academic year. The collaborating units are using a shared assessment tool to determine outcomes and effectiveness of the education.*

*This learning outcome aligns with the Baccalaureate Learning Goals of Analysis & Problem Solving and Communication. Under analysis and problem solving, students will be asked to recognize and synthesize valid and relevant information from various sources to answer the assessment questions. For communication, students will be challenged to comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and oral presentations. The students will also be required to interpret, analyze, and evaluate ideas presented in a variety of creative formats, including written, verbal and visual formats.*
Measures

Collection Date: This workshop is offered twice during each semester in the fifth and sixth weeks. Exact dates are dependent on room availability.

Method(s): The assessments are completed through paper questionnaires before and after the workshop [see Appendix B for the assessment instrument].

Population: Students attending the workshop are required to participate in the assessment. New members of fraternities and sororities are invited and can choose to attend the workshops. The Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Council have made it mandatory for their member organizations’ new members to attend.

Results

New Member Education had 275 student participants. Fifty one students completed the pre-test and 24 completed the post-test. The results are as follows:

In the pre-test, 98.04% identified “consent,” 84.31% “age,” and 72.55% “no force” as the three things needed for legal sexual activity. In the post-test, 100% identified “consent,” 66.67% identified “age,” and 66.67% identified “sober” as the three things needed for consent.

In the pre-test, 88.24% identified the “Health Center” and 78.43% identified “Campus Police” as two places a victim of sexual assault can seek help on campus. In the post-test, 100% identified the “Health Center” and 62.50% identified “Campus Police.”

In the pre-test, 50.98% identified “arrest”, 49.02% identified “expulsion from school,” and 49.02% identified “kicked out of the CSUS system” as two possible consequences for violating the campus sexual misconduct policy. In the post-test, 79.17% identified “kicked out of the CSUS system” and 62.50% identified “arrest” as the two possible consequences for violating the sexual misconduct policy.

In the pre-test, 86.27% identified “vomiting while unconscious or semi-conscious,” 78.43% identified “passed out and not able to be awoken,” 76.47% identified “pale, grey, and bluish skin.” In the post-test, 79.17% identified “vomiting while unconscious or semi-conscious,” 95.83% identified “passed out and not able to be awoken,” 95.83% identified “pale, grey, and bluish skin.”

In the pre-test, 96.08% identified calling “911” as the appropriate step to take if someone shows signs of alcohol poisoning. In the post-test, 100% identified calling “911” as the appropriate step to take if someone shows signs of alcohol poisoning.

In the pre-test, 66.67% identified “getting intoxicated most weekends,” 64.71% identified “getting a DUI” and 62.75% identified “consistently causing problems for other people...
when they are drinking” as indicators that a person has problems with his or her drinking. In the post-test, 87.50% identified “getting intoxicated most weekends,” 70.83% identified “getting a DUI” and 91.67% identified “consistently causing problems for other people when they are drinking” as indicators that a person has problems with his or her drinking.

In the pre-test, 72% indicated that the following statement was false: “It is hard to determine whether or not certain actions can be classified as hazing.” In the post-test, 79.17% indicated the same statement was false.

In the pre-test, 92% indicated that the following statement was false: “If someone agrees to participate in a hazing activity, it is not considered hazing.” In the post-test, 95.83% indicated the same statement was false.

In the pre-test, 70% indentified “fraternity council” as the group or person to notified if he or she witness or experience hazing while 52% identified “Student Activities” and 24% identified “Karlos (a professional staff member in the SO&L office (formerly Student Activities).” In the post-test, 91.67% indentified “fraternity council” as the group or person to notified if he or she witness or experience hazing while 70.83% indentified “Student Activities” and 29.17% indentified “Karlos (a professional staff member in the SO&L office (formerly Student Activities).”

In the pre-test, 52% identified collective responsibility as “being responsible for your fraternity,” 42% identified collective responsibility as “being responsible for your brothers’ actions together”, and 70% identified collective responsibility as “being responsible as a chapter.” In the post-test, 62.50% identified collective responsibility as “being responsible for your fraternity,” 70.83% identified collective responsibility as “being responsible for your brothers’ actions together”, and 79.17% identified collective responsibility as “being responsible as a chapter.”

In the pre-test, 6% indicated that “5% of the world’s population identifies as LGBTIQQ,” while 16% selected 10%, 58% selected 15% and 20% selected 30%. In the post-test, 4.17% indicated that “5% of the world’s population identifies as LGBTIQQ,” while 91.67% selected 10%, 0% selected 15% and 4.17% selected 30%.

In the pre-test, 94% indicated that they would listen to a friend that “came out” to them and ask appropriate follow up questions. In the post-test, 95.83% indicated that that would demonstrate similar supportive behavior.

Conclusions

Overall, our students who responded to the pre/post-tests of the New Member Education survey demonstrated a somewhat greater awareness of the expectations related to consensual sex, excessive use of alcohol, and who to contact for services related to sexual assault and hazing. However, because they were pre-testing at a significantly high level, there was little room to demonstrate any growth in a particular
area or subject. On a related note, as we develop our New Member Education further we will be looking to craft outcomes that capture a more nuanced understanding of what they are learning from participating.

As we look to the coming academic year, we are planning to implement programming related to raising awareness about consensual sex as well as engage our fraternal organizations in more effective conversations and discussions about bystander intervention as it relates to sexual health and hazing.

**Program Objective #1**

Put in place a highly collaborative pilot leadership development program that will encourage student involvement in campus life and reward those currently involved.

*Rationale: Based on the results of the OIR study on student involvement and the findings of the MSL, the LRP pilot is designed to encourage student development and experiential leadership by introducing students to a number of involvement opportunities, events, and workshops. In addition to the recognition of emerging student leaders, the LRP will recognize those students who are already actively engaged in leadership development through campus involvement. It is also intended to serve as a model of interdepartmental collaboration.*

*In September 2009 students in Leadership 32 were invited to choose two pre-approved workshops, events, lectures and programs from each of four module categories: Service, Appreciating Diversity, Leadership and Hornet Pride. After successfully completing a total of eight components from within these four modules, students will be recognized during the Student Activities Leadership Recognition Reception. This effort may also provided essential data needed for leveraging grant dollars.*

*Working in tandem with Dr. Beth Erickson, we will be drawing on student post-participation reflections reporting of their experiences in the LRP pilot. This pilot project will be completed by June 30, 2010.*

**Measures**

Collection Date: The data collection period will be on a semester basis, one classroom focus group occurring the week of December and participant self-reports.

