

NTID
Student Life Team Outcomes Assessment
Plan and Report for AY 2006-2007 Middle States

Program Goal: Provide relevant information, support, advocacy, and challenge to deaf and hard of hearing as they seek to develop critical coping and social skills, leading to success both in and beyond college.

Critical Outcomes for all Students		Assessment of Outcomes		Timeline		Results	
Domain/Task/Capability	Performance Criteria/Benchmarks	Instrument/Opportunity	Assessment of Performance	Develop	Collect	Summarization of Results	Use of Results
Outreach and connection with students	Students will develop awareness and comfort with Student Life Team Staff	Advisor evaluations	100% of students advised will complete surveys indicating strengths and improvements needed in the formal advising experience	Fall 2005	Quarterly through academic year	After initial efforts to collect evaluations quarterly, feedback from students indicated that this was too frequent a timeline for evaluation. Additionally, while a student's willingness to complete the survey would be one indication of their investment in the program, we realized that measuring solely the percentage of completed surveys was ineffective in measuring our success in the area of outreach	The evaluation is now being distributed annually at mid-year point. Aggregate evaluation data collected for all advisors within the department is reviewed for satisfaction levels regarding amount of contact with advisors, availability of advisors, support from advisors, and communication effectiveness of advisors. If individual evaluations are found to be unsatisfactory, the advisor's supervisor will work with the student organization and the advisor to develop a growth and improvement plan, and a second evaluation will occur after 8 weeks.
		Supervisor evaluations	100% of students supervised will complete surveys indicating strengths and	Fall 2005	Quarterly through academic year	After initial efforts to collect evaluations quarterly, feedback from students indicated that this was too frequent a	The evaluation is now being distributed annually at the mid-year point. Aggregate data regarding

			improvements needed in the formal advising experience			<p>timeline for evaluation. Additionally, percentage of response was determined to be an ineffective measurement for success or satisfaction in this area, since the students doing the evaluations are paid by the department. It would be expected that they complete all paperwork asked by the department. The evaluation tool was appropriate, but the department use and interpretation of that tool has changed.</p>	<p>supervision effectiveness is provided to the department staff via staff meeting and planning days, with specific targets for improving or maintaining services and support identified from this data. In addition, summaries of the individual evaluations of supervisors are included in professional staff appraisal documentation, and annual plans of work are designed to incorporate individual on-going improvement and professional development in this area.</p>
		Quality of Life Survey	<p>In semi-annual distribution of the survey, questions relevant to connection to the institute (D9, F7, I3) will all have a response mean of at least 4.5 and not more than 5% will be below a 3</p>	AY 2000-01	<p>Survey was replaced with a different instrument, as feedback from the community indicated the survey was not appropriate for language and time demands.</p>	<p>A new tool for evaluation has been developed for distribution in the Winter quarter 2006-07. This tool will incorporate evaluation of both outreach services and facility services, as the department has opened and continues management of a new 6 million dollar facility since this evaluation process began. With the new services/needs, a new evaluation approach needed to be incorporated.</p>	<p>The new tool is a much streamlined hard copy document, and will be distributed to all students utilizing department services during the sixth week of each quarter. Results will be compiled by our newly established Assistant Director, and reported back to the department for discussion and appropriate practice modifications at quarterly planning days. The first incidence of this system will occur in January 2007</p>

							with data reported back to the department in the first week of March 2007.
Resource Expertise	Student and professional staff will have opportunities to identify and develop skills	Plans of Work	Staff will complete annual plan of work including mutually identified areas of growth. In areas identified, staff will grow in 100% of these areas due to opportunities provided	AY 2003-04	Progress is monitored in staff quarterly reports, and reviewed annually in performance appraisal	Staff have identified areas of professional growth and interest via plans of work annually since 2003-04. In addition, student staff employee evaluations, advisor evaluations, and colleague/supervisor evaluations have been utilized to identify additional areas of growth/need during this time.	Utilizing a combination of conference attendance, supported professional presentation development, book and article discussion, and on-campus/local workshops, staff have been given the opportunity to address all areas of professional interest. Included are two professionals who have successfully moved from interim to full time contracted employees, and one who has moved from a less than satisfactory appraisal to a satisfactory one during this time period, as a result of this methodical and systematic approach to professional development. This method will continue to be utilized.
		Student Staff Training Evaluation	Student staff will complete annual training sessions, and provide evaluation indicating growth in at least five areas of coping/social	AY 2005-06	First collection of data will occur in evaluation Spring 2006	Staff feedback and evaluation was collected in Spring 2006. Areas of strength, improvement and new ideas were solicited from current student staff who had completed a year of work and training with the	Training schedule and timeline was modified to allow for more team building and individual skill building in the earliest part of training, and has built in a year-long resource

