**Northern Michigan University**

**OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN/REPORT FORM**

**Administrative or Educational Support Unit**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Department or Unit | | Center for Student Enrichment | | | |
| This document is the | 🞎 PLAN or 🗹 REPORT for July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 | | | Date Submitted: | June 29, 2011 |
| Submitted by (Unit Representative) | | | David Bonsall | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department or Unit Mission Statement: Was this mission statement revised this year? Yes \_X\_ No** |
| The Center for Student Enrichment provides students with a variety of co-curricular and classroom connected experiences which promote personal and professional growth, connect the campus with surrounding communities, and enhance the college experience. |

**Functions within the University:**

|  |
| --- |
| In addition to being part of NMU’s continuous improvement process, outcomes assessment plays a direct role with the AQIP Systems Portfolio (100-page document submitted every four years). To increase awareness and help gather Portfolio information, **please type “X” for all AQIP categories directly related to your unit’s core mission**. Some functions appear in more than one category. This is a first round collection of this information so do the best you can with the selection; if you want help, ask S. Poindexter. (Note: this section of the form is short-term; it will be deleted once functions have been mapped between units and the Systems Portfolio.)  **X** AQIP Category 1: Helping Students Learn documents the curricular and co-curricular processes and student learning support.  **X** AQIP Category 2: Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives documents the key non-curricular functions by which NMU serves the region, e.g. community engagement initiatives of students and employees, and department outreach.  **X** AQIP Category 3: Understanding Students’ and Other Stakeholders’ Needs documents how NMU builds relationships with students, alumni and employers and identifies, targets and meets their needs.  **🞎** AQIP Category 4: Valuing People documents NMU personnel recruitment, training, satisfaction, services and programs.  **🞎** AQIP Category 5: Leading and Communicating documents processes that guide NMU in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and communicating decisions and actions.  **🞎** AQIP Category 6: Supporting Institutional Operations documents student and administrative support services, safety, and facilities.  **🞎** AQIP Category 7: Measuring Effectiveness documents IT systems and institutional research NMU employs to collect, analyze, and distribute, and how departments use them to manage improvement, e.g. use of charts, “cubes,” dashboards.  **🞎** AQIP Category 8: Planning Continuous Improvement documents NMU’s strategic and administrative planning processes.  **X** AQIP Category 9: Building Collaborative Relationships documents how NMU works with external organizations from which we receive students (school systems) or goods and services (vendors and utilities), send our graduates (schools and employers), and support or regulate our programs (agencies).  (A full description of the Portfolio’s categories and its detailed topics are available at [www.nmu.edu/aqip](http://www.nmu.edu/aqip) under the Current Document tab.) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Administrative Objective #1** *(State an ongoing goal by which the unit gauges its overall performance in a key role year after year, i.e. your “bottom line” measure.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** *(Describe the statistic or criteria that measures success in achieving this goal. What is the desired and/or minimum target you expect*? *What method is used to collect the data for the statistic*?) |
| **Annually assess the impact/value of student development initiatives that include Academic Service Learning, Superior Edge, the Student Leader Fellowship Program, and Health Promotion classroom presentations.** |  | **Academic Service Learning** – the **Student Experience Survey** will be used to collect data. Two key statistics that will measure success in this area are:   * % of respondents who feel their interactions with the community practice enhanced their learning/ understanding of the course. Minimum target is 80%; desired target is 90%. * % of respondents who feel the community participation aspect of their course showed them they could become more involved in their community. Minimum target is 80%; desired target is 90%.   **Superior Edge** – the **Edge Completion Survey** will be used to collect data. Key statistics that will measure success in this area are:   * Citizenship Edge – % of respondents who feel that by completing the Citizenship Edge they gained a greater awareness of community needs and challenges. Minimum target is 85%; desired target is 95%. * Diversity Edge – % of respondents who feel that by completing the Diversity Edge they gained a greater appreciation for cultural differences. Minimum target is 85%; desired target is 95%. * % of respondents who feel that by completing the Leadership Edge they improved their leadership skills (patience, listening, assertiveness, etc.). Minimum target is 85%; desired target is 95%. * % of respondents who feel that by completing the Real World Edge they gained an appreciation for the challenges of “real world” situations (resources, personalities, etc.). Minimum target is 85%; desired target is 95%.   **Student Leader Fellowship Program** – the **Pre- and Post-Individual Profile** will be used to collect data. Key statistics that will be used to collect data are the degree of change recorded in Student Fellows’ responses to the following three statements:   * I know how to vary leadership approaches depending on the situation and the group. * I have a sense that my contributions to society are important. * I have a commitment to volunteering in this or another community.   Choen’s d effect sizes are considered to indicate a large programmatic or treatment effect if 0.8 or greater. Our desired target is 0.8 or greater.  **Health Promotion Classroom Presentations** – the **Pre-Post Classroom Presentation Surveys** will be used to collect data. The key statistics that will measure success on a 5-point scale are:   * % change from “knowledge before” to “knowledge after” for classroom presentations on alcohol. Minimum target is 10%; desired target is 20%. * % change from “awareness of helping resources before” to “awareness of helping resources after” for classroom presentations on alcohol. Minimum target is 20%; desired target is 25%. * % change from “knowledge before” to “knowledge after” for classroom presentations on sexual assault. Minimum target is 15%; desired target is 25%. * % change from “awareness of helping resources before” to “awareness of helping resources after” for classroom presentations on sexual assault. Minimum target is 25%; desired target is 30%. * % change from “knowledge before” to knowledge after” for Alcohol/Marijuana Intervention Classes. Minimum target is 20%; desired target is 25%. * % change from “awareness of helping resources before” to “awareness o f helping resources after” for Alcohol/Marijuana Intervention Classes. Minimum target is 35%; desired target is 40%.   Additional survey results for Academic Service Learning, Superior Edge, the Student Leader Fellowship Program, and Health Promotion classroom presentations can obtained by contacting the Program Coordinators:   * Academic Service Learning – Dave Bonsall * Superior Edge – Rachel Harris * Student Leader Fellowship Program – Jon Barch * Health Promotion Office – Lenny Shible |
| **Summary of Data Collected** *(Provide trend data and summarize)* |  | **Describe how results were used to improve services** |
| **Academic Service Learning**   * 85% of student respondents felt their interactions with the community practice enhanced their learning/understanding of the course (89% in 2010-2011). * 88% of student respondents felt the community participation aspect of their course showed them they could become more involved in their community (86% in 2010-2011).   **Superior Edge**   * 98% of respondents (100% in 2010-2011) felt that by completing the Citizenships Edge they gained a greater awareness of community needs and challenges. * 100% of respondents (96% in 2010-2011) felt that by completing the Diversity Edge they gained a greater appreciation for cultural differences. * 100% of respondents (96% in 2010-2011) felt that by completing the Leadership Edge they improved their leadership skills (patience, listening, assertiveness, etc.). * 96% of respondents (100% in 2010-2011) felt that by completing the Real World Edge they gained an appreciation for the challenges of “real world” situations (resources, personalities, etc.).   **Student Leader Fellowship Program**   * d effect size for the statement “I know how to vary leadership approaches depending on the situation and the group” was 1.90 (1.98 in 2010-2011). * d effect size for the statement “I have a sense that my contributions to society are important” was 1.71 (1.61 in 2010-2011). * d effect size for the statement “I have a commitment to volunteering in this or another community was 1.98 (2.14 in 2010-2011).   **Health Promotion**   * There was an 11% change from “knowledge before” to “knowledge after” for HP200 classroom presentations on alcohol (9.4% in 2010-2011)\*. * There was a 33% change from “awareness of helping resources before” to “awareness of helping resources after” for HP200 classroom presentations in alcohol (32% in 2010-2011)\*. * There was a 28.6% change from “knowledge before” to “knowledge after” for FYE and RAD classroom presentations on sexual assault (9.4% in 2010-2011)\*. * There was a 46.8% change from “awareness of helping resources before” to “awareness of helping resources after” for FYE and RAD classroom presentations on sexual assault (32% in 2010-2011)\*. * There was a 26.5% change from “knowledge before” to “knowledge after” for Alcohol/Marijuana Intervention Classes. * There was a 61.5% change from “awareness of helping resources before” to “awareness of helping resources after” for Alcohol/Marijuana Intervention Classes.   \*Responses to survey question were presented in aggregate form for HP200 and FYE/RAD classes in 2010-2011; in 2011-2012 they were broken down to HP200 and FYE/RAD. |  | Across the board it is evident by the results that the impact of student development programs emanating from the Center for Student Enrichment is very high. The significant impact that these initiatives are having points to challenges, albeit positive ones as we move forward. They include:   * Extending academic service learning opportunities to a greater number of students (1,926 students were enrolled in courses with ASL experiences in 2011-2012). This will have to be accomplished in partnership with faculty and academic departments. * We have been encouraged by the AQIP and Outcomes Assessment Coordinator to implement a needs assessment with faculty every three years to determine which skills are most important for graduating students in their discipline to have developed. This data can be used to shape *Skill Builder!* workshop offerings as well as suggesting possible academic service learning experiences. * Continuing the upward trend of students who are logging Superior Edge hours and completing “edges” (42% of oriented students logged hours in 2011-2012). The positive effect of Superior Edge on student recruitment is being increasingly noted. Rachel Harris, the Associate Director/Superior Edge Coordinator in the Center for Student Enrichment, is currently exploring ways in which the Superior Edge experiences affect student retention, academic achievement, and graduate rates. * The positive effect that participation in the Student Leader Fellowship Program continues to be impressive – on campus, statewide, and nationally. A positive challenge in a related area will be to more closely align *Skill Builder!* workshop offerings with academic programs and student organization needs. * Health Promotion Office classroom presentations continue to show positive results with students. The challenge for the Health Promotion Office is to extend their educational efforts beyond their current areas of emphasis – responsible use of alcohol, substance abuse, safe sex, and sexual assault – to additional focus areas that include proper diet, exercise, and balance in life.   Some of these new directional areas for the CSE student development initiatives, particularly in the Academic Service Learning and Health Promotion areas, will be limited in scope due to available resources. |
| **Administrative Objective #2** *(State a 1-2 year objective intended to improve a unit process, service, or output.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Objective* :  **Develop and “operationalize a rural/urban “Service Exchange” between Northern Michigan University and the University of Michigan – Dearborn.**  *Rationale (Why you are setting this objective; mark with “X”)*:  **X** Effectiveness/quality action Efficiency/cost action  Compliance issue Satisfaction measure Create baseline  Other (explain):  *Does this objective relate to a Road Map goal? (Refer to last page for the Road Map goals). If yes, type the related Road Map codes here*:  CE-2 |  | *Describe timetable plans to achieve objective*.  a. Determine service activities and dates for the exchanges (July, August 2011).  b. Determine responsibilities that hosting/visiting institutions will assume (July, August 2011).  c. Help develop/advise a new student organization called “Michigan Service Exchange – NMU Chapter” and work with them to coordinate promotion and arrangements for the service trip to Detroit (September, October).  d. Advise and assist the Michigan Service Exchange – NMU Chapter with arrangements/hosting for the UM-Dearborn trip to Marquette/Northern Michigan University (September, October).  *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success?[[1]](#endnote-1) Examples: If the rationale was Efficiency/cost, what is the desired and/or minimum target criteria for savings in time or cost? If the rationale was Satisfaction, what is the measure and what increase is desired*?  To determine success, we will administer a short survey to service exchange participants measuring impact, lessons learned, affordability, etc.) and we will also evaluate from an administrative standpoint. |
| **Summary of Data Collected** (*Summarize the evidence)* |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** |
