

Student Affairs Assessment Leaders 2014 Landscape Survey

Center for the Study of Student Life

March 2015

INTRODUCTION

This report provides an overview of results from the Student Affairs Assessment Leaders (SAAL) 2014 Landscape Survey. The purpose of the survey was to research the beliefs and perspectives of student affairs assessment professionals, particularly with respect to the measurement of student learning and outcomes.

The SAAL Landscape Survey was administered via an open link using Qualtrics survey software February 17 through March 11, 2014 to members of the SAAL and NASPA Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Knowledge Community list-servs. The survey resulted in 180 cases after removing 14 cases due to lack of responses and 1 case where the individual indicated that they did not participate in student affairs assessment. These 180 cases include 43 cases that only partially completed the survey. Analyses were run both with and without these partially complete cases and differences are noted where applicable.

The overarching goal of the project was to better understand how Divisions of Student Affairs can impact and intentionally improve student learning outcomes through effective assessment practice. In addition, the study aimed to provide insights into current trends and best practices in assessment across the higher education landscape.

HIGHLIGHTS

- **83.4%** of student affairs assessment professionals had fewer than 10 years of experience and **50.3%** had fewer than 5 years of experience working in student affairs assessment. Only **5.2%** had greater than 15 years of experience.
- **63.1%** of participants reported that their divisions had identified student learning outcomes.
- Of those whose divisions had identified learning outcomes, **54.1%** reported that the process of identifying, developing, and implementing a framework for measuring these learning outcomes took 12 months or less.
- Of those whose divisions had not identified learning outcomes, **53.7%** identified lack of expectation internally as a major barrier, while lack of support from senior leadership (**31.5%**) and lack of expertise (**25.9%**) were also identified as key barriers.
- **64.8%** of professionals whose divisions had *not* identified learning outcomes said they would be doing so in the near future.
- **100%** of participants reported that they sometimes or frequently used surveys of current students as indirect measures of student learning.
- **86.1%** reported sometimes or frequently using rubrics, checklists, or other scoring frameworks to quantify direct evidence of student learning.
- **70.2%** of student affairs assessment professionals said that they did *not* use common measures or tools in partnership with academic affairs or faculty.
- **77.0%** of respondents perceived their leadership to have good or excellent knowledge of student affairs assessment practice, whereas **75.2%** perceived their leadership as good or excellent champions of assessment.
- **52.3%** of student affairs assessment professionals reported that one full-time staff person was dedicated to conducting student affairs assessment at their institution.
- **47.8%** reported that their annual student affairs assessment budget (not including salaries and wages) was under \$25,000.

FINDINGS

CHARACTERISTICS OF ASSESSMENT PROFESSIONALS

Summarized below are characteristics of the student affairs assessment professionals that participated in this research. Student affairs assessment is a relatively new field, which is reflected by the fact that 83.4% of respondents had fewer than 10 years' experience working in assessment for student affairs. The majority (55.0%) of student affairs professionals who participated were involved in assessment at the division level, although a sizeable minority (28.9%) was involved at the department/unit level.

Years of Experience

How many years of experience do you have: (n = 115)

Response	Fewer than 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30 or more
Leading/working in assessment for student affairs (n = 115)	53.0%	30.4%	11.3%	3.5%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Working in other roles in student affairs (n = 114)	21.1%	28.1%	21.1%	15.8%	7.0%	6.1%	0.9%
Leading/working in assessment outside of higher education(n = 94)	87.2%	7.4%	3.2%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Level of Involvement

At what level are you involved in Student Affairs assessment? (n = 180)^a

Level	n	Percent
Division	99	55.0%
Department/Unit	52	28.9%
Program	13	7.2%
Division and Department/Unit ^b	6	3.0%
Division, Department/Unit, and Program ^b	7	3.9%
Other	3	1.7%

a) Analyses were repeated after removing the 43 cases that did not complete many of the subsequent items on the survey. The percentages of respondents who chose each level did not demonstrate major changes.

b) "Other" responses indicating that the participant was involved with assessment at more than one level were recoded into "Division and Department/Unit" or "Division, Department/Unit, and Program" as applicable.

