

Administrative & Support Areas

Annual Assessment Report

Due: **May 15, 2018**

Thank you for taking the time to complete your unit/department's Annual Assessment Report. Assessment is an ongoing and systematic process aimed at understanding and improving student learning, the environment for student success and college operations. To demonstrate that Temple is fully compliant with Middle States standards on assessment and institutional effectiveness, we must document our assessment processes and the uses of assessment information for improvement. We have designed the following report to streamline the collection of assessment information.

Unit/Department Name:

Student Success Center

Sub-Unit Name (if applicable):

(Ex: Compensation)

Contact Name (Who can we reach out to if we have a question about the report?):

Lori Salem

Contact Email:

Lori.salem@temple.edu

Section 1: Professional Association or Standards

Is there a professional association that outlines standards for best practice in your area of higher education? (Examples: CAS – *Council for the Advancement of Standards*, Student Affairs; NACADA – *National Academic Advising Association* – Academic Advising; NACE – *National Association of Colleges and Employers* – Career Center)

- Yes
 No

If yes, what is the name of the association/organization?

Section 2: Mission & Program Outcomes

Good assessment begins with well-defined and clearly articulated Program Outcomes (POs) aligned with the mission of the department/unit. POs are overarching expectations of support provided by the unit/department and are focused on the delivery of services, processes, activities or functions to students, faculty or staff. POs are unlikely to change from year-to-year unless there are substantial changes to the mission of your unit. POs should be “SMART”: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time Related.

What is your department’s/unit’s mission statement? (Optional)

The Student Success Center provides extracurricular academic support programs and services for undergraduate and graduate students at Temple University. We also contribute to Temple’s undergraduate curriculum by providing oversight and development for the writing-intensive course program. In all of these activities, we seek to ensure that all Temple students have full access to high-quality learning opportunities.

Please list your unit/department’s (or sub-unit/department’s) Program Outcomes:

- | |
|---|
| 1. Deliver multidisciplinary academic support services to graduate and undergraduate students at Temple University. |
| 2. Examine, evaluate, and continuously improve our programs and services to ensure that that programming is accessible and effective for Temple’s diverse student body and curricula. |
| 3. Anticipate the need for and create new academic support programs based on changes at Temple or new developments in the field. |
| 4. Engage with faculty, dean’s offices, department chairs, and other administrators to develop and sustain a high-quality program of writing-intensive courses at Temple. |
| 5. |

We recommend 3-5 Program Outcomes, the number of outcomes is up to your department. If you have more than 5 POs, just add rows to the Table and add the additional outcomes.

Section 3: Completed Assessment Activity Since 2015

In this section, you will provide details about program level assessments your unit/department has completed since 2015. We ask you to describe the assessment(s), tell us about the findings, describe how and with whom you shared the findings and tell us how you used (or plan to use) the findings for making improvements. Examples of assessments include: surveys (including university-wide survey such as NSQ, TUSQ or NSSE), focus groups, activity volume, log data, transactions, and pre/post-tests.

Assessment Strategy 1

Describe the assessment strategy. Please provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.

To understand the utilization and reach of our programs and services, we collect data about students use of services and about their attendance at special events and activities. Broadly, three types of data are collected:

1. Basic usage data recording the date, time and purpose of each visit, along with students TU-ID
2. Attendance lists (with date, students' names and TUIDs) for events/activities out of the Center
3. Narrative reports describing what happened in each visit/activity

From the list of Program Outcomes above, which POs were assessed using this strategy? Just list the number of the PO(s) assessed.

1 and 2

What were the findings from this assessment?

The list below summarizes the SSC usage numbers, by service type:

Academic Coaching	1048
Conversation Partners	1665
Events	1483
Exam Review Workshops	2401
Graduate Colloquium & Retreats	269
STEM Tutoring	8634
Peer Assisted Study Sessions	7951
Writing Tutoring	8917
Writing Workshops	1936
TOTAL	34304

Since AY 2017/18 was the first year for the SSC, these numbers will serve as a baseline for comparison in future years.