| a) Accomplished. Twelve students from the University of Michigan-Dearborn visited Marquette and Northern Michigan University on the weekend of October 21-23 to participate in Make a Difference Day. Sixteen students from NMU traveled to Detroit and the University of Michigan-Dearborn on the weekend of November 4-6 and planted trees under the auspices of the Greening of Detroit projects.  b) Accomplished. Host institutions provided housing and two meals; student participants paid for the rest of their meals. Each institution paid their respective transportation expenses.  c) Accomplished to a degree. Students interested in forming this organization were successfully recruited at Fall Fest. Initial meetings revealed that their interest was in participating in the Service Exchange, not in maintaining an organization.  d) Not accomplished (see “c”). Student employees and the Director of the Center for Student Enrichment along with the UM-Dearborn staff planned and operationalized the Service Exchange.  Summary Comments: Rather than a written evaluation, reflective discussions were conducted with student participants at the conclusion of both weekend exchanges. These discussions revealed how rich of an experience the Service Exchange was and how successful they were in accomplishing the goal of providing participating students a service experience in an environment decidedly different from what most were accustomed.  UM-Dearborn students visiting Marquette and Northern Michigan University:   * marveled at the Mackinac Bridge; many had never crossed it and one had never been north of Saginaw. * were struck by how sparsely populated the Upper Peninsula is. * were appreciative of the beauty of the Marquette area. * were impressed with the “sense of community” that is present in a city the size of Marquette.   NMU students travelling to Detroit and the University of Michigan-Dearborn:   * were struck by the human and physical facility needs in sections of Detroit. * were appreciative of what a major metro area has to offer as demonstrated by a visit to the Detroit Institute of Art. This was especially noted by a student from Gwinn who had never before been in a major metro area. * developed a much more positive impression of Detroit than they held prior to their visit due in large part to a tour of Detroit that included downtown, Belle Isle, Indian Village and the Eastern Market. Several stated that they were more willing to consider living and working in Detroit. * had a welcomed cultural experience by eating dinner at a Middle Eastern restaurant. |  | The Rural/Urban Service Exchange provided student participants with a very rich educational experience. There is reason to consider making this an annual event. The reservation and potentially limiting factor is the relative expense per participant. The results of this objective certainly motivate us to continue exploring ways and means of sponsoring domestic service trips as well as the international service trips that we coordinate. |
| **Administrative Objective #3** *(State a 1-2 year objective intended to improve a unit process, service, or output.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |
| *Objective*:  **Expand “Coffee with the Community” from several selected community organizations to any non-profit organization wishing to visit with NMU faculty about potential academic service learning projects.**  *Rationale (Why you are setting this objective? Mark with “X”)*:  **X** Effectiveness/quality action Efficiency/cost action  Compliance issue Satisfaction measure Create baseline  Other (explain):  *Does this objective relate to a Road Map goal? (Refer to last page for the Road Map goals). If yes, type the related Road Map codes here*:  CE-2 |  | Describe timetable plans to achieve objective.  a. Determine a date, location, time, etc., for Coffee with the Community by June 30, 2011.  b. Compile a mailing list of non-profit organizations by August 1.  c. Develop an informational/promotional plan for NMU faculty and non-profit leaders by August 1.  d. Make arrangements/implement informational/promotional plans – September – October.  *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success*?1  We will administer short surveys of faculty and non-profit leaders to determine success (# of potential academic service learning linkages, perceived benefit of Coffee with the Community, etc. |
| **Summary of Data Collected (**Summarize the evidence) |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** |
| a) Accomplished. Coffee with the Community was held on Friday, October 21, 2011, from 8–11 a.m. in the Peter White Lounge of the University Center.  b) Accomplished.  c) Accomplished.  d) A letter was sent to the contact person for selected non-profit organizations asking them to register for Coffee with the Community by Friday, September 30, and to include with their registration at least three service learning project ideas. The project ideas were sent via e-mail to faculty and teaching staff prior to and during the event. Coffee with the Community was also promoted to faculty and teaching staff with a postcard.  Summary: Nine of the invited non-profit organizations registered and participated in Coffee with the Community (registration was limited to non-profit organizations with the perceived potential to offer multiple and varied service learning project possibilities). A total of 20 faculty and teaching staff members participated in Coffee with the Community.  