Position within Institution

A majority (56.5%) of participants reported their official title as equivalent to a “Director” or “Assistant/Associate Director.” However, there was significant variation in the titles reported by participants, and there was also variation in the title of the person to whom they report. These data suggest that the institutional context in which student affairs assessment takes place may differ between institutions.

Which of the following best captures your official title? (n = 115)

Title	n	Percent
Director	43	37.4%
Assistant/Associate Director	22	19.1%
Coordinator	18	15.7%
Assistant Dean	12	10.4%
Assistant/Associate Vice President	8	7.0%
Dean	2	1.7%
Analyst	1	0.9%
Vice President	0	0.0%
Other	9	7.8%

Which of the following best captures who your position reports to? (n = 115)

Title	n	Percent
Vice President	34	29.6%
Director	28	24.3%
Assistant/Associate Vice President	18	15.7%
Dean	14	12.2%
Assistant/Associate Director	9	7.8%
Assistant Dean	3	2.6%
President	1	0.9%
Other	8	7.0%

MEASURING STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The following items were used to assess practices regarding the measurement of student learning outcomes. First, participants were asked whether their division had identified student learning outcomes. Based on their response, they were asked follow-up questions designed to investigate the process for determining student learning and/or the barriers to doing so.

Identification of Learning Outcomes

Regardless of your role, has your division identified student learning outcomes? (n = 179)^a

Response	n	Percent
Yes	113	63.1%
No	66	36.9%

a) Analyses were repeated after removing the 43 cases that did not complete many of the subsequent items. The percentage of respondents that selected “yes” was 60.6% and the percentage that selected “no” was 39.4%.

Definition of Student Learning Outcomes

Participants who indicated that their division had identified student learning outcomes were asked to provide their “working definition” of Student Learning Outcomes using the item below. These open-ended responses were then coded for content by identifying and grouping similar or related key terms into themes. Responses frequently contained more than one theme.

If [your division has identified student learning outcomes], please provide your working definition of “Student Learning Outcomes”. (n = 68)

Theme	Key Terms	n	Percent
Use of Causal Language	Because of..., result of..., due to..., effect of... (e.g., program, learning experience)	42	61.8%
Skills and Competencies	Do, able to do, behaviors, skills, competencies, demonstrate	38	55.9%
Knowledge and Cognition	Know, think, understand	31	45.6%
Psychosocial Characteristics	Attitudes, dispositions, value(s), affect, emotions	14	20.6%
Measurable	Measurable, quantitative	14	20.6%
Value-Added Language	Change, improve, different	8	11.8%
Specific	Specific, explicit	8	11.8%

a) The item n includes only those participants who responded with a definition. Eleven participants did not provide a definition of SLOs in their responses and were excluded from analysis.

Timeline for Developing a Learning Outcomes Framework

For professionals whose divisions had identified student learning outcomes, the process for identifying, developing, and implementing a divisional framework for measuring student learning outcomes most commonly (43.4%) took between 1 and 6 months to complete. However, 14.5% of participants reported that the process took 1.5 years or more. Whereas many (43.4%) participants felt that this process took as long as expected, an equal percentage felt that it took longer than expected.

From start to finish, how many months did it take to identify, develop, and implement an initial learning outcomes framework? (n = 76)

Months	n	Percent
0	1	1.3%
1 – 6	33	43.4%
7 – 12	17	22.4%
13 – 18	8	10.5%
19 +	11	14.5%
Ongoing	2	2.6%
Don't know / NA	4	5.3%

How did [the timeframe to identify, develop, and implement an initial learning outcomes framework] compare with your own expectations? (n = 76)

Response	n	Percent
Took less time than expected	10	13.2%
Just as expected	33	43.4%
Took longer than expected	33	43.4%

Resources for Developing a Learning Outcomes Framework

Among those whose divisions had identified learning outcomes, the most commonly reported resources used were *Learning Reconsidered / Learning Reconsidered 2* and the Frameworks for Assessing Learning and Development Outcomes (FALDOS) developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). In addition, some respondents indicated that learning outcomes developed by their own institution or other institutions were used to guide the development of divisional learning outcomes. Additional sources included assessment-related publications (e.g., textbooks, journals) and professional organizations, either for student affairs, assessment, or a functional area.

