College of the Redwoods Student Development Outcomes Notes
Prepared by Dr. Nathan Rexford
June 18, 2019

<u>General Notes</u>

- A number of the outcomes address how well the service area is delivering their service for the students. However, some of the outcomes seek to measure how well the students are learning about information related to the service. While terminology is not set in stone, ==as a best practice many institutions when evaluating student service divisions identify outcomes where students receive== *==knowledge==* ==as SLOs and outcomes where students receive== *==services==* ==as SAOs==. Both are arguably fine for the office of student development, though I would argue that SAOs should take priority given the different mission than the office of instruction.
    - Take as an example online orientation, at COS run through the Counseling/Advising department. Currently, no students are *required* to complete orientation, though we do offer registration incentives. Thus, one could argue for an SAO that discusses the *reach* of orientation services, with a possible assessment of number or percentage of students receiving orientation services. At the same time, one could argue for an SLO that calls for students to be able to demonstrate mastery of basic registration practices after orientation, with a possible assessment of a pre/post test with questions focusing on topics such as using the catalog for course selection, maneuvering through the student information system to register, etc.
    - At the same time, many non-instructional departments have little reason or reasonable opportunity to assess student learning. Information Technology departments would have to very thoroughly hunt for a possible "learning opportunity", and at least at my institution, the Office of Research has no formal interactions with students. Obviously, in the realm of Student Development, it is much easier to envision student "learning" opportunities, but I would imagine there is a desire to be mindful of standardization.
    - Presented just as a recommendation based on my best practices training, ==each service area should have a minimum of one SAO==. An SLO or two would provide a more complete set of outcomes, but there should always be at least as many (preferably more) SAOs==. If College of the Redwoods demands high levels of in-department standardization, carefully determine if all service areas can reasonably support SLOs.==
- The word *understand* appears in a number of outcomes. The difficulty with the word "understand" is that evaluation is arguably limited to self-reporting. If that does not feel rigorous enough for some areas, consider *demonstrate, explain*, or even *list*.
- In a few cases, the outcomes include particularly specific language that would better act as an assessment of the given outcome. In fact, a well-written outcome should be able to generate more than a single method of assessment, at which time it is then the duty of the area director to determine which option is most appropriate (and feasible) for the given cycle.
- This is discussed in specific cases below, but in a number of areas ==there is an intersection between services offered by areas inside Student Development division and instructional offerings, some of which are apportionment-eligible courses==. Because outcomes and assessments for apportionment-eligible classes are *currently* more heavily scrutinized than ones in student service areas, ==I would advise that none of the SAOs / SLOs for the== *==areas==* ==address content or delivery of that kind of instruction==. If the area directors still feel it is important, they can reach out to the faculty who oversee the relevant subjects.

<u>Specific Service Areas – Outcomes</u>

- Academic Support Center

- o This is admittedly personal preference, but I prefer succinct outcomes. I would strike the introductory clause in both outcomes.
  - o Both listed outcomes more closely follow the SLO template. Interestingly, the second outcome even calls out the nature of ASC services. ==Consider working with area director to develop at least one SAO. As an example, at COS we have committed to having Math and English peer tutors available every hour the ASC is open.== That would likely be too modest an objective at COR, but perhaps a target of basic skills students using their services?
- Athletics
  - o The third outcome *appears* to represent an internal institutional effectiveness project. While likely an important analysis to conduct, the current wording doesn't lend itself to typical SAO templates. With that said, one could imagine an outcome that speaks to the second part, something along the lines of "Maintain levels of retention and success among student athletes comparable to the district-wide average", which could then be assessed through the Cap & Gown program.
  - o Outcomes that more closely follow SLO template (first and second) outnumber outcomes that more closely follow SAO template. However, the second outcome could be reworked into an SAO, committing to maximizing the number of students who maintain athletic eligibility.
- CalWORKS
  - o The first outcome needs to be reworked to an aggregate-level outcome. Example: "CalWORKS students will develop…."
    - ▪ Without knowing too much about COR or program-specific procedures, if it is mandatory for all CalWORKS students to develop a SEP, it would not make an ideal outcome, as deviation represents not continuous steps to improvement, but immediate lack of compliance.
  - o The second and third outcome could be seen as two possible methods of assessing and outcome dedicated to decreasing premature exit among the CalWORKS cohort.
- Child Development Center
  - o After reviewing the assessment report for reference, the first outcome is potentially too close to a compliance issue. As noted earlier, the danger in making SAOs out of regulations is that there is no room for development. They must be done, or the program is out of compliance.
  - o The third outcome, beyond its slightly cumbersome reading, touches on an interesting point of discussion. Does the service area of the CDC "own" outcomes for the students, or are those the domain of the Early Childhood Education program? Typically, outcomes related to the administration of instruction by teaching staff are linked with the most closely related academic program. Is there a possibility to rework that outcome to focus on the efforts of the support staff? I went to check the CDC website to find information for more specific possibilities, but apparently, it is undergoing some construction.
    - ▪ Strictly speaking, this applies to the second outcome as well.
- Counseling/Advising
  - o ==None of the outcomes as listed fit the typical mold of SAOs. The first two outcomes more closely fit the SLO mold, and the third outcome represents internal training.==
  - o ==With that said, the first outcome could easily be reworded into an SAO. The focus would be on increasing the percentage of students completing a SEP. Potential wording minimizing changes to the original: "The Counseling/Advising Department will enable all students to select an education goal and complete a [SEP]".==

- DSPS
  - The first outcome could be reworked similar to the Counseling/Advising outcome, with a focus on the department's efforts rather than the student's performance (which of course would be a fantastic way to assess the department's efforts)
  - The second outcome may face the same challenge as the third outcome from the CDC concerning the question around assessment of outcomes related to course instruction.
- Enrollment Services
  - Outcomes that more closely follow SLO template (first through third) outnumber outcomes that more closely follow SAO template.
  - It was interesting to see that a service area named "enrollment services" functionally had 3.5 of the outcomes tied to Financial Aid with perhaps some of the fourth outcome tied to the Admissions Office. It might be worth considering development of an outcome solely for that area.
  - The first outcome, if left as an SLO, needs to be rewritten to adjust nonparallel wording of the two "lessons".
    - Possibility: *Students will demonstrate an understanding of the due dates for fees related to registration as well as the resulting consequences of unpaid balances.*
- EOPS
  - If I recall correctly, isn't an Ed Plan a mandatory part of the counselor/advisor contacts to receive all of the program rewards? In which case, it may be better to rework the second outcome as an SAO around maximizing the number of students each year who "fully complete the program"
  - Again much more personal preference than set "best practice", but for the first outcome, I would simplify to *Students in the EOPS program will demonstrate knowledge of the program requirements and the services it provides*. The orientation enrollment (coupled with perhaps a pre/posttest) will provide a great assessment.
- Library
  - The outcomes have mismatched conjugations. I personally prefer the phrasing of the second outcome *will demonstrate*.
  - The first outcome fascinates me, as I would argue that as it is worded it would be a fine SAO or SLO. Given the other two are much closer to SLOs, I would hope that Library would consider going the SAO route and assessing via resource desk requests, emails to the librarian, etc.
  - The second outcome *seems* very similar to outcomes connected to LIBR-5. The decision on what to do about outcomes derived from courses or course-like instruction has been addressed earlier; whatever the decision, do not forget this one.
- Multi-Cultural Center
  - For the second outcome, was there a typo and it should have been "participating *in* student clubs…", or is it more "as a result *of the activities of* participating student clubs…"? Either of those would be fine, though obviously they have subtle differences.
  - Both of the outcomes are arguably SLOs. One possibility would be to rework the first outcome into an SAO committing to providing a full suite of cultural activities.
- Residential Life
  - The fourth outcome represents an opportunity for internal training rather than a service area outcome
  - Based on the assessment data, most of these are assessed via indirect evidence. I would strongly advise developing a direct assessment.

- ▪ For example, perhaps one focused on the Residential Life area hosting a variety of enriching experiences for its charges (which could be assessed by event number, type, and attendance).
- TRIO
  - o The first two outcomes have their assessment targets built-in, which is not typical for SAOs or SLOs. They could be written more generally to speak of improvement in services, outcomes, etc. while allowing targets to be maintained separately (and thus potentially adjusted more flexibly).
  - o Neither of the SAOs present in the first two forms are measured via direct assessment. On the instruction side of the house, that would not meet standards. The rules are looser on the student services side of the house and thus more of a local decision, but it is arguably good practice to ensure that one of the SAOs address delivering services and outcomes fully in the control of the given area.
- Upward Bound
  - o The first and second outcomes are summaries of *objectives* derived from Upward Bound project objectives (COR and COS share the same targets). As an outcome for that service area, there is a way to still use this valuable information as assessments of a broader goal – the ability of the Upward Bound program to make a meaningful impact on the trajectories of vulnerable high school students.
  - o The third and fourth outcome, as currently stated, represent another area with greyed lines between service areas and instructional offerings. They will need to change according to whatever choice was made for the others.
- Veterans
  - o Outcomes that more closely follow SLO template (first and second) outnumber outcomes that more closely follow SAO template.
  - o Both outcomes following the SLO template use "internalized" action verbs. Consider switching to something external such as *demonstrate*, *describe*, or *explain*.
  - o The single SAO uses an indirect assessment which is partially written into the outcome

Specific Service Areas – Assessments

- _General Notes
  - o Several of these assessments may change in relevance depending on how thoroughly area directors use the feedback in the previous section. To that end, I will primarily focus only on potential typos/data mistakes as well as simple suggestions for methodology improvements where applicable.
  - o For course SLOs, a college must examine at least one SLO through disaggregation for evidence of disproportionate impact in at least one dimension of interest (race/ethnicity at COS). Given that a number of outcomes in the COR Student Development area are modeled after SLOs, I would advise doing the same (perhaps this is already done, and it simply was not evident from the reports I viewed).
  - o It was not immediately evident from the assessment inventory whether there was a standardized assessment cycle shared in common by all areas. If there is not such a cycle, it may be a relatively straightforward way to strengthen up the argument that COR engages in "continuous, broad-based, *systematic* [emphasis mine] evaluation and planning" as required in ACCJC Standard 1.

- As an addendum to the possibility of making a standardized cycle, I would argue that it is most important that at least one SAO be assessed each year, with leftover time in the cycle devoted to either SLOs or other SAOs.
  - As I am sure you and IT are well aware, no outcomes were visible in the assessment inventory for the terms *2016X, 2016F, 2017S*, even when it notes there were outcomes assessed. In *2017X*, the outcomes are visible, but there is no report present for the ASC, the only area to report an outcome assessed in that term. In *2017F*, most areas that where outcomes were assessed had visible reports, but not all. From *2018S* onwards, the number of visible reports matched number of outcomes assessed in all areas.
  - In a number of cases, the "Student Level Assessments" section has missing data. I draw attention to these instances where I can. Note that it is *possible* that for some outcomes that section would not be relevant, in those cases, a response such as "N/A" would aid in clarity.
- ASC
  - In the *2019S* term, the "Student Level Assessments" section has missing data.
- Athletics
  - The assessment of Outcome 2 in *2018S* term is what I would expect from an SAO focusing on maximizing student eligibility, but it is a rough metric for assessing the understanding of requirements and policies that the current wording describes.
- CalWORKS
  - In the *2018S* and *2019S* terms, the "Student Level Assessments" section has missing data in all assessment reports.
- Child Development Center
  - In the *2017F* term, the "Student Level Assessments" section has missing data.
- Counseling/Advising
  - While the feedback in the *2019S* term about improvements made to orientation was comprehensive, the potential adjustment listed in the *2017F* report for Outcome 2 could still prove valuable in assessing how well students access resources.
- DSPS
  - The argument in Outcome 3 about a loss of awareness because you no longer present at a faculty-training event is completely believable. With that said, here a fascinating dimension of disaggregation could be job classification (i.e. are the 10% mostly part-time faculty, staff, etc.).
- Enrollment Services
  - The assessment in the *2019S* term is exhaustive, incorporating elements that would be often associated with SAO assessment (inventory of workshops, attendance at workshops, plans for expansion of offerings) as well as SLO assessment (workshop quizzes, satisfaction results, etc.). The scheduled June 2020 reassessment could be more broadly accessible by focusing on the most important elements.
- EOPS
  - In all terms **except** *2018F*, the "Student Level Assessments" section has missing data.
- Library
  - The re-analysis conducted in Spring 2019 to close the loop for the Fall 2017 assessment was particularly interesting. The case could be made even stronger by noting how similar (or different) the two pools of students were in their majors (thus disproving a possible critique that students in "easier" majors drive the finding).

- o In the *2018S* and *2019S* terms, the "Student Level Assessments" section has missing data for all assessment reports.
- Multi-Cultural Center
  - o In the *2018S* term, the "Student Level Assessments" section has missing data
  - o Only one outcome was assessed over the period visible in the inventory
- Residential Life
  - o Tying into my comments in the previous section, another possible direct assessment of service area outcome could be a retooling of the "facilitates academic success". In this new context, the expected outcome would be providing opportunities for students to improve their academic status. The assessment could be the number of students that see improvement *after* they go on periodic check-ins as identified in the action plan. The assessment is still technically indirect, but at least it follows a direct intervention.
- TRIO
  - o If the decision were made to shift the spirit of the first two outcomes into a broader-framed SAO, the assessments as currently baked into the outcome would still be appropriate and would serve as a good balance against the pre/posttest assessment used for the third outcome.
- Upward Bound
  - o To reiterate from the previous section, I definitely understand the motivation for using the mandatory regulatory goal reports as assessment tools. I would imagine that the first two assessment reports could continue in their current form to help measure a more broadly written outcome.
  - o This is the only "portfolio" assessment I have seen, and it serves as a nice counterbalance to the other indirect assessments.
- Veterans
  - o In the *2019S* term, the "Student Level Assessments" section has missing data for the report attached to Outcome 2.
  - o It is unfortunate that the SAO-like Outcome 3 had no reports at all in the visible assessment inventory. Given that it is currently the sole SAO, it will need to be strong.