Methods: This reporting will be done via focus group(s) and self-reporting opportunities made available to students via OrgSync (See Appendix C and D for the assessment instruments).
Population: Approximately 40 students registered in Dr. Beth Erickson’s Leadership 32 course.

## Results

During Fall 2009, as part of SO&L’s leadership initiative, and based on recommendations of the LEAD Committee, we launched a pilot Leadership Recognition Program (LRP) in collaboration with Dr. Beth Erickson from RPTA whose Leadership 32 class students (35) participated in a series of campus events and programs designed to 1) get them involved outside of the classroom and 2) participate in leadership development workshops. Dr. Erickson’s students received course credit when they attended or participated in eight events hosted by various on and off campus departments or entities. These events were divided into four categories including Service, Leadership Development, Appreciating Diversity and Hornet Pride with the expectation that students would participate in two events from each category over 16 weeks. This pilot also allowed us to experiment with various options to track individual student participation in different events (as tracking was identified as one of the barriers to such a program).

By the end of the Fall 2009 semester, we had partnered with several on and off campus departments and organizations to host more than 50 eligible events on the LRP calendar that fulfilled the requirement. The information collected through the end-of-year student evaluations and in the structured feedback session (December 2009) with all 40 students provided valuable insight into their learning experiences and suggestions for improving the next steps in the initiative. For Spring 2010 we utilized OrgSync for all participant tracking and communication, added an additional category of “Professional Development,” increased the number of events offered (from 50 to more than 100) and added events on the weekend. The student feedback also gave us the confidence to expand the LRP to three more classes as we set a goal of having 100 students participate in the Spring 2010 program. Instead of 100 we had more than 250 students complete the LRP in Spring 2010 (32 in Dr. Erickson’s Leadership 32 class and 221 in EOP courses taught by Al Striplen, Jesus Tarango, and Kellie Corbisiero).

Those students enrolled in the EOP courses attended nearly 500 hours of events. The most attended events were from the Professional (113 event hours) and Leadership Development (89 event hours) categories with an additional 65 event hours from the Multiple Category which counted for either of those two categories. Sixteen students went above and beyond the required four events (EOP faculty required fewer events than Dr. Erickson chose to require), and two students completed eight events qualifying them for an even higher level certificate from SO&L.

We found the following in response to our survey, structured reflection session with Dr. Erickson’s Leadership 32 students:

When asked about some of the best experiences students had in the LRP, students shared a number of different things with us including, the 1) “Taiko [Dan] drummers [because they] reinforce history and music, entertaining and learning”; 2) the Resume
Builder, Speed Interviews and Etiquette Dinner facilitated by the Career Center which was described as “amazing” and something several students would do again; 3) the lecture on the subject of White Privilege presented by author Tim Wise because “[inequality is a] community situation because it’s everyone’s problem not just that person” and another found it “very powerful and intense”; the ‘Leader In You’ workshop as it “allowed the students to be open and learn how to be comfortable in oneself”; the “We Not Me” workshop for its emphasis on “teamwork and it was “fun” and attending campus athletic events because doing so offered the student the chance “to support the school” and she will “continue to go in the future.”

When asked what were some new experiences students had as a result of participating in the program a number reflected on events and activities that took place through the PRIDE Center’s PRIDE Week schedule. For example, one student reflected on the Kings of Drags event and described being “uncomfortable” but also shared that she “pushed herself to experience and challenged herself” and that in doing so she was able to “learn about another culture” and someone else shared this about the same event: “I attended ‘Kings of Drag’ and it was very interesting because I had never attended something like that before. I definitely stepped out of comfort zone.” Another student described the event as “Interesting and would go [to a similar event] with an open mind next time” and another stated that “[it] was cool to see that they didn’t care what others thought about what they did.” While one other described not knowing that the PRIDE Week Kick-off event she attended was not a “school pride event” as she originally thought and when she got there she said she “felt out of her element” but she “stayed because the other [attendees] who were there were into it.”

One student described attending the “F” Word Panel (and event about feminism as a part of Women’s Herstory Month 2010) in which he “learned that I was a more conservative guy than I thought” but that in attending he found it “put you out of your comfort zone and gave you the chance to learn to think for yourself.”

Students also reflected on programs and events that they found fun such as volunteering for the Children’s Day in the Quad event, attending a Hornet baseball game, attending a poetry reading that raised awareness about gender inequality, participating as a Safe Rides volunteer, and getting to know other classmates.

“What I liked about the LRP Program is that the LRP made me go to events that I wanted to go to but did not in the past because I did not find time for it. I am really glad I went to all the events I did.”

When we inquired as to what students might get involved in again minus the LRP course credit they highlighted Career Center opportunities, particularly internship panel, speed interviews, and Hornet Athletic events.

When we asked if the LRP provided them with an opportunity to interact with people or a culture different than themselves or different than those that they already regularly interact with they reflected often on the opportunities to work with children from the Teen Center and events hosted by the PRIDE Center and the queer community. One student reported that “the diversity events were the most helpful to future leaders really because you learn to accept different perspectives.” Finally, when we asked if and how
the content of the events attended complimented or contradicted what they were learning in their class they shared that the “Leader in You workshop is different from theories brought in class and that it [gave me] another perspective of leadership.”

Overall, the participants described an appreciation of “the experiential learning opportunities” and described having “learned a lot that helped me prepare for my future career,” “time management and self-awareness,” “leadership development,” “new perspective on race and gender as it relates to professions,” “teamwork skills” and learning about resources available on campus through the “Women’s Center Opening Event” and the various “Career Center opportunities” and someone “really liked the way the program as a whole was put together. [Five] different categories give you so much exposure to things you wouldn’t usually get in touch with” reported one student participant.

We also asked students to share their recommendations to make the next phase of the Leadership Program more accessible or more desirable for student participants. Three resounding themes emerged: 1) Sign-In process at event needs to be consistent; 2) Service opportunities need to be more varied; and 3) Participants need more reminders about events (suggested using Facebook and email “blasts” for such communication.