Which of the following common resources has/have assisted/guided you in developing a division-wide student learning outcomes framework? Check all that apply. (n = 81)

Resource	n	Percent
CAS FALDOS	57	70.4%
<i>Learning Reconsidered / Learning Reconsidered 2</i>	56	69.1%
NASPA Assessment, Evaluation and Research Knowledge Community	33	40.7%
AAC&U Values	28	34.6%
ACPA Commission for Assessment and Evaluation	20	24.7%
Other	25	30.9%

Other Responses^a:

- University/institutional learning outcomes
- Other institutions (peers, aspirant, successful examples)
- Functional area specific organizations
- Books/authors (e.g., Bresciani, Maki)
- National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)
- Research, conferences, publications
- I don't know

a) Other Responses are summarized from the data and are not direct quotes.

Barriers to Developing Learning Outcomes

Professionals whose divisions had *not* identified student learning outcomes identified lack of expectation internally (53.7%) as the most common barrier. However, some of the participants responded that their institutions were in the process of developing learning outcomes, or that outcomes had been established at the departmental level and a bottom-up approach was being taken to establishing divisional learning outcomes. Most (64.8%) said they would be developing learning outcomes in the near future. These data suggest that there is a trend toward developing learning outcomes among institutions that have not yet done so.

What top two factors have prevented your division from developing learning outcomes? (n = 54)

Factors	n	Percent
No expectation internally	29	53.7%
Lack of support from senior leadership	17	31.5%
Lack of expertise	14	25.9%
No time	8	14.8%
No desire	8	14.8%
Lack of support from colleagues	8	14.8%
No expectation externally (e.g., accreditation)	6	11.1%
Other	18	33.3%

Other Responses^a:

- Learning outcomes are at the departmental, not division level
- In the process of defining learning outcomes
- Division adopts learning outcomes defined by institution
- History of decentralization, lack of culture of assessment
- Assessment is a new position

a) Other Responses are summarized from the data and are not direct quotes.

Will you be developing learning outcomes in the near future? (n = 54)

Response	n	Percent
Yes	35	64.8%
No	19	35.2%

DIRECT AND INDIRECT EVIDENCE

Participants were asked to report the extent to which their division used direct and indirect forms of evidence in their assessment practice.

Indirect Evidence

Surveying current students was the most common form of indirect evidence collected, with 100% of participants reporting that they were used at least sometimes and 74.8% of participants reporting frequent use. Surveys of other groups of people were less common, though all were used sometimes or frequently by nearly half of the sample.

Please identify which INDIRECT forms of evidence your Division of Student Affairs uses to measure student learning outcomes in your programs or services. An indirect method is any data-gathering process that asks for reflection upon one's knowledge, behaviors, skills, or thought processes.

Indirect Evidence - Surveys	Never Use	Sometimes Use	Frequently Use
Alumni surveys (n = 115)	43.5%	46.1%	10.4%
Current student surveys (n = 123)	0.0%	25.2%	74.8%
Employer surveys (n = 119)	36.1%	48.7%	15.1%
External stakeholder surveys (n = 115)	49.6%	47.0%	3.5%
Exit interviews/surveys for graduates (n = 119)	30.3%	48.7%	21.0%
Graduating senior surveys (n = 119)	29.4%	38.7%	31.9%
Transfer student surveys (n = 119)	50.4%	35.3%	14.3%

Note: Shaded areas indicate the most common response for each row.

None of the non-survey methods of collecting indirect evidence of student learning were used frequently by over half of the sample. Focus groups were the most common non-survey method of collecting indirect evidence of student learning outcomes: 93.5% of participants said their divisions used focus groups sometimes or frequently. Benchmarking (86.7%) and retention studies (75.6%) were also used sometimes or frequently. Job placement statistics and student self-scored rubrics had the highest percentages of participants who reported that they never used these forms of indirect evidence (40.7% and 43.6%, respectively).