In addition to comparisons over time, we will also evaluate our usage numbers in reference to the framework of “tiered” academic support articulated by educational psychologists (typically associated with the [RTI framework](#).) According to this model, academic support programs should seek to provide “targeted” academic support to approximately 20% of the eligible student population, and “intensive” support to an additional 5% of eligible population. Taken overall, our usage numbers appear to meet the threshold, “targeted support” threshold, but they may be somewhat below the threshold for “intensive” support. (Academic Coaching—our primary vehicle for providing intensive support—is a brand new program this year.)

(Gina – we’re still closing the books on AY 17/18, so these analyses aren’t completed yet. When we move to the October due-date for assessment, this will be doable.)

With whom and how did you share findings from this assessment? Check the box next to the person/group(s) with whom you shared the findings and in the box tell us HOW you shared the data with them. For example, you may share findings at a meeting, in an email, in a one-on-one meeting, or via a website.

Department/Unit Staff

How: Staff in the SSC have regular access to the data collection systems and they review data regularly for their own purposes. We share summations of the data for each service at the end of each semester in staff meetings.

Department/Unit Leaders

How: Same as above

Students

How: we share general data about the SSC with students in our "Intro to the SSC" presentations, which happen in classes and at Orientations.

Faculty

How: Data are sometimes shared with faculty/departments as part of meetings in which we are evaluating services or planning new services.

University Administration/Leadership

How: Data are shared with the VPUS at several points during the year.

External Community Members

How:

Other

Who:

How:

How did you use or how are you planning to use the findings from this assessment for improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you make (are making) as a result of your findings.

We use these data for many practical purposes, including creating staffing plans and schedules, evaluating staff performance, anticipating future staffing needs. We use these data to inform conversations and collaborations with faculty about academic support programs.

Assessment Strategy 2

Describe the assessment strategy. Please provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.

To understand and improve the quality of SSC services, we conduct regular structured performance evaluations, including direct observations, of all graduate and undergraduate tutors, conversation partners, coaches, and PASS leaders. Staff performance observations are based on rubrics (specific to each of our major support programs) that are designed to capture data about pedagogical practices used in the interactions. (See "Rubrics" attached.)

From the list of Program Outcomes above, which POs were assessed using this strategy? Just list the number of the PO(s) assessed.

1 and 2

What were the findings from this assessment?

The specifics of this are somewhat different of each of our programs. Our most recent assessment of STEM tutors revealed that, overall, the aspect of our tutoring pedagogy that was most challenging for STEM tutors was incorporating meaningful "comprehension checks" into their tutoring sessions. First semester tutors struggled most, whereas more experienced tutors were better able to enact the pedagogy.

With whom and how did you share findings from this assessment? Check the box next to the person/group(s) with whom you shared the findings and in the box tell us HOW you shared the data with them. For example, you may share findings at a meeting, in an email, in a one-on-one meeting, or via a website.

Department/Unit Staff

How: We share and discuss these findings at our regular staff meetings.

Department/Unit Leaders

How: Same as above

Students

How: We share individual feedback about performance with each student employee; we share general summaries of our findings with tutors in our tutor development program.

Faculty

How: We sometimes share general descriptions of these findings with faculty as part of discussions about how the SSC services work.

University Administration/Leadership

How: We sometimes share general descriptions of these data with the VPUS, as part of regular discussions about SSC programs.

External Community Members

How:

Other

Who:

How:

How did you use or how are you planning to use the findings from this assessment for improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you make (are making) as a result of your findings.

We use these findings principally as a kind of formative assessment. We shared individual feedback and evaluation with each tutor with the goal of helping them develop as tutors. We also use them to help us continually refine our staff development programs. (For example, based on the data from this year, we plan to add a more substantial focus on “comprehension checks” to our Fall 2018 development program for STEM tutors.)

Sometimes the findings are used as summative assessment. The individual observations are part of each staff members’ employment record with us, and are used to make decisions about continued employment or promotion.

Assessment Strategy 3

Describe the assessment strategy. Please provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.

To understand graduate students experiences with professional and career development, and to anticipate their need for future support programs, we partnered with Career Services* to conduct a university-wide survey of TU Graduate students.

*Career Services launched a working group called the Graduate Career Network, which drew together individuals who were involved in providing support to graduate students. The SSC Associate Director, Lorraine Savage, served as co-leader of the GCN, and in that capacity she led the group in developing and implementing this survey. The results were used by both the Career Center and the SSC.