**Conclusions**

As SO&L looks to piloting the next phase of the Leadership Initiative (LI), we have considered the feedback from our LRP students and will be working to streamline the sign-in process at all events and activities. Toward this goal, we received an ASI-funded grant that will provide us with the opportunity to employ two to three students on a part-time basis to assist us with tracking participation at the various events and programs. We also purchased two IPADS that will allow for the electronic tracking of students at each event through OrgSync. We have also made the decision to use vending fees to hire a part-time student assistant that can assist us with marketing and promoting the LI events and activities via social media. Finally, we will continue to work closely with our faculty and departmental partners to ensure that there are multiple options available to students in every category at times and days of the week that meet our diverse student body’s schedules and interests.

SO&L also worked with Dr. Beth Erickson and Ms. Vickii Castillion on the analysis of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership data. This analysis provided us with yet another perspective of leadership development and education at Sacrament State and in turn, gave us insight into potential next steps for the LI. Results of the MSL analysis are available at the SO&L website: [www.csus.edu/soal](http://www.csus.edu/soal).

As we plan for the next year, we are working in collaboration with Housing and Residential Life (HRL) on the development and implementation of a Leadership and Engagement Floor. We will be collaborating on developing Student Learning Objectives which allow us to gather a more nuanced understanding of students’ learning experiences as they relate to participating in the Leadership and Engagement floor.
Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Alysson Satterlund, Student Organizations & Leadership, 916.278.7914
Mission Statement

Mission: The Testing Center administers campus specific exams, CSU system-wide tests, and national standardized tests to current and prospective students. Testing accommodations are provided for students with special needs and make-up test services are available to students upon faculty request. Tests are proctored in private, controlled classrooms designed to reduce sound and visual distractions.

Planning Goals

Goal 1: To administer all tests in a quiet, monitored, controlled environment, so that students can concentrate without distraction.

Goal 2: To provide appropriate accommodations for students with special needs.

Goal 3: To offer make-up test services to faculty.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome 1
After completing computer based training, part-time student staff (employed as proctors, readers and scribes), will score at least 90% on a post-test covering testing policies and procedures.

Rationale: Training for proctors, readers and scribes is critical to the success of services provided by the Testing Center. For the past two years, the Testing Center Coordinator has used a computer-based training program to train student staff on testing policy and procedure at their own pace. The Director observed that online testing has proven to be more successful than former modalities in helping to reduce the number of problems encountered by students and staff on testing days (see 2007/2008 Testing Center Assessment). As such, the Testing Center Coordinator will continue to use this self-paced training strategy and to assess the results annually.

This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goal Number 4 – Information Competence.

Measures

Testing Center staff members require that student staff achieve a minimum score of 90% on a post-test (covering policies and procedures) after they complete the computer-based training module. The post-test is made up of 26 multiple choice, true/false and short answer questions (Appendix A).
Results

The data collection was put on hold as the Testing Center Coordinator leading the assessment retired. A new staff person has been identified to continue the assessment starting in Fall 2010.

Conclusions

N/A

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Tejeshwar Chowdhary, Director of Enrollment Operations Support (916) 278-7846. tsc@csus.edu
Mission Statement

Mission: The Office of the University Registrar oversees processing, security and storage of all academic records. Processing includes: evaluation of transfer credit, student registration, verification of enrollment and graduation, maintenance of academic records, processing and delivery of official transcripts, and degree conferment. In collaboration with academic and administrative departments, Registrar staff members empower students to actively participate in their enrollment, persist toward their degree, and maintain their academic records. To that end, the office provides telephone and face-to-face services, workshops, presentations; and email and on-line consultations with students, faculty, staff and alumni.

Planning Goals

Goal 1: Ensure that all matriculation, registration, transcript evaluation, and graduation processes are completed in a timely and accurate manner.

Goal 2: Maintain and safeguard the integrity of student information and academic records.

Goal 3: Enhance services to students, faculty, staff and alumni through continual review and analysis of work output and satisfaction data.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome 1

Upper-division (senior) students preparing to graduate will correctly answer at least 80% of all questions on a graduation workshop post-test immediately following the workshop.

Rationale: When students clearly understand the components of their degree, their individual degree requirements, and the graduation application process staff believe that they will be more likely to make better decisions on classes that move them toward degree completion.

This student learning outcome supports baccalaureate learning goals Number 2—Analysis and Problem Solving; and Number 4—Information Competence.

Measures

The Graduation Evaluation staff in the Registrar’s Office invited students to the Graduation Workshop who had earned at least 80 units and who have not filed an application to graduate. After attending the workshop, staff expected participants to
demonstrate basic knowledge on how to apply for graduation; to determine whether they are making effective progress toward their degree; and, to clarify degree their individual requirements.

Staff offered twenty workshops throughout the 2009-10 academic year. 179 students attended the nine sessions that were offered in the fall. 279 students attended the eleven sessions that were held in the spring. The workshop instructor asked participants to complete a seven question pre- and post-test during each workshop.

As experienced in previous semesters, some students either arrived too late for the pre-test or left early and did not take the post-test. As such, staff only completed a score analysis for students that finished both the pre- and post-test (143 students in the fall and 167 students in the spring).

The pre- and post-tests are intended to measure how well students retained information from the graduation workshop in four content areas:

- How to apply to graduate
- How to determine minimum graduation requirements
- How and when degrees are posted by the university
- How to get credit for additional coursework

Results

Students exhibited improved performance from the pre- to post-test on a substantial number of questions. There were, however, two areas where students had more difficulty in responding correctly, although the majority gained better understanding and comprehension (Outstanding requirements – what should you do?; and Transfer units, once they reach 70 units, will additional courses count toward the 120 unit cap for the degree?). Refer to pre-/post-tests results by term/year in Appendix A.

In comparing pre- to post-test responses, staff noted that students in the fall had a better improvement rate for most questions than the students in the spring. This could be due to more fall students completing both the pre- and post-test vs. the spring (in fall, 179 students participated, 143 post-tests were returned, a 79.9% ratio; in spring, 279 students participated and 167 post-tests were returned, a 59.9% ratio).