Please identify which *INDIRECT* forms of evidence your Division of Student Affairs uses to measure student learning outcomes in your programs or services. An indirect method is any data-gathering process that asks for reflection upon one’s knowledge, behaviors, skills, or thought processes.

Indirect Evidence – Non-Survey Methods	Never Use	Sometimes Use	Frequently Use
Benchmarking (n = 120)	13.3%	51.7%	35.0%
Focus groups (n = 122)	6.6%	68.9%	24.6%
ID card scans/swipes at services/events (n = 119)	23.5%	39.5%	37.0%
Job placement statistic generation (n = 118)	40.7%	38.1%	21.2%
Reflective journals (n = 117)	29.9%	63.2%	6.8%
Retention studies (n = 119)	24.4%	52.1%	23.5%
Secondary data analyses (n = 117)	35.0%	54.7%	10.3%
Student self-scored rubrics (n = 117)	43.6%	50.4%	6.0%

Note: Shaded areas indicate the most common response for each row.

Direct Evidence

Participants reported using most forms of direct evidence sometimes but not frequently. Case studies and portfolios were never used by the majority (62.2% and 56.7%, respectively) of participants' divisions. Direct observations, essays, interviews, and tests or quizzes were used at least sometimes by over half of the sample. Surveys were the only form of direct evidence that were used frequently by most (77.4%) participants' divisions. The majority (86.1%) of participants reported sometimes or frequently using rubrics, checklists, or other scoring frameworks to quantify direct evidence of student learning.

Please identify which DIRECT forms of evidence your Division of Student Affairs uses to measure student learning outcomes in its programs or services. A direct method is any data-gathering process that requires a display of knowledge, behaviors, skills, or thought processes.

Direct Evidence	Never Use	Sometimes Use	Frequently Use
Case Studies (n = 119)	62.2%	35.3%	2.5%
Direct Observations (n = 122)	12.3%	54.9%	32.8%
Essays (n = 121)	43.0%	52.9%	4.1%
Interviews (n = 122)	17.2%	61.5%	21.3%
Portfolios (n = 120)	56.7%	35.0%	8.3%
Surveys (n = 124)	4.0%	18.5%	77.4%
Test or Quizzes (n = 122)	32.8%	51.6%	15.6%

Note: Shaded areas indicate the most common response for each row.

To what extent do you use rubrics, checklists, or other scoring frameworks to quantify direct evidence? (n = 123)

Response	n	Percent
Never use	17	13.8%
Sometimes use	80	65.0%
Frequently use	26	21.1%

What direct evidence of student learning do you collect? Please select all that apply. (n = 121)

Direct Evidence	Collect (%)
Evaluations of performance	74.4%
Observations of student behavior	74.4%
Student performance	60.3%
ID card scans/swipes at services or events	59.5%
Reflective journals	57.0%
Employer surveys	40.5%
Document analyses	33.9%
Secondary data analyses	31.4%
Project-embedded analyses	28.9%
Environmental scans	24.8%
Student work samples	24.8%
Capstone projects	14.9%
Performances on national exams	9.9%
Photo analyses	9.9%
Internal juried review of student projects	5.8%
External juried review of student projects	5.0%
Music analyses	1.7%
Other	9.9%
<hr/>	
Other Responses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One minute surveys • Observation with rubrics • Job performance evaluations 	

a) Other Responses are summarized from the data and are not direct quotes.

SHARED MEASURES

Participants were asked to indicate how often they shared measure or tools with academic affairs or faculty members. Over 70% of respondents indicated that they did not use common measures or tools with academic affairs or faculty members.

Do you use common measures or tools in partnership with academic affairs/faculty (e.g., dashboards, accreditation databases, common skills training, etc.)? (n = 121)

Response	n	Percent
Yes	36	29.8%
No	85	70.2%

Participants who did report the use of shared measures or tools were asked to provide a description. Descriptions were coded for content using common keywords (e.g., training, database) and categorized. Responses indicated that, at some institutions, both faculty/academic affairs and student affairs use data systems or specific tools to track information about students for assessment, accreditation, or other purposes. Some also reported that assessment training was conducted and/or taken by both members of student affairs and faculty/academic affairs. Only two responses indicated that faculty/academic affairs and student affairs shared frameworks for defining and/or measuring student learning outcomes.

