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The Division of Student Affairs at San Francisco State University launched its inaugural assessment program in April 2009. Prior to that date, units within Student Affairs had focused primarily on individual program improvement efforts. In preparation for the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review scheduled for March 2011, Student Affairs shifted the focus and began a deliberate effort to bring student learning outcomes to the forefront. The move from a student satisfaction/program improvement model to a student learning outcome-based model resulted in this document which describes the assessment plans that were developed and implemented within Student Affairs units during the 2009-10 academic year.

To begin this effort, Student Affairs directors received a two-day training program conducted by Lori Varlotta, Vice President for Student Affairs, California State University Sacramento. The training program helped Student Affairs directors understand the basics of assessment:

- Aligning the department mission with the missions of the Student Affairs Division and the University. In some cases, the departments needed to craft new mission statements.
- Identifying the two to three overarching planning goals to broadly frame their work during the upcoming years.
- Articulating at least three significant student learning outcome and/or program outcomes to achieve for students who participate in their programs or utilize their services.

Directors were asked to develop instruments and collect data to measure the student learning that occurred. As might be expected in an inaugural effort at identifying measurable outcomes, some instruments and assessment approaches proved to be more valuable than others. The second cycle of developing and measuring outcomes will be greatly improved based on the experience gained in 2009-10. The foundation for evidence-based decision making and outcome-based assessment will be used to create more robust assessment plans for the next cycle in 2010-11.

The following report details the assessment plans created by each unit in Student Affairs. For specific questions about the outcomes associated with a certain program area, please contact the Director identified as the contact person for that particular department. Assessment plans for the following Student Affairs departments are included:

- Athletics
- Campus Recreation
- Career Center
- Disability Programs and Resource Center
- Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)
- Financial Aid
- LEAD (Leadership, Engagement, Action, Development)
- Registrar’s Office
- Student Health Services
- Student Outreach Services
- Testing Center
- Undergraduate Admissions
- University Housing
Mission Statement

The Office of the University Registrar strives to provide efficient, accurate user-friendly services that will contribute to the attraction, retention, and graduation of a highly-diverse student body. The office is responsible for the overall management and integrity of student academic records. We are committed to provide all constituents, e.g. students, faculty, university administrators, and interested parties with resources that enable them to accomplish their objectives.

Rationale

The Office of the University Registrar strives to provide efficient, accurate user-friendly services that will contribute to the attraction, retention, and graduation of a highly-diverse student body.

Planning Goals

**Goal 1:** Maintain and safeguard the integrity of student information and academic records.

**Goal 2:** Help students and the campus community understand academic policies and procedures and how to utilize resources.

**Goal 3:** Ensure that all record updates to student academic records are done in an accurate and timely manner.

Student Learning Outcomes and Program Objectives

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO) #1**

Develop a web function for students who may need to request alternative media instructional materials and notify them via email and through the DPRC Office about using the new web page to request their materials. 40% of DPRC students who need materials for Spring 2011 will be able to use this web page without any assistance. 95% of DPRC students will demonstrate that they can use this web site by ordering materials for Fall 2011.

**Rationale:**

This student learning objective will support the University’s compliance with the Chancellor’s Office ATC initiative and make the process more efficient and user-friendly for students who require alternative media of instructional materials. This will also allow the DRPC staff additional time to prepare alternative media materials for students. In addition, only 50% of courses offered during a semester have their books listed on the class schedule when Early Priority Registration occurs. By providing students with the ability to identify the courses they enrolled in during EPR, DPRC can contact faculty earlier to post their course materials. This will enable the production of alternative media materials.

**Measures:**

Write a short paragraph that describes the measure(s) planned for use in determining the extent to which the outcome or objective was met.

The plan is to count how many students requested alternative media materials via the Web on their own without coming into the DPRC Office, count those students who required assistance from DPRC in using the Web
application, and count those students who used the original paper form. The Registrar’s Office management team will compare those who used the new Web application versus those who required assistance/used the paper form. The timeframe for this data collection will be May 2010, through September 2011.

This project was defined and the programming specs were finalized. The programmers in DoIT will be primarily responsible for coding. Phase 1 is to deliver a new SIMS screen for DPRC to record student requests for alternative media. This has a target date of Summer 2010. Phase 2 will include a front-end web application for students to request DPRC to create alternative media for them. Our goal is to implement the entire package for Spring 2011 registration.

Results:
Results will follow once measurements are complete. Since Phase 1 will be implemented in Summer 2010, we cannot measure the number of students served by the new SIMS screen or future web application until it is implemented next semester.

Conclusions:
Conclusion will follow once measurements are complete.

Student Learning Outcome #2
During Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, the Registrar’s Office and Advising Center will work together to ensure students who require Math and English remediation are given every opportunity to complete these requirements. The goal is to increase the completion rate by 10% for Fall 2009 first-time freshman (FTF) admits requiring remediation by the end of their first year of enrollment. We will focus on remedial math for the Fall 2009 admits.

Rationale:
Students who complete their remediation will be able to continue at SF State and ultimately graduate in a more timely manner. In addition, the University will not have to offer as many classes for remediation.

Measures:
In Fall 2008, no in-class visits or additional offers of tutoring students or retaking the ELM placement tests were done by University officials.