The average (seven question) pre-test score for sessions held in the fall was 67.8%, and post-test 84.1%; this represents a 16.3% increase pre- to post-test for fall. Students participating in the fall met the learning objective exceeding the minimum 80% average score. The average score of all pre-tests held in the spring was 71.1%, and the post-test 80%; this represents an 8.9% increase for the spring. Students participating in the spring workshops did not achieve the learning objective.
Conclusions

The reason(s) students failed to meet the learning objective in the spring is unclear to the Registrar’s Office staff. The Registrar already noted that a smaller percentage of students completed the post-test in the spring vs. the fall. However, he does not believe this would account for the entire drop in the average number of correct responses. Staff will continue to analyze this outcome to attempt to determine what measures can be taken to improve the success rate for spring participants.

The Registrar and Associate Registrar did attend a number of the workshops and collected anecdotal observations both from staff who presented and from students who participated. The anecdotal remarks were very positive and students felt that they gained valuable information during the workshop. Workshop instructors also encouraged students to follow-up and visit the Graduation Evaluations department for one-on-one graduation advising during walk-in hours (and many of the students took advantage of this offer).

Additionally during this past year, the Registrar’s Office and Division of Information Technology collaborated to develop an on-line application for graduation. An on-line interactive tutorial along with a section for Frequently Asked Questions was also developed and is available on the Registrar’s website – Applying to Graduate Online http://www.csus.edu/registrar/graduation/apply_online.stm

A pilot group of selected academic departments and majors tested and implemented this software with great success. This project should further streamline the graduation process for students. The Registrar Office’s goal is for all academic departments to adopt the on-line application and approval process within the next year.

In a continuing effort to learn from this assessment and to make improvements, the Registrar and Associate Registrar will request the following actions from the graduation evaluation staff for 2010-2011:

- Conduct a thorough review of the questions posed along with the expected answers. An analysis of the information presented as compared to the results will be reviewed and adjustments made to the information presented, both in the graduation workshop and on the Registrar’s website.
- Explore options for administering the pre and post-tests to improve the response rate. This may include: additional hard copy materials, referral to web-site links, shortened presentation, incentives to stay to the end.
- Target specific majors for workshops so students with similar graduation requirements attend the same sessions.
- Create an on-line workshop to capture greater numbers of students including those unable to attend an in-person workshop.
- Update the power point presentation to include the on-line graduation application process.
**Program Objective 1**

All documents regarding student academic records that are received in the Registrar's Office will be tracked, and will be processed in a timely and accurate manner. An initial review of current document processing speed (cycle time) and accuracy (quality control) rates will be completed in spring 2010. Based on the results of this review, more specific program objectives will be established for future semesters.

*Rationale: In the past three years, the University has transitioned from a legacy student administrative software system to a new system called CMS. This transition resulted in significant system processing/response delays, and the need for business processes to be re-engineered. Additionally, new CSU and Sac State administrative and executive level polices were introduced which prevented staff from processing documents in as timely manner as was planned. This program objective aims to alleviate the resulting delays.*

**Measures**

Registrar’s staff completed an inventory of document types and associated production reports in spring 2009. Staff reviewed the inventory to insure that data regarding quality control and cycle time was being captured. After the review, document processing outcomes were analyzed to determine which processes or reports needed to be improved for the next processing cycle (2010/2011).

Examples of specific document processing objectives include:

- Complete Standard outgoing transcript requests within 10 days of completed request receipt
- Complete Transfer Credit Evaluations (TCE) based on institutional priority prior to new student attendance at orientation
- Complete Degree Evaluations prior to the 1st day of registration for the semester indicated on the student’s graduation application

**Results**

The Registrar asked staff to focus processing improvements in three areas:

1. **On-line Transcript Ordering**

   To provide on-line transcript order services to students and alumni, the Registrar implemented Robo-Registrar, a Credentials, Inc. product used at multiple universities. The option to order transcripts on-line has now been available for over a year (the new system went into full production in mid-February, 2009). Students and alumni now have the option to pay with a credit card and this has been well received. Staff report that Robo-Registrar has helped streamline official transcript order and production processing and reduced the number of...
complaints. Over 60% of all transcript orders are captured using the Robo-Registrar system. Although each transcript produced must be reviewed to assure accuracy (verify data converted from the CMS implementation), the standard processing time has gone from 10 business days to 6 – 8 business days. The program objective has been met.

2. Transfer Credit Evaluation Priority

After eliminating a significant backlog in transfer credit evaluations in 2008/2009 the Registrar further improved transfer credit processing by establishing a priority procedure to insure that transcripts are processed for students in priority groups in a timelier manner. Priority groups are:

A. New transfers students applying for financial aid (in order to accurately reflect the student’s grade level for aid processing)
B. New transfer students attending Orientation (to insure that registration holds are cleared and pre-requisite requirements are entered into the student’s academic record)
C. Graduating seniors with external credit (to insure that graduating the credit reflected for graduating seniors is as accurate as possible)

The Transfer Credit Evaluation team experienced staffing reduction during the past year as two of the five staff had to take extended medical leaves. Simultaneously, there was an overall increase in the number of transcripts to be evaluated. This combination of events caused the average processing time for TCEs to be increased. Consequently, the overall goal of finalizing the transcript evaluation prior to the first day of the semester was not met.

3. Graduation Processing (application, evaluation, check-out)

Since transitioning to CMS, the most significant processing delay experienced by students has been delivery of completed graduation evaluations. According to the Academic Advising Policy, staff must complete a graduation evaluation for any student who applies for graduation at least one semester prior to the term for which they have applied to graduate. After transitioning to CMS, staff experienced a 20% decrease in graduation processing efficiency. At the same time, significant delays in system response time exacerbated this problem. During the past year, mandatory two day a month furloughs also reduced processing time.

Regardless of the challenges presented, for the past two semesters, the Registrar’s Office has been able to complete graduation evaluations for all students who applied (on-time) to graduate before the beginning of their final semester. The most significant contributing factor to this success was a partnership created with key staff in the College of Business, Liberal Studies program, Athletic Advising and Academic Advising. These departments already
had some graduation evaluation expertise. With minimal training, the staff in partner departments were able to complete evaluations for their students. Partnering with staff in these departments increased the Registrar’s capacity to complete degree evaluations for all students.