If yes: Please briefly describe these tools or measures used on your campus? (n = 21)

Measures/Tools	n	Percent
Specific tools (e.g., MAP-Works, TracDat, CampusLabs, other)	10	47.6%
Institutional data system (e.g., shared database, dashboard, warehouse)	9	42.9%
Training (developing outcomes, collecting evidence, using systems)	5	23.8%
Shared learning outcomes	2	9.5%

OTHER ASSESSMENT

Participants were asked to rank how much time and effort was spent conducting various types of assessments. The chart below highlights the two types of assessment with the highest percentages of each ranking.

In terms of overall assessment in your Student Affairs division, please rank the following based on the time and effort spent assessing each, with 7 being the most time and effort, and 1 being the least.

Assessments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Satisfaction assessment (n = 119)	14.3%	11.8%	8.4%	5.0%	10.9%	19.3%	30.3%
Operational metrics and figures (n = 118)	6.8%	8.5%	12.7%	19.5%	14.4%	23.7%	14.4%
Needs assessment (n = 118)	7.6%	11.9%	17.8%	27.1%	22.0%	8.5%	5.1%
Student learning (n = 119)	10.9%	10.9%	20.2%	14.3%	21.8%	9.2%	12.6%
Climate study (n = 118)	16.9%	19.5%	23.7%	11.0%	17.8%	7.6%	3.4%
Environmental scans (n = 113)	17.7%	23.9%	14.2%	15.0%	8.0%	11.5%	9.7%
Literature reviews (n = 114)	32.5%	17.5%	11.4%	5.3%	7.9%	12.3%	13.2%

Note: Shaded areas indicate the most common response for each column.

CULTURE OF ASSESSMENT

To investigate the culture of assessment within student affairs divisions, respondents were asked to rate various units or areas on their knowledge, support, and integration of assessment practices. In addition, they were asked to identify general barriers to adopting a greater emphasis on assessing student learning.

Note: Some units or areas have a high number of non-responses or “Don’t Know/Not Applicable” responses. These were not included in the unit n, so percentages represent only those who responded with a ranking for that unit or area. Caution should be taken when interpreting these percentages, which cannot be generalized to all institutional contexts.

Knowledge of Assessment

The groups perceived by respondents as highest in knowledge of student affairs assessment practices included leadership (77.0% good or excellent) and director level staff (72.4% good or excellent). Administrative support or front-line staff were perceived as lowest in knowledge of student affairs assessment practices (63.0% poor or very poor).

Please rate each unit in your division on their level of knowledge regarding student affairs assessment practices.

Units (n) ^a	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know/NA (n) ^a
Administrative Support Staff/ Front-line Staff (n = 108)	17.6%	45.4%	29.6%	6.5%	0.9%	9
Advisors and Counselors (n = 94)	3.2%	19.1%	42.6%	29.8%	5.3%	23
Analysts/Assistive Techs (n = 58)	6.9%	17.2%	29.3%	34.5%	12.1%	57
Coordinators (Program officer, Program administrator) (n = 114)	2.6%	4.4%	36.8%	48.2%	7.9%	3
Director level staff (Director, Assistant, Associate) (n = 116)	2.6%	4.3%	20.7%	53.4%	19.0%	1
Leadership (VP, AVP, Alignment Leaders, Chief Business Officers) (n = 113)	1.8%	4.4%	16.8%	48.7%	28.3%	4
Medical, Dental, Psychologists, Psychiatrist, Legal Professionals (n = 61)	8.2%	9.8%	37.7%	31.1%	13.1%	56
Special Assistants and Executive Assistants (n = 68)	11.8%	22.1%	38.2%	23.5%	4.4%	48

a) The n for each unit includes those who responded with a ranking from Very Poor – Excellent. Those who responded Don’t Know/NA or who did not respond to are not included. Percentages are calculated from the unit n.

Note: Shaded areas indicate the most common responses for each row.