From the list of Program Outcomes above, which POs were assessed using this strategy? Just list the number of the PO(s) assessed.

1 and 2

What were the findings from this assessment?

See "GCAC Grad Survey" (attached) for a full summary of the results. Overall, the survey revealed that graduate students wanted more professional and career support than they currently receive, and it suggested that advising/support for pursuing non-academic careers was a particular area of need.

With whom and how did you share findings from this assessment? Check the box next to the person/group(s) with whom you shared the findings and in the box tell us HOW you shared the data with them. For example, you may share findings at a meeting, in an email, in a one-on-one meeting, or via a website.

Department/Unit Staff

How: These data were shared with SSC staff as part of regular staff meetings

Department/Unit Leaders

How: same as above

Students

How:

Faculty

How:

University Administration/Leadership

How: Data were shared with the VPUS. The survey data were shared with all of the members of the Graduate Career Network.

External Community Members

How:

Other

Who:
How:

How did you use or how are you planning to use the findings from this assessment for improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you make (are making) as a result of your findings.

We used these data to redesign our graduate colloquium, which is a biweekly “speaker series” for graduate students who are nearing degree completion. The Colloquium, which was initially formed as an offshoot of our dissertation writing retreats, had a curriculum largely focused on the personal and professional aspects of dissertating (like creating an effective relationship with one’s advisor, preparing to go on the job market, navigating competing time demands, etc.) Based on this survey, the Colloquium now includes presentations by speakers on pursuing “Alt-Ac” and non-academic careers.

Assessment Strategy 4

Describe the assessment strategy. Please provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.

To ensure the consistency and quality of writing-intensive courses, we review and re-certify all writing-intensive courses on a four-year cycle. In 2017/2018, 56 w-course proposals were reviewed.

From the list of Program Outcomes above, which POs were assessed using this strategy? Just list the number of the PO(s) assessed.

4

What were the findings from this assessment?

When a w-course is due for review, departments submit a “proposal” that includes several documents describing what they intend the course to look like going forward, and well as a portfolio of documents depicting how the course has been taught since it was last reviewed. (See “W-course Review Process” attached.)

Of the 56 course proposals reviewed in 2017/2018:

- 23 were immediately approved without changes
- 28 required “minor” changes or further documentation
- 5 required “major” changes

With whom and how did you share findings from this assessment? Check the box next to the person/group(s) with whom you shared the findings and in the box tell us HOW you shared the data with them. For example, you may share findings at a meeting, in an email, in a one-on-one meeting, or via a website.

Department/Unit Staff

How:

Department/Unit Leaders

How:

Students

How:

Faculty

How: faculty (and department chairs) receive direct feedback about the outcome of the review of their course proposals. Yearly summaries of the outcomes of the reviews are presented at EPPC and to the WICC.

University Administration/Leadership

How: Summaries of the outcomes of proposal reviews are presented to the VPUS. Feedback about the reviews of individual course proposals are provided to the relevant dean’s office.

External Community Members

How:

Other

Who:

How:

How did you use or how are you planning to use the findings from this assessment for improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you make (are making) as a result of your findings.

Individual faculty members (and departments) use the feedback on their proposals to shape how the design future syllabi and assignments; department chairs and deans offices use the feedback on w-course proposals to inform decisions about course section sizes, and teaching assignments.

The WICC uses the overall summaries of the outcomes of w-course reviews to inform discussions about the w-course guidelines and policies. For example, we used an analysis of courses that failed to meet the enrollment guideline to inform how we interpret that guideline and how we communicate with stakeholders about it. In the coming year, we will use the data from the proposal reviews to reconsider/refine the w-course guideline related to "Information Literacy."

Assessment Strategy 5

Describe the assessment strategy. Please provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.

To investigate the dynamics that shape students' decision to use or not use the Writing Center, the SSC Director undertook research to explore the academic and non-academic characteristics of users compared to non-users.

From the list of Program Outcomes above, which POs were assessed using this strategy? Just list the number of the PO(s) assessed.

1,2 and 3

What were the findings from this assessment?