**Conclusions**

The Registrar is very pleased that both the on-line transcript ordering system and the priority processing for transfer credit evaluations have been fully implemented. In addition, the graduation reengineering project as described below has been successfully implemented this year significantly improving processing time for graduation evaluations.

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Dennis Geyer, (916) 278-7748. dgeyer@csus.edu
University Union and the WELL/Recreational Sports
2009-2010 Assessment Plans

Mission Statement

Note: Departmental mission must be directly aligned with those of the University and the Division. This statement should include approximately 3-5 sentences that identify the name of the department, its primary functions, modes of delivery and target audience.

Mission: The University Union and the WELL exist for the benefit of students, offering a welcoming environment where students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the greater community participate in campus life. The program, services, and facilities of the Union foster personal growth, encourage social interaction, and develop leadership skills. This involvement leads to memorable experiences and builds a community that cultivates enduring commitment, pride, and loyalty toward the University.

Rationale: The University Union and the WELL area a dynamic part of the educational program of the campus. Its program and organization serve as a laboratory for citizenship, and train students for social responsibility and for leadership. Through its facilities, boards, committees, and staff, it provides a cultural, social, and recreational program aiming to make free-time activity a cooperative factor with study in education. It encourages activities which give maximum opportunity for self-realization and growth with a goal toward the development of persons, as well as intellects. The Union/WELL supports the view that what a student does educationally in the hours outside the classroom is of major importance, and that the Union/WELL can assist in adding an additional dimension to education—vastly expanding the time and the means through which the University educates.

Planning Goals

Note: Planning Goals are broad statements that describe the overarching, long-range intentions of an administrative unit. Goals are used primarily for general planning, as the starting point for the development and refinement of program objectives or student learning outcomes. (UCF Administrative Handbook, University of Central Florida).

Goal 1: Train staff and students to provide customer-oriented service sensitive to the needs of our multicultural campus community.

Goal 2: Enhance students’ (interns and assistants) interpersonal, leadership, and critical thinking skills; help prepare them for active citizenship beyond college.

Goal 3: Increase the use of the University Union’s and the WELL’s programs, services, and facilities by members of the campus community.

Goal 4: Partner with faculty and other Student Affairs units to offer educationally purposeful programs that will increase the learning of those who participate.
Student Learning Outcome 1

Design Intern Program

By August 2009, the 09-10 Design Interns will hone their skills by learning a cutting-edge print and presentation format design. This contemporary design will completely change the University Union’s Annual Report, other widely read documents, and various publicity materials. Student performance information gathered this year will serve to create rubric tools that will more formally assess student learning in future.

Rationale: The University Union receives a mandatory fee from every student who attends Sacramento State. To inform and attract students to the Union’s services and programs, it must produce high quality marketing material. The design intern program trains students to create and maintain a top-notch reporting and marketing program. Such training is invaluable to those student interns who wish to enter the field as a new professional.

This outcome aligns with the Baccalaureate Learning Goal of Competence in the Disciplines. Interns will grow their skill set dramatically by acquiring hands-on experience and by using state-of-the-art design techniques. They will also gain experience in having their para-professional work assessed and critiqued by “real-life” end users.

Measures

Note: Measures describe the methodology and timeframe for data collection. Measures also should identify the population being surveyed and/or tested. Provide materials such as survey instruments, check lists, focus group protocols, etc. in an appendix.

- Pretest: The interview process sets the baseline of skills for the intern taking on the project. An individual learning plan is developed at that time.

- In Process: Emphasis in the experience of working directly with UUOCI Executive Director for content input and design feedback/adjustments and with Reprographics (or other printer) for coordination of the proofing and printing of the final design

- Post Test: Throughout the project, a supervisor will conduct skill observation sessions and provide the interns with immediate feedback in the following areas:
  - Design process
  - Design skills
  - Presentation skills
  - Print processes
  - Ability to work in collaboration with the Client.
Evaluate design skill set and experience in working on this and similar projects

Results

Note: Results include a brief narrative of findings, and/or essential tables or graphs. The results should indicate the extent to which the program objective or student learning outcome was met.

Parker, a graduating senior was the design student that was awarded the Design Internship for 2009-10. Initially Parker’s design skills and ability to bring projects to successful completion were questionable. Certain specific design skills were not up to standard and required much supervision and mentoring. His challenges are not unique to him; most early design students have similar issues and skill development occurs over time. The support provided by the Design Team encouraged Parker to take on a new project and to take it from start to finish. The project was the Union’s Annual Report for 2008-09. This required his skill set to increase, and for him to better manage his time and his work. This project also required Intern A to work with a client outside the Design Unit, the Executive Director of the Union. He was able to communicate his vision, willing to accept constructive criticism without internalizing it to a point of design paralysis and brought a new design ethic to the annual report. He completed the project on time, in budget and delivered a creative approach to presenting some otherwise dry material.

Conclusions

Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It should also “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

The Design Internship program is different from most others when it comes to measuring skill development. It is much more about design skill development and subjective evaluation than numerical quantification of that skill. Parker’s experience clearly demonstrates how he grew during his internship program and in fact he is currently working on the 2010-2011 Strategic Plan before he leaves our organization. Please see the attached addendum for more details on Intern A’s progress and growth through the Design Internship Program of the University Union.

Student Learning Outcome 2

Building Supervisors will develop professional skills necessary to effectively operate the University Union and prepare them for professional life after Sac State.

  Skill Set will include:
  1. Quality of work
  2. Efficiency
  3. Job skill knowledge
  4. Communication
  5. Initiative
6. Attitude  
7. Polices and procedure  
8. Safety  

Rationale: The University Union and the WELL takes pride in:

- Hiring and retaining the best trained and most results-driven student staff on campus.  
- Teaching student employees to use newly acquired skills to improve customer service to the campus community.  
- Developing supervisors who can role model desired skills and behaviors, and earn the respect of the other student employees  
- This outcome aligns with the Baccalaureate Learning Goal of Communication, specifically, the ability to speak, listen, and respond, with understanding and appreciation, to a wide variety of customer and staff requests. This outcome also aligns with the Baccalaureate Learning Goal of Analysis and Problem Solving, specifically in response to issues that arise during every shift, requiring effective communication, job knowledge, and the correct attitude and disposition to achieve excellence in their job responsibilities and in life.