Support for Assessment

The units perceived as championing assessment the most included leadership (75.2% good or excellent) and director level staff (70.4% good or excellent). Administrative support or front-line staff were perceived as lowest in championing assessment (55.2% poor or very poor). The similarities between rankings for knowledge and championing of assessment suggest that there may be a relation between understanding and supporting the practice of assessment within student affairs.

Please rate each unit in your division on the degree to which the unit champions assessment.

Units (n) ^a	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't know/NA (n) ^a
Administrative Support Staff/ Front-line Staff (n = 96)	26.0%	29.2%	27.1%	15.6%	2.1%	19
Advisors and Counselors (n = 90)	10.0%	16.7%	42.2%	27.8%	3.3%	24
Analysts/Assistive Techs (n = 57)	15.8%	17.5%	33.3%	22.8%	10.5%	57
Coordinators (Program officer, Program administrator) (n = 110)	4.5%	7.3%	23.6%	44.5%	20.0%	5
Director level staff (Director, Assistant, Associate) (n = 115)	3.5%	4.3%	21.7%	40.0%	30.4%	0
Leadership (VP, AVP, Alignment Leaders, Chief Business Officers) (n = 113)	2.7%	5.3%	16.8%	33.6%	41.6%	2
Medical, Dental, Psychologists, Psychiatrist, Legal Professionals (n = 59)	13.6%	15.3%	23.7%	33.9%	13.6%	56
Special Assistants and Executive Assistants (n = 66)	13.6%	27.3%	21.2%	25.8%	12.1%	49

a) The n for each unit includes those who responded with a ranking from Very Poor – Excellent. Those who responded Don't Know/NA or who did not respond are not included. Percentages are calculated from the unit n.

Note: Shaded areas indicate the most common responses for each row.

Integration of Assessment into Practice

The degree to which respondents perceived different areas of their student affairs divisions as integrating assessment into practice varied. Over 70% of respondents perceived Assessment, Evaluation, and Research (86.8%), Residence Life/Housing (82.6%), Leadership Programs (79.2%), Recreation and Fitness (71.3%), and Orientation Programs (70.7%) as integrating assessment with moderate to significant effectiveness. Over 50% of respondents perceived Campus Safety/Police (52.9%), Fundraising/Development (61.7%), Registrar (56.1%), and Student Accounting/Bursar (78.9%) as not assessing student learning at all. There were fewer clear trends regarding areas perceived as integrating assessment ineffectively.

Please rate how each of the student affairs areas in your division has integrated student learning assessment into its practice.

Students Affairs Areas (A – F) (n) ^a	Does not assess student learning	Assesses but not effectively	Assesses with moderate effectiveness	Assess with significant effectiveness	Don't Know/NA (n) ^a
Academic Advising (n = 44)	29.5%	34.1%	27.3%	9.1%	68
Assessment, Evaluation and Research (n = 76)	3.9%	9.2%	44.7%	42.1%	36
Athletics (n = 47)	34.0%	29.8%	31.9%	4.3%	65
Campus Safety/Police (n = 51)	52.9%	25.5%	19.6%	2.0%	60
Career Services (n = 84)	8.3%	22.6%	41.7%	27.4%	28
College/Student Union (n = 93)	14.0%	21.5%	47.3%	17.2%	18
Commuter Services (n = 60)	18.3%	26.7%	48.3%	6.7%	50
Counseling and Testing Services (n = 91)	8.8%	24.2%	44.0%	23.1%	21
Dining/Food Service (n = 71)	36.6%	21.1%	32.4%	9.9%	41
Disability Support Services (n = 84)	19.0%	25.0%	40.5%	15.5%	28
Financial Aid (n = 50)	38.0%	20.0%	32.0%	10.0%	62
First Year Experience Program (n = 64)	6.3%	25.0%	50.0%	18.8%	48
Fraternity and Sorority Life (n = 81)	14.8%	33.3%	45.7%	6.2%	30

a) The n for each area includes those who responded with a ranking. Those who responded Don't Know/NA or who did not respond are not included. Percentages are calculated from the area n.

Integration of Assessment into Practice (Cont.)

Please rate how each of the student affairs areas in your division has integrated student learning assessment into its practice.