In Fall 2009, in September and October, 2009, Karen Kingsbury, Director of New Student Programs, visited students in remedial Math classes. Students were informed about tutoring services offered by the University and the option to retake the October or December ELM placement test. Students were also informed that they could not repeat Math 59 or 60 through regular University enrollment and would have to take through CEL at a higher cost.

We will measure the number of entering freshmen who enroll in remedial math that can test out of further remedial math classes. We will compare the number of F08 FTF admits with F09 FTF admits that test out of remedial math during their first semester of enrollment at SF State.

Results:
For Fall 2008, 957 FTF admits enrolled in remedial Math 59 or Math 60 classes. There were 10 students (1%) who tested out of remedial math and did not have to take any additional remedial math classes.

In Fall 2009, 982 admits enrolled in remedial Math 59 or Math 60 classes. With in-class visits by Karen Kingsbury, additional tutoring in EOP and CARP, plus email notices to students about the October ELM test, 90 students (9%) tested out of remedial math during their first semester of enrollment at SF State.

Conclusions:
Students who enroll their first semester at SF State gain the skills necessary to pass their ELM test and do not have to re-take the same math class or enroll in the following semester in the second level remedial math class.
Informing students that tutoring is available and they can retake the ELM test is critical to a greater number of students completing their math remediation requirement in their first semester. This is a financial savings to the students and the University. In addition, this helps with retention because these students tested out of remedial math, they are eligible to continue after their first year at SF State.

**Program Objective #1**
The Registrar’s Office implemented an on-line transcript ordering application on the Portal in January 2009. Students have been notified by email and are handed a flyer about on-line transcript ordering when they submit a paper transcript request in person at the One Stop Student Services Center.

The percentage of students who use the Portal on-line transcript ordering application will increase by 30% by April 2010.

**Rationale:**
The on-line transcript ordering application was developed to provide students with a faster, easier way of ordering and paying for official transcripts. This application also includes a tracking feature for students to check the status of their transcript orders. This should reduce the need for students to contact the Registrar’s Office.

**Measures:**
The percentage of students who used the on-line transcript ordering application during two comparable months, April 2009 versus April 2010 will be compared.

### Monthly Transcript Requests Processed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Portal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Portal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2221</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-08</td>
<td>2264</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td>3709</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>4359</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-09</td>
<td>3136</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3456</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-09</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2411</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td>2164</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2394</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-09</td>
<td>2595</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-09</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>2933</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-09</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>3976</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-09</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2341</td>
<td>4261</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-09</td>
<td>2121</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>5282</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-10</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>2522</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-10</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>4117</td>
<td>7509</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-10</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>4537</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-10</td>
<td><strong>1561</strong></td>
<td><strong>1583</strong></td>
<td><strong>3144</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results:**
In April 2009, 10% of the official transcripts were ordered on the Portal and 90% were input by staff in the Registrar’s Office. In April 2010, 50% of the official transcripts were ordered on the Portal and 50% were
input in by staff in the Registrar’s Office. We have achieved our goal and will continue to encourage students and alumni to order their official transcripts on the Portal.

Conclusions:
The increase in the number of transcripts ordered by students on the Portal between April 2009 and April 2010 has the following results:

- Decrease in incorrect addresses and returned mail because students enter the information
- Transcripts printed and mailed faster
- Payments collected on-line result in a more secure method for students to submit their payments
- Students have access on-line to see the status of their transcript requests resulting in less phone inquiries to the Registrar’s Office

Program Objective #2
The on-line grade change web application was recently developed to improve processing time and accuracy, to provide security against fraudulent signatures, and to provide automated email confirmations to students and instructors. This project will be introduced via email and direct contact and training of department registration coordinators. 40% of grade changes done in January 2010 will be submitted on the web instead of faculty submission of paper petitions.

Rationale:
Departments will be able to track their on-line grade changes and clearly communicate with their students when grade changes are approved.

Measures:
The plan is to compare the number of grade changes done on the web compared with the number of paper grade changes processed in the Registrar’s Office.

We implemented grade changes on the web in August 2009 and requested that all grade changes be submitted via the web beginning September 1, 2009. In January 2010, 51 grades changes were processed by staff via paper grade change petitions and 525 were done by faculty on the web. Thus, 91% of all grade changes were done using the SF State Faculty Web Grade Change web application.

Results:
Except for some exceptions that need Registrar’s Office review, all grade changes are now submitted electronically by faculty on web grades.

Conclusions:
We implemented in August 2009 that all grade changes must be processed on the web through www.sfsu.edu/faculty. Faculty and departments have embraced this procedure. We believe success can be attributed to the following.

1. Communications: The Registrar’s Office met with each college and their department chairs to explain this change. In addition, web grade changes include automatic emails. When an instructor submits a grade change, an auto-email is sent to the chair for review. When the grade change is approved by the chair and dean, auto-emails are sent to the instructor and student confirming the grade change has been processed.

2. Security awareness: The campus community has been educated to be more security conscious. They understand that paper grade change petitions aren’t as secure as on-line submissions for grade changes.

3. User-Friendly: Grade changes were incorporated into the current end-of-term grade submission application that faculty have been using for a number of years. Their learning-curve was shorter because of this. In addition, faculty and department chairs/college deans like the user-friendly on-line process that includes a comments section for the instructor, chair and dean to make notes about each individual grade change.