Measures

The rubric has been developed (see attached Addendum #1).

Results

The peer evaluation was completed by 36 operations performance of 3 individual Building Supervisors, in 8 leadership skill categories. The results of this assessment are intended to give supervisors better guidance as to where to focus future training. The results are broken down by actual score as well as average for each category.

Total score breakdown (for 36 respondents):

(5) Excellent = 1153–1440  
(4) Exceeds Expectations = 865–1152  
(3) Meets Expectations = 577–864  
(2) Below Expectations = 289–576  
(1) Unacceptable = 0–288

Building Supervisor #1 731 Meets Expectations  
Building Supervisor #2 908 Exceeds Expectations  
Building Supervisor #3 1179 Excellent
Building Supervisor Leadership Skills Performance Results:
Average Group Score
April 2010
N=3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Skill</th>
<th>n-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work: Attention to detail; thoroughness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency and organization</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job knowledge</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills with customers and co-workers</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative; responsibility; dependability</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job attitude</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adheres to and promotes safety guidelines</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It also should “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

In 2009-10, the Building Supervisors were evaluated by their peers and those that they supervised based on the knowledge and skill sets required of these top level positions within the student employment program of the Union. A rubric was created and utilized for this evaluation process.

The data yielded information for the development and implementation of a personal development plan for each of the supervisors. While all supervisors scored that they met expectations or higher, it was determined that focus needs to be placed on the following skill sets:

- Quality of work: Attention to detail; thoroughness
- Communicating with customers and co-workers
- Initiative; responsibility; dependability
- Job attitude

Effort applied in these areas will elevate the performance levels to that of “exceeds expectations”, which has been determined to be our minimum level of successful performance.

This being the first time using the rubric, it was an overall success. In the coming year, the rubric should be utilized twice, once mid fall semester and then again in late spring semester. This adaption will demonstrate the growth of our student supervisors.
throughout the year and the impact of the ongoing training received by the supervisors throughout the year.

**Student Learning Outcome 3**

The student assistant will be able to demonstrate with the needed skill sets as a part of the interview process. The skills include: Extensive abilities in web programming & accessibility standards.

**Measures**

- **Pretest:** The interview process sets the baseline of skills for the IT Student Assistant taking on the corporate wide Web Programming. An individual learning plan is developed at that time (specified in job description pg. 18).
  - Knowledge of Web Programming Standards and Trends in Wbe 2.0
  - Knowledge in HTML, CSS, PHP, ASP, JavaScript, AJAX, XML, mySQL, Microsoft SQL Server, and RSS.
  - Knowledge of Development Environments such as Dreamweaver, Visual Studio 2005 or higher.
  - Basic understanding of TCP/IP based wired and wireless (802.11b, 802.11g, 802.11n) networks, both hardware and components
  - Ability to document resolutions to problems/issues for future reference.

- **Post Test:** Throughout the project, a supervisor will conduct skill observation sessions and provide the student Assistant with immediate feedback in the following areas:
  - Web Design process
  - Programming skills and project outcomes
  - Ability to work with clients through the corporation
  - Ability to work in collaboration with the IT Team

**Results**

This was not completed due to the opening of a new building and the extraordinary demands on our IT team’s time and resources to make sure the building’s technology is ready. A job description was created and a student hired in this position. See Addendum #2,

**Conclusions**

A rubric will be developed in 2010-11 to evaluate skill development and performance of design interns.
Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Leslie Davis, Executive Director University Union and the WELL, (916) 278-6745 or leslied@csus.edu
Mission Statement

Note: Departmental mission must be directly aligned with those of the University and the Division. This statement should include approximately 3-5 sentences that identify the name of the department, its primary functions, modes of delivery and target audience.

Mission: The mission of the Women’s Resource Center (WRC) is to confront sexism and promote gender equity through education, advocacy, and programming. The Center develops programs on campus to increase student awareness and understanding of the contributions, opportunities and barriers facing women in our society. The mission of the PRIDE Center is to improve the campus climate for LGBTIAQQ students and advocate for the respect, safety, and integration of all members of the campus community through dynamic programming, educational outreach, and advocacy services.

Planning Goals

Note: Planning Goals are broad statements that describe the overarching, long-range intentions of an administrative unit. Goals are used primarily for general planning, as the starting point for the development and refinement of program objectives or student learning outcomes. (UCF Administrative Handbook, University of Central Florida).

Goal 1: Develop students’ understanding of the contributions, opportunities and barriers facing women in contemporary society through participation in the Women’s Resource Center activities.

Goal 2: Increase students’ respect for and acceptance of the LGBTIAQQ community on campus through participation in the PRIDE Center’s programs, celebration events and the facilitation of the Safe Zone Training Program for faculty, staff, and students.

Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes

Note: The Objectives or Outcomes can be one of two types: program objectives or student learning outcomes. The former are related to program improvement around issues like timeliness, efficiency and participant satisfaction. The latter addresses what a student learns or how a student changes by participating in the program or utilizing the service. Both program objectives and student learning outcomes are measurable statements that provide evidence as to how well you are reaching your goals.

Student Learning Outcome #1

80% of students participating in Women’s Resource Center workshops will indicate an increased understanding of the contributions, opportunities, and issues facing women in contemporary society.
Rationale: In support of this goal and in concert with the Baccalaureate Learning Goal of “Values and Pluralism”, the Center plans the following:

- Schedule special events and workshops that deepen students’ ability to recognize and understand: 1) the contributions, opportunities and issues facing women in contemporary society, and 2) the implications of various social structures and the ways people are grouped in our society.
- Host social and academic support groups that positively impact the retention of participating female students (Math and Science Café, Single Moms Support Group, Statistics Café)

Measures

Note: Measures describe the methodology and timeframe for data collection. Measures also should identify the population being surveyed and/or tested. Provide materials such as survey instruments, check lists, focus group protocols, etc. in an appendix.