The research showed that the choice to use (or not use) the Writing Center users was shaped by a "push-pull" relationship between academic standing (SAT scores) and identity. (The full article is attached.)

With whom and how did you share findings from this assessment? Check the box next to the person/group(s) with whom you shared the findings and in the box tell us HOW you shared the data with them. For example, you may share findings at a meeting, in an email, in a one-on-one meeting, or via a website.

Department/Unit Staff

How: The work was shared (as a work-in-progress) with the SSC staff

Department/Unit Leaders

How:

Students

How:

Faculty

How:

University Administration/Leadership

How:

External Community Members

How: The research was published in the Writing center Journal, and later a report about the research was published in the Chronicle of Higher Ed.

Other

Who:

How:

How did you use or how are you planning to use the findings from this assessment for improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you make (are making) as a result of your findings.

The research raises very challenging questions about how writing centers serve students, and especially about the pedagogies and practices that writing centers commonly use. It was used to launch a follow-up research project (forthcoming in *Writing Center Journal*).

In the SSC, the research has led us to reconsider features of our writing tutor development program and our tutoring practices, and to develop alternative forms of academic support for writers, other than one-on-one tutoring. In fall 2017, we launched a program of “write-ins” for undergraduate students, based on this research.

If you have more strategies to report, just copy and paste all the questions/prompts and create as many additional assessment strategy sections as you need.

Section 4: Other Changes based on Trends/Strategic Plan

Sometimes you make changes based on trends in higher education, new strategic plans or initiatives at the university, or for other reasons. In this section, you will describe changes made based on trends/strategic plans and how you plan to assess the effectiveness of the change.

Describe what change you made and what you based this change on.

We created a new service called “Academic Coaching.” The service is designed to serve students who need high-intensity academic support that is combined with ongoing coordination and monitoring. It is frequently used by students who are registered with DRS (but it is open to any student who has needs that can’t be met through our other, less intensive services.)

Academic Coaching programs (or programs with similar foci) are increasingly common in universities, especially because they help students who had learning support IEPs in high school to make a bridge into the college environment. Broadly speaking, national trends are moving toward creating academic support that is more diversified, and more directly connected to disability support offices.

Tell us how you plan to assess the effectiveness of the change.

We will assess the Academic Coaching program based on usage data, and based on observations of coaching sessions.

Since this program involves creating an individualized support plans (with semester-by-semester goals) we will also be able to evaluate the plan based on student outcomes.

Section 5: Annual Objectives (optional section)

Do you have any unique goals/objectives for the year? If so, describe the objective(s) and how you are assessing progress.

Section 6: Next Steps (Planned Assessment)

Tell us about your next steps for assessing your unit/department.

What assessments are currently underway or planned for this academic year? For example, your area may have items on the TUSQ that will be administered in Spring 2018 or you might have conducted focus groups in the fall and are review in the fall and are reviewing findings.

PO #1 & 2: Evaluate the effectiveness of the Math tutoring service (on its own, and in comparison to related programs). This is being undertaken with support from Institutional research and in collaboration with the math Department

PO #1 and #2: Survey research to explore student perceptions of and satisfaction with the Writing tutoring program and the Conversation partners program

PO #4: Analyses of key indicators in the w-course program. (Statistical analyses of 1.) The numbers of w-courses sections; 2.) Section enrollment numbers; 3.) Instructor status; and 4.) Instructor continuity over an eight-year period.

PO. #3: Analysis of Temple students' participation in a broad range of academic support and enrichment programs (based on data collected from all VPUS offices and programs.) This is a speculative project that may yield new insights about patterns of student engagement beyond just one unit.

Do you have any documents you would like to share?

Please feel free to email supporting documents in addition to your completed report. Additional documents may include: assessment plans, survey instruments, reports created for other audiences, etc. If you are including supporting documents, please tell us below what documents you are attaching.

"Rubrics" – comprises samples of the rubrics we use for assessing the performance of our student staff members.

"GCAC Grad Survey" provides a summary of the results of the survey of graduate students conducted in collaboration with the Graduate Career Network

"W-course Review Process" outlines the documents collected and assessed as part of regular w-course re/certifications

"Decisions...Decisions" is a copy of the published article described under Assessment Strategy #5