Student Affairs Areas (F - P) (n) ^a	Does not assess student learning	Assesses but not effectively	Assesses with moderate effectiveness	Assess with significant effectiveness	Don't Know/NA (n) ^a
Fundraising/Development (n = 47)	61.7%	17.0%	12.8%	8.5%	65
Graduate Student Services (n = 34)	32.4%	17.6%	38.2%	11.8%	78
Health Services/Health Center (n = 89)	16.9%	14.6%	46.1%	22.5%	24
International Student Services (n = 50)	22.0%	28.0%	42.0%	8.0%	62
Judicial Affairs (n = 90)	21.1%	24.4%	43.3%	11.1%	21
Leadership Programs (n = 101)	5.9%	14.9%	53.5%	25.7%	10
Learning Center/Tutoring Center (n = 54)	13.0%	22.2%	35.2%	29.6%	58
LGBTQ Resource Center (n = 57)	21.1%	17.5%	47.4%	14.0%	55
Multicultural Affairs/Multicultural (n = 78)	15.4%	33.3%	38.5%	12.8%	34
Non-Traditional Student Services (excluding Veterans and Graduate Students) (n = 50)	32.0%	36.0%	26.0%	6.0%	62
Orientation Programs (n = 92)	8.7%	20.7%	45.7%	25.0%	19
Outreach (n = 32)	25.0%	37.5%	28.1%	9.4%	78
Parent and Family Relations (n = 63)	39.7%	17.5%	28.6%	14.3%	49

a) The n for each area includes those who responded with a ranking. Those who responded Don't Know/NA or who did not respond are not included. Percentages are calculated from the area n.

Integration of Assessment into Practice (Cont.)

Please rate how each of the student affairs areas in your division has integrated student learning assessment into its practice

Student Affairs Areas (R – Z) (n) ^a	Does not assess student learning	Assesses but not effectively	Assesses with moderate effectiveness	Assess with significant effectiveness	Don't Know/NA (n) ^a
Recreation and Fitness/Recreation Center (n = 80)	16.3%	12.5%	43.8%	27.5%	31
Registrar (n = 41)	56.1%	12.2%	29.3%	2.4%	70
Residence Life or Housing (n = 98)	2.0%	15.3%	52.0%	30.6%	14
Senior year Experience programs (n = 13)	30.8%	23.1%	38.5%	7.7%	98
Service Learning (n = 64)	14.1%	20.3%	40.6%	25.0%	48
Spiritual and Faith related programs/services (n = 38)	31.6%	31.6%	23.7%	13.2%	74
Student Accounting/Bursar (n = 38)	78.9%	10.5%	7.9%	2.6%	73
Student Activities and Organizations (n = 104)	4.8%	28.8%	50.0%	16.3%	8
Student Conduct (n = 99)	18.2%	21.2%	50.5%	10.1%	13
Student Government (n = 86)	43.0%	25.6%	29.1%	2.3%	26
Student Success Centers (n = 40)	12.5%	27.5%	40.0%	20.0%	72
Sustainability Programs (n = 30)	36.7%	23.3%	30.0%	10.0%	80
Transfer Student Services (n = 47)	23.4%	42.6%	27.7%	6.4%	64
Veteran Services (n = 58)	31.0%	31.0%	31.0%	6.9%	53
Women's Center (n = 37)	18.9%	37.8%	32.4%	10.8%	67

a) The n for each area includes those who responded with a ranking. Those who responded Don't Know/NA or who did not respond are not included. Percentages are calculated from the area n.

Barriers to Student Learning Assessment

Participants were asked to identify the general barriers to adopting a greater emphasis on student learning assessment faced by their division. Responses indicated that lack of time, knowledge, and financial resources combined with apathy for assessment among staff were key barriers to student learning assessment.