- Host a focus group of WRC event participants to evaluate the impact of the activity/program on understanding the contributions, opportunities and issues facing women in contemporary society (Vagina Monologues; International Women’s Day, Social/Academic Support Groups, Love Your Body Day, Women in Technology Panel, Women in the Military) (See Appendix A).
- Post test of students at participating events to assess learning (See Appendix B).

Results

Note: Results include a brief narrative of findings, and/or essential tables or graphs. The results should indicate the extent to which the program objective or student learning outcome was met.

Background

In mid-August 2009, the WRC was merged on an interim basis with the office of Student Organizations & Leadership (formerly Student Activities) and in a cost-saving measure the position of Director of the Women’s Resource Center was eliminated following the retirement of Dr. Pat Grady.

With the support of the professional staff of Student Organizations & Leadership and several student program assistants funded by ASI grants and an alumni giving campaign, the WRC created new events and programs as well as hosted or co-sponsored programs traditionally associated with the WRC at Sac State:
18 Single Mom Support Group meetings with a total of three student participants per week; 16 Math & Science Cafes with a total of two student participants per week in Fall 2009 and one student participant per week in Spring 2010; eight Statistics Cafes with three student participants per week in Spring 2010; seven Veterans Cafes with varied attendance (five to 25 student participants depending on the program); two movie afternoons with faculty facilitation (Dr. Jacqueline Carrigan and Dr. Sujatha Moni) in which 15 students participated; 11 mental and physical health-centered workshops with Student Health Center and the WELL in which a total of 94 students participated; two lectures on the impacts of pornography (McNair Scholar Megan Mass) in which 165 people attended; one lecture on female sexuality (Dr. Patty Woodward) in which 125 people attended; a professional clothing drive for a local non-profit organization (WEAVE) netted 30 suits and had 20 student volunteers participate; ten students promoted Pan-Hellenic Council’s “Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention programs and Charity Denim fund-raiser for Ovarian Cancer Research ($750 raised); co-sponsored three performances of the Sac State Vagina Monologues and the Sacramento Taiko Dan Drummers; coordinated and collaborated on events for Women’s Herstory Month (Open Mic: Women of Color in Higher Education [with the MCC], The F-Word Panel [Dr. Vicki Hall], Women in Technology Panel [with WITI], Women’s Rights and Politics in America [Drs. Rebecca Kluchin and Erika Gasser]; three-week "Stop the Pain" gallery display [University Union, the WELL, and Collaborative Services] and Women of Influence Awards [with Housing and Residential Life]).

Assessment of the outcomes of this year’s programs and events are drawn from post-event surveys and direct face-to-face requests for feedback made by me to participants.

Overall, results of 29 post-event surveys and direct responses to requests for feedback included an appreciation and overall enjoyment of the lectures presented on the subject of women’s sexuality; the value of the “F-Word Panel” as a venue for examining feminism in 2010; the importance of the Women of Influence 2010 event as a means to recognize and promote a community of empowerment on our campus; a new understanding of the biological impacts of viewing pornographic material; and the importance of cross-unit collaboration as a means to serve students (as was the case with the student-led Veterans’ Café hosted by the Women’s Resource Center).

One of the student coordinators for the Veterans’ Café remarked that the most successful event was one in which Undersecretary Barbara Ward from the California Department of Veterans Affairs discussed “women’s and minority issues that veterans face around the State. This event included many graduate students [from] the social work field, Women’s Studies students, and veterans. It was our largest turnout and most successful event.” – VSO Student Leader

One attendee of the Women and Pornography event described have a greater “awareness of the widespread hidden world of pornography.” - Women and Pornography attendee
Another attendee of the Women and Pornography event indicated that he/she learned “A LOT!” and described having “different views of pornography” after having attended the lecture.

An attendee of our Single Moms Support Group shared that the group is “something I need and really look forward to it.”

An attendee and recipient of this year’s Women of Influence award remarked that “this [event] was a wonderful experience, and it was great to hear what these women are doing in the Sac State community.”

Another attendee and recipient of the Women of Influence award shared that “it feels great to be recognized with all these great women. I know that if I do good, then younger students will see that and be the best that they can be.”

Feedback shared about the Statistics Café indicated that its current design does not address student needs and the format is too taxing on our volunteer tutors. Its attendance has also suffered from a lack of consistent marketing about its availability.

Conclusions

Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It should also “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

The WRC will be focusing its 2010-2011 programming efforts on developing events and activities in three primary venues: 1) Weekly or bi-weekly social and academic support groups led by student volunteers; 2) Campus-wide lectures presented by faculty members that focus on health issues pertinent to women (and those who support them) and 3) Community building celebrations that engage the campus community in creative and thought-provoking dialogue about gender equity and policy.

The WRC will coordinate one more series of Statistics Café in a new format based on recommendations from a faculty member working with us through the University’s K-12 STEM and MEP program. We will evaluate it in December 2010 to determine if we should continue to support it.

Now that the WRC has been stabilized with ASI-grant funding for student assistants and $1000 in alumni giving to support program costs, we anticipate that we will be in a better position to evaluate and assess the impact of the WRC at Sacramento State. Particularly, we will work more diligently to focus on the benefits of social support groups we have organized: 1) Single Moms Support Group, 2) Science and Math Café, 3) Statistics Café, and 4) Veterans Café. It would be valuable to know if these groups positively impact retention.

The WRC has benefited from articles in the State Hornet (Sac State women honored at ceremony, March 23, 2010; Single-Parent Students, February 17, 2010; Putting Her
Story Back in History!; March 3, 2010; and the Veterans’ Café was highlighted in the Sacramento Press (Saluting college veterans, January 29, 2010) as well as from collaborations with Veterans Affairs, Multi-Cultural Center, Women Studies Department, ASI, Women in Technology, University Union and Collaborative Services, individual faculty members, UNIQUE, Student Health Services, and Housing and Residential Life.

**Student Learning Outcome #2**

80% of students who participate in PRIDE Center programs/workshops will demonstrate an increased understanding of the issues and dynamics that affect the LGBTIAQQ student community after participation.

**Rationale:** In support of this goal, and in concert with the Baccalaureate Learning Goal of “Values and Pluralism”, specifically to develop students’ ability to recognize and understand the implications of various social structures and the ways people are grouped by such characteristics as status, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, the program plans the following:

- Organize and facilitate Sac State classroom presentations/panels of students from the Queer Community.
- Examine issues affecting the LGBTIAQQ community through dynamic student-led programming.
- Create opportunities for celebration of LGBTIAQQ community through on-campus events such as PRIDE Week and Queer History Month

**Measures**

- Host a focus group of PRIDE Center program/event participants to evaluate the impact of the activity/program on understanding the issues affecting the LGBTIAQQ community (See Appendix C).
- Post test of students at participating events to assess learning (See Appendix D).

**Results**

**Background**

In mid-August 2009, the WRC was merged on an interim basis with the office of Student Organizations & Leadership (formerly Student Activities) and in a cost-saving measure the position of Director of the Women’s Resource Center was eliminated following the retirement of Dr. Pat Grady. Along with the WRC came the PRIDE Center which was supported financially through the WRC.
With the support of the professional staff of Student Organizations & Leadership and several student program assistants funded by reallocated ASI grant dollars and an alumni giving campaign, the PRIDE Center created new events and programs as well as hosted or co-sponsored programs and training sessions traditionally associated with the PRIDE Center at Sac State:

Gay Rights in America Lecture had 15 attendees (Dr. Brian DiSarro); Queer History Month 2009 was recognized with four programs (Welcome Back Reception [ten attendees], Coyote Grace Concert [50 attendees] and co-sponsored with UNIQUE, Guess Who’s Gay [standing room only, 180 attendees], and I Have Two Mommies, I Have Two Daddies panel with the MCC [60 attendees]); Domestic Partnerships vs. Marriage panel (40 attendees); PRIDE Week (Campus Ally Fair, PRIDE Week Kickoff Reception [20 attendees]; Queering the Femme: Gender is not a Two Party System [20 attendees], Sevenrepeat co-sponsored with UNIQUE, Queer People of Color Art Reception with the MCC, Kings of Drag performance, Out & Greek Lecture [40 attendees], A Night of Poetry with Andrea Gibson co-sponsored with UNIQUE, Gender Bender variety show); GLBT Culture and Politics Symposium co-sponsored with the Department of Government [15 attendees]; Lavender Graduation (Fall [12 attendees] and Spring [25 attendees]); 14 classroom panels and two Safe Zone trainings.

Overall, results of 19 post-event surveys and direct responses to requests for feedback included an appreciation and overall enjoyment of the lectures presented on the subject being raised in a household with parents of the same gender, the Domestic Partnership vs. Marriage panel, Guess Who’s Gay, and PRIDE Week events and programs.

Two attendees of the Domestic Partnership vs. Marriage lecture reported having changed their minds about supporting Prop 8 after attending the event and one attendee of the GLBT symposium reported that the event did not change his views but did reinforce that “gays should have equal rights.” Another attendee of this event described that listening to the panel “definitely added complexity to my perspective” while another shared a recommendation that the symposium would have benefited from sharing more information about “gays in the African American community.”

After reviewing 24 feedback surveys, more than 90% of students attending classes in which a PRIDE Center panel was presented reported that the experiences of the panel members provided them with a better understanding of the diversity within the Queer community; 75% reported having a better understanding of the discrimination Queer individuals face; 80% reported being more aware of how their actions might affect the Queer community and more than 80% were able to identify campus resources that are available for Queer students and their allies.

The PRIDE Center provided Safe Zone training to the professional staff and interns of the MCC and EOP.
Conclusions

Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It should also “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

The PRIDE Center will be focusing its 2010-2011 programming efforts on developing programs and activities in three primary areas: 1) Bi-weekly awareness-raising events representative of our diverse community; 2) Increasing the number of Safe Zone Trainings and Panels across campus; and 3) Annual campus-wide celebrations which recognize the contributions of the queer community.

The PRIDE Center benefited from articles in the State Hornet (PRIDE Center discusses same-sex marriage, March 23, 2010; Queer History Month, PRIDE Center works to increase awareness, Gays deserve straight support; Event strives to break down misconceptions; October 14, 2010) and collaborations from individual faculty members (Dr. Brian DiSarro), UNIQUE, MCC, Queer Student Alliance, ASI, KSSU, Sigma Phi Epsilon, Academic Advising and Career Center, MECHA, Housing and Residential Life, Peer Health Educations, and Green Student Alliance.

Program Objective #1

80% of the faculty who requested classroom PRIDE Center panel presentations last year will indicate their satisfaction with the presentations.

Rationale: In support of this goal, the PRIDE Center plans the following:

- **Survey faculty who scheduled classroom panel presentations in their classes during Academic Year 2009-10.**
- **Identify revisions to improve the presentations.**
- **Foster future collaborations between faculty and the PRIDE Center.**

Measures

A survey following the facilitation of a PRIDE Center panel will identify faculty members' level of satisfaction with various aspects of the classroom panel presentations (See Appendix E).

Results

The PRIDE Center organized and facilitated 14 student-led classroom discussion panels during the 2009-2010 academic year. Overall, feedback from faculty was positive. One faculty member reported difficulty in organizing the panel with the PRIDE
Center staff and cancelled it. However, all other faculty members indicated agreement with the statement “[t]his presentation was a valuable classroom experience.”

Conclusions

Note: The conclusion should summarize briefly the collection and analyses of data. It should also “close the loop” by identifying what decisions and/or program modifications were made on the basis of these analyses.

The PRIDE Center panels serve as an outstanding venue to raise awareness on campus. It is our intention to focus our resources on expanding the number of panels and Safe Zone trainings we present as well as increasing the quality of customer service we provide to those who work with the PRIDE Center. To expand the PRIDE Center’s training and outreach capacity, we will develop a group of PRIDE Center Allies who will be trained to participate in panels and to serve as Safe Zone trainers (and have already trimmed the time it takes to participate in Safe Zone training [from six to two hours]). As we look to the next academic year, we will determine the level of impact preparing to be a Safe Zone trainer has on students who participate in the training and serve as Safe Zone trainers.

Questions regarding the programs and outcomes delineated in this section should be addressed to Alysson Satterlund, 916.278.7914. alysson.satterlund@csus.edu