A short survey was conducted with both parties. Participating faculty and teaching staff responses include the following information:   * All were willing to attend Coffee with the Community if it is offered again next year. * The dialogue with members of the community was appreciated and useful. * Consider changing the date and time. * It was well-organized.   Community non-profit organization leaders’ comments included:   * Great way to brainstorm helpful ideas that may not have been previously thought of. * Nice way for the NMU instructors to make connections with some of the community organizations in a very efficient way. * Inviting way to have a useful dialogue between the campus and the community. * Would definitely attend again. * Were able to talk with faculty about internship possibilities as well as service learning projects. |  | Coffee with the Community worked well for the faculty and community organizations that were able to connect on a project that met the educational objectives of a particular course. Several future project ideas of mutual interest were discussed in the evaluations. If and when they come to fruition remains to be seen. There is no substitute for face-to-face discussions. Most participants said they would participate in Coffee with the Community if it is offered again. Still, there may be more efficient and effective ways of connecting interested faculty with relevant community partners. This will be discussed during the summer. |

Many service units already use an evaluative measure and this approach is now more common in assessment theory– not everything we try works out the way as hoped and creating a target and/or success/bail out threshold is appropriate. In cases where this is a new approach for a unit, in the 2011-12 Plan consider how you *might* measure the added value of an objective; however, it is not yet a requirement. The OA committee will provide suggestions in its feedback for this year. During the year, dialogues, additional resources, one-on-one meetings and/or seminars will be held to evolve our OA process.

**Road Map Codes to Tie to Unit Objectives**

Some unit objectives may address specific operational issues. Other unit objectives are strategic initiatives that align with goals in the University strategic plan - Road Map to 2015. These latter unit objectives are potential AQIP Action Projects – giving a little more recognition to unit efforts. Listed below are Road Map categories and goals, preceded with a code. Use these codes when describing Objectives #2 and #3. (Note: Even if your objective is not an exactly itemized as a Road Map priority, still use the code if it applies to that goal.) The full Road Map is at [www.nmu.edu/roadmap2015](http://www.nmu.edu/roadmap2015).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Road Map to 2015 Goals*** | |
| ***Code*** | ***Innovation Goals*** |
| **I-1** | Balance successful programs with new offerings |
| **I-2** | Professional development program that rewards innovation and collaboration |
| **I-3** | A growing portfolio of corporate collaborations that exploit NMU’s technical expertise, enhance academic programs and facilitate global engagement for students and faculty both on campus and abroad |
| **I-4** | Develop the financial resources to support innovation and student success |
|  | ***Meaningful Lives Goals*** |
| **ML-1** | A Liberal Studies Program that provides students with the abilities and knowledge necessary for lifelong learning and effective citizenship in a challenging and rapidly changing world |
| **ML-2** | Develop a new academic advising system that integrates the advising assets of academic departments and student services to contribute to a new, effective retention management network—similar to our enrollment management network |
| **ML-3** | Integrate the highest possible level of information technology skills and competencies throughout the university |
|  | ***Campus Attributes Goals*** |
| **CA-1** | Utilize the Campus Master Plan and related initiatives to continue to build and develop a greener and more learner-centered campus |
| **CA-2** | Enhance processes throughout campus operations to guide the use of resources and inform resource allocation |
| **CA-3** | Enhance the portfolio of academic programs, research and other activities that leverage the university’s location |
| **CA-4** | Be a model community for sustainable education and practices |
|  | ***Community Engagement Goals*** |
| **CE-1** | Include all units of the campus in the process of community engagement for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. |
| **CE-2** | Increase faculty, staff and student involvement in the Superior Edge program, academic service learning and other community engagement and leadership development initiatives. |
| **CE-3** | Put into action a commitment to be an inclusive community where differences are recognized as assets of the institution, respected attributes of the person and a valuable part of the university experience |
| **CE-4** | Increase collaboration with local communities, schools, governments, development groups and other partners to enhance community and economic development in the Upper Peninsula. |

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)