Listed are general barriers to adopting a greater emphasis on assessing student learning that some divisions face. Please select all that apply to your student affairs division. If there are other broad issues not listed, please provide them. (n = 113)

Factors	n	Percent
Unclear expectations by accreditation body	18	15.9%
Lack of staff knowledge on ways to assess student learning	98	86.7%
Lack of scholarly documentation on impact within a student affairs context	28	24.8%
Lack of support from senior leadership	40	35.4%
Lack of financial resources to commit to assessment	65	57.5%
Concern about negative reaction from staff	36	31.9%
Apathy in general for assessment by staff	59	52.2%
Amount of time/work needed to assess	97	85.8%
Other	18	15.9%

Other Responses:

- Not enough staff/staff hours for student learning assessment.
- Some departments do not see benefits or applicability of learning outcomes assessment.
- Departments do not see how they influence student learning.
- Lack of learning outcomes or poorly constructed learning outcomes.
- Lack of skills or low confidence in skills required to conduct student learning assessment.
- Lack of culture of assessment, no support among leadership and/or faculty.
- Competing priorities and processes.

a) Other Responses are summarized from the data and are not direct quotes.

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND RESOURCES

To investigate the institutional contexts in which student affairs assessment took place, the student affairs professionals who participated were asked to report the type and size of institution in which they worked. In addition, participants were asked to estimate the resources (e.g., staff and funding) devoted to student affairs and assessment at their institution.

Institutional Type and Size

Most of the student affairs professionals who completed a survey worked at four-year public or private institutions. Participants were asked to estimate their total student enrollment. Responses that did not provide an estimate were eliminated, and the remaining responses were categorized into the table reported below. Institutional size varied, but over 60% reported that their total student enrollment was between 10,000 and 50,000 students.

My institution is a: (n = 115)

Institution	n	Percent
4 year private	30	26.1%
4 year public	75	65.2%
2 year public	7	6.1%
Another institution of higher education (for-profit, seminary, etc.)	3	2.6%

Your total student enrollment for Fall 2013: (n = 91)

Enrollment	n	Percent
Under 500 students	2	2.2%
1,000 – 2,999 students	6	6.6%
3,000 – 9,999 students	16	17.6%
10,000 - 24,999 students	29	31.9%
25,000 – 49,999 students	33	36.3%
50,000 or more students	5	5.5%

Note: Some institutions are represented multiple times because more than one respondent from that institution completed the survey.

Assessment Staff

Most of the respondents indicated that there was one full-time staff person dedicated to conducting student affairs assessment at their institution. However, about 18% of the professionals who completed a survey did not know how many full-time staff were dedicated to assessment in their division.

How many dedicated Full Time staff do you have to conduct assessment activities in your division? Please answer for your Division of Student Affairs, regardless of your role. (n = 109)

Assessment Staff	n	Percent
1	57	52.3%
2	15	13.8%
3	6	5.5%
4 - 5	4	3.6%
6 - 7	3	2.8%
8 - 9	3	2.8%
10+	1	0.9%
Don't know	20	18.3%

Note: Some institutions are represented multiple times because more than one respondent from that institution completed the survey.

Student Affairs Staff

How many Full Time Professional Staff (not including Administrative Assistants) does your Division of Student Affairs employ? Please answer for your Division of Student Affairs, regardless of your role. (n = 114)

Student Affairs Staff	n	Percent
Fewer than 50	20	17.5%
50 - 99	18	15.8%
100 - 149	14	12.3%
150 - 199	12	10.5%
200 - 249	8	7.0%
250 - 499	19	16.7%
500 or more	12	10.5%
Don't know	11	9.6%

Note: Some institutions are represented multiple times because more than one respondent from that institution completed the survey.

Funding

Over half (56.6%) of participants reported that their division's annual assessment budget was under \$50,000, not including salaries or wages. However, a significant proportion (35.4%) was not able to estimate their annual assessment budget.

NOT including salaries or part-time employee wages, how much is your assessment budget each year? Please answer for your Division of Student Affairs, regardless of your role. (n = 114)

Assessment Budget	n	Percent
Less than \$25,000	54	47.8%
\$25,000-\$49,999	10	8.8%
\$50,000-\$74,999	2	1.8%
\$75,000-\$99,999	1	0.9%
\$100,000-\$124,999	2	1.8%
\$125,000-\$149,999	0	0.0%
\$150,000-\$174,999	0	0.0%
\$175,000-\$199,999	2	1.8%
\$200,000 or more	2	1.8%
Don't know	40	35.4%