

# **Student Affairs Assessment Leaders Professional Development Committee**

*Presents*

## **Mixed Methods Assessment & the 2017 SAAL PD Needs Assessment**

*November 7, 2017*

Marylee Demeter, Ed.M., M.A.; SAAL Professional Development Committee (PDC)

Nicole Long, Ph.D.; Director of Assessment and Engagement, University of Delaware; PDC

Stephanie Mimbs, Living & Learning Community Graduate Assistant, University Tennessee, Knoxville

Moderator: Kerry Klima, Assistant Director, Assessment and Evaluation, CSU Long Beach

# Structured Conversation Outcomes:

As a result of participating in this conversation, you will:

- ▶ Understand the rationale for employing mixed methods in SA Assessment.
- ▶ Evaluate strategies for collecting or utilizing existing data *qualitative data* and *quantitative data*, and employ those approaches best suited to assessment goals.
- ▶ Analyze and combine qualitative and quantitative results to provide recommendations that inform decision-making.
- ▶ Use those results to make decisions, improve programs, and take action.
- ▶ Understand the rationale and process for the SAAL's 2017 Professional Development (PD) Needs Assessment, administered in conjunction with the 2018 Membership Renewal process.
- ▶ Learn about your PD needs, and how the PDC is using the results to bring you opportunities to learn about the topics important to you in your good work!

# Why Mixed Methods?

## Quantitative Methods

- ▶ Trends
- ▶ Wide range of topics

## Qualitative Methods

- ▶ Understand Complex Phenomena
- ▶ Narrow Focus



Collect simultaneously  
Integrate of data

# Mixed Methods Approaches: Tailor to your Assessment Question(s)

## Qualitative

- ▶ Interviews
- ▶ Surveys: Comment Boxes/Text
- ▶ Observations: field notes
- ▶ Focus Groups

## Quantitative

- ▶ Surveys
- ▶ Observations: Attendance/Counts
- ▶ Likert Scales

## Panel Question:

- ▶ Please discuss an SA assessment project where you employed Mixed Methods.

# Rationale for 2017 Needs Assessment

- ▶ 2013 Membership survey used to identify topics for Structured Conversations.
- ▶ By early 2016, data was “tapped out.”
- ▶ Demonstrated need for information to inform SC Topics
- ▶ Information could also be used to inform Resource Repository (organization, resources)
- ▶ Gather listing of SAA offices to share on SAAL Website
- ▶ Refer to [NA Proposal Draft](#)

# Development

## ▶ Development Team:

- ▶ Dr. Matt Pistilli, **DIRECTOR OF ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCH**, Division of Student Affairs, Iowa State University
- ▶ Kristin Buscher, Director of Assessment, Peru State College
- ▶ Marylee Demeter, Ed.M., M.A.,; SAAL PDC

## ▶ Process:

- ▶ Gather PD related questions from 2013 Membership survey
- ▶ Revise: Add & delete topics

# Administration

- ▶ PDC collaboration with Membership Committee and SAAL Board.
- ▶ With membership renewals planned for late 2017, there was concern of survey fatigue and repetition of information.
- ▶ Solution: early renewal combined with Needs Assessment, summer 2017.
- ▶ Data collection: Qualtrics



# Analysis

## Analysis Team

- ▶ SAAL PDC:
  - ▶ Marylee Demeter
  - ▶ Nicole Long
  - ▶ Megan Bell
  - ▶ Kerry Klima
- ▶ Assessment in Student Affairs Graduate Course, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
  - ▶ Patrick Biddix, Ph.D.
  - ▶ Stephanie Mimbs
    - ▶ Many thanks to classmates who contributed!

## Analysis Plan

- ▶ Preliminary Analyses
  - ▶ PDC reviewed results during administration to ID topics for SAAL's Fall SC Series.
- ▶ Analyze all Qualitative responses
  - ▶ Develop basic themes
  - ▶ Code qualitative data for themes
- ▶ Summarize all quant responses.
  - ▶ Complete a side-by-side display for the interested/knowledgeable questions with rankings
- ▶ Executive summary report with recommendations

# Panel Question

- ▶ Was there was a specific order of data analysis that was best here?
- ▶ Will there ever be a time where you should start with one analysis method or does it depend on your assessment question?

# Preliminary Analysis

- ▶ The Structured Conversation subcommittee reviewed preliminary results during the last week of July and identified the following topics to consider for fall SCs.
  - ▶ *Technology*- we discussed that we are not sure what the surveyors intended with their ideas of technology.
    - ▶ Ad hoc analyses: Review SAAL Listserv archives April 2017 - 2018
- ▶ Call for panelists:
  - ▶ Ethics of predictive analytics
  - ▶ Partnering with academic affairs on assessment
  - ▶ Technology systems and applications
  - ▶ Technical and data analysis techniques (e.g., procedures, mixed methods, etc.)
  - ▶ Assessment related to diversity and inclusion
  - ▶ Career trajectories for student affairs assessment leaders (e.g., reflections on experiences and further career opportunities, career “next steps,” etc.)

# Panel Question

- ▶ What were some challenges with this preliminary analysis?

# Quantitative Results

## Question 46

Item	Level of Interest			Knowledge Level		
	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD
Technology and assessment	1	4.15	0.86	5	3.27	0.91
Using existing data sources	2	4.15	0.83	5	3.27	0.91
Creating a culture of assessment	3	4.07	0.90	4	3.31	0.84
Developing an assessment plan	4	3.80	1.02	3	3.57	0.91
Use of professional standards	5	3.71	0.95	7	3.02	0.82
Writing effective outcomes	6	3.69	1.08	2	3.66	0.91
The assessment cycle	7	3.42	1.11	1	3.77	0.95

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Slightly, 3 = Moderately, 4 = Very, 5 = Extremely

### Key Takeaways:

- Respondents were **very** interested in learning more about **technology and assessment**, but were moderately knowledgeable.
- Respondents were **very** interested in using existing data sources, but were moderately knowledgeable.

# Quantitative Results

## Question 48

Item	Level of Interest			Knowledge Level		
	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD
Quantitative data analysis	1	3.88	0.92	4	3.18	0.97
Qualitative data analysis	2	3.86	0.91	3	3.19	0.98
Meta-analysis	3