Report of the SDAG: Student Development Assessment Group
Meeting March 3, 2014 10:00am – 11:00am
FM 112

Present: Paul Chown, Sheila Hall, Kintay Johnson, Ruth Moon, Ana Duffy.

1. **Assessment Outcomes – progress report**

   Paul reported that he and Sheila have met with every service area except Athletics. We discussed ways to promote and outreach SDAG services in assisting areas with their outcomes and assessments. Sheila commented that many areas have promising shared outcomes. Discussion followed on what level of detail and how much analysis is required or expected in the outcomes and thus in their assessments, and in the reporting tool. The group reviewed the Enrollment Services / Financial Aid outcomes as an example of fairly detailed outcomes. Paul reported that the department is satisfied with their outcomes, and that everyone has their preference. The reporting tool, however, should just report the bullets. The consensus of the group was that detail is required by many student services departments for the full understanding and explanations of what that department does to contribute to student success. However, it may not need to be included in this form. Reports or analysis that provide detail can be noted as an artifact on the form, with a statement describing where the report is housed. Reports can also be presented to various college bodies or committees as appropriate.

2. **Student survey** – interest has been expressed in compiling a single student survey that has questions from each student development area to be used for their assessment outcomes.

   The current annual student satisfaction survey (Noel-Levitz) only provides for ten custom questions selected by the college. There are so many different surveys being distributed by so many different departments. If only one baseline survey were disseminated widely to all students on regular cycle, departments could then use fewer, or shorter surveys. Departments would also benefit from getting survey results from students outside their reach. Kintay suggested we collect examples of surveys currently in use. Ruth proposed also asking for any other questions people would like included on the cumulative survey. Paul agreed to send a request to all of the contact persons from the assessment form.

3. **New Assessment form** – workshops to be offered this spring. Each of us in SDAG needs to understand the new form in order to help.

   The SDAG reviewed the form, field by field, to confirm shared and clear understanding of exactly what is expected. It is recommended that one person from each program area be responsible for completing the form. Only that person needs training, although others would be welcome to attend.

   If an area has multiple outcomes to be assessed in the current cycle, each outcome should be recorded separately on its own form. Discussion covered clarifying what kinds of information could be included under the category of additional information, assessment methods or tools, and the criteria or rubric used to determine if the outcome was not met, was met, or was exceeded. We confirmed that actual numbers of students who did not meet, or met, or exceeded the criteria should be put into those fields, not percent of total. Also, Kintay clarified that the rubric/criteria should match the method/tool, to be sure that you are measuring what you want to measure.

   Paul shared some examples of work done in various areas to help us understand the ways these suggestions could be applied. A discussion followed regarding program outcomes vs. student learning outcomes. We clarified that program outcomes should be based on the program mission, and should be
included in the program review, which can draw on the data and lessons learned from the assessment of the student learning outcomes.

The phrase “closing the loop” has been removed from the form, since many people were confusing that with the continuous quality improvement cycle. The form now prompts for an entry only if substantial changes must be made in the SLOs, or the method/tool, or the rubric/criteria. The form still requires a follow-up, which can be entered at anytime, ideally when the recommended change is made. The pattern of continuous quality improvement will then be shown over time as the same or similar outcomes are assessed, and can also be reported in detail in artifacts as described above. The CTL process is only intended for big changes to the outcomes, the assessment methods, or the criteria for evaluating not met/met/exceeded.

4. **New and updated forms to aid in assessment** (Service Area Stoplight, Service Area Planning)
   Deferred to the next meeting.

5. **Establish regular meeting time and frequency.**
   We will confirm this via email.

6. **Other discussion?**
   There being none, meeting adjourned at 11:10am.

These meeting notes by Ruth Moon.