			skill development			<p>department. Strengths: Staff training was useful information, got to know the professional staff. Areas to improve: Knowledge and familiarity with campus resources, team building time needs to be extended, and better coordination of the schedule between summer and fall student staff members in transition.</p>	<p>knowledge development component, allowing student staff to continue to learn and gain awareness of campus resources throughout the year. Evaluation of these changes will be collected again in Spring 2007 to inform the training plans for 2007-08.</p>
Program Impact and Support	<p>Programs covering topics of First-Year Experience, AALANA Student Needs, and Leadership Development including the addressing of judicial trends and late-night social needs will be provided</p>	<p>Quality of Life Survey</p>	<p>In semi-annual distribution of the survey, questions relevant to program importance and satisfaction (E4, G2, G3, and H4) will all have a response mean of at least 4.5 and not more than 5% will be below a 3</p>	<p>AY 2000-01</p>	<p>Survey was replaced with a different instrument, as feedback from the community indicated the survey was not appropriate for language and time demands.</p>	<p>Program impact measurements have been modified after initial survey was deemed inappropriate. Current methods include: Judicial/conduct statistics - includes review of aggregate involvement as well as analysis of types of conduct trends/issues, evaluation and documentation of individual learning goals achieved for each educational workshop, general satisfaction measured for late-night social/alternative events, and quarterly program attendance records.</p>	<p>Conduct statistics continue to show a declining trend overall, from an all-time high in 1998 of 40% to a current level under 18%. Interventions have included the evolution of an environmental management approach to the issues. Initially, the community of students was educated and invested in finding solutions to the problems (1998). The administration was then provided resources and information to become more globally invested (1999). Introduction of social norms education efforts (2000), cross-department and divisional programming (2001), and a residential paradigm shift (2005) all</p>

							<p>continue to present, and each has produced declines in the conduct stats. Program evaluations indicate students self identifying at least three new skills/information learned for each program. Attendance at educational programs remains inconsistent - with the smallest programs hosting 12-15 students, and largest workshops hosting 45-50. Further review of program "draw" needs to be developed to provide for more consistent attendance and ultimately use of resources. Late night programming evaluation indicates that students are satisfied with current selections, would like more frequent programs, and attendance is consistently at 200+ students. Current plans are to review budget plans to attempt to identify further resources in this area without disrupting current educational programs and opportunities.</p>
		Individual program	85% of completed	Spring 2005	After each program is	Program evaluations have	Professional staff are asked to

		evaluations	evaluations will indicate one What I learned listing to be consistent with the nationally published list of the "Top Ten Skills Employers Want"		provided, results summarized quarterly	been provided quarterly at randomly selected programs. Full-scale distribution at ALL programs began winter 2007. Of the evaluations collected, 60% self-identify learning a skill that is among those most desired by employers.	more clearly identify their learning outcomes and goals before beginning to plan a program, and are also asked to better state those goals for the students, with the intent of soliciting more deliberate and informed feedback from the audience at the conclusion of each program as to whether the program achieved the stated goals adequately.
		Programming Budget	90% of all programming monies will be spent addressing FYE, AALANA, Leadership and Community Behavioral concerns	Beginning AY 2003-04	Monthly and annual analysis of budget	The budget is reviewed monthly and an annual aggregate review of the budget is completed. Budget indicates that at least 90% of program funding is dedicated to the areas identified.	Because departmental priorities are solid, and the issue is more often that departmental resources alone cannot accomodate the requests and needs for programming, necessary and important partnerships with many key and relevant departments in and outside of our division have been established for the purpose of sharing resources. FYE, NCE, NLC, SAISD, Conduct/Bader, Women's Center, NorthStar Center, Residence Life, Campus Life, and RIT Leadership Institute all provide examples of this kind of

							resource sharing and co-sponsorship.
		Staff time	90% of staff time allotted for programming will be committed to planning, prep, delivery and evaluation in stated areas of priority	Beginning AY 2003-04	Quarterly report indicates time allotted to specific areas and tasks	Because more than half the department staff have been interim until present, and/or positions have been newly created this year, position descriptions were finalized and completed for all positions in Spring 2006. Beginning in November of 2006, a revised format for developing the plan of work which now adds focus and intentionality to the specific area of priority for each position was introduced. Staff will complete and begin utilizing this format as a guide for appraisal in the 2007 academic year. Prior to this, aggregate departmental percentages indicate that staff remained in practitioner tasks for 85 to 90% of their work time, and in administrative tasks for 10 to 15% of their time, however individual measurements of position priority were ineffective given the temporary nature of the employment for several positions, and the necessity then of contracted employees to take on additional responsibilities outside the scope of their positions.	While reviewing position descriptions and areas of responsibility, student feedback indicated a lack of focus on upper/mid year students in the department's structure. As new position descriptions were developed for full time/contracted positions in spring of 2006, this focus was added as a community need and area of responsive focus. In addition, the establishment and management of the student development facility has provided additional facilities and service needs and as a result, new position descriptions also reflect this shift to insure that support for community needs remains current and relevant to our students.

Comments:

Operating at a full professional team who are fully contracted for the first time in eight years, and the addition of a 6 million

dollar student development facility have called into question the use and nature of evaluation at all levels of our programming. It would be expected therefore, that what is documented and collected currently will continue to evolve. It is our hope that modifications to current tools, and in some cases the elimination of some tools to be replaced with better and more enlightening methods is viewed in light of our effort to collect better and more relevant data. The process continues to provide information not only to fuel the improvement of our programs and services, but also to fuel the improvement of our assessment efforts.

/ssl
Rev: 01/05/2007

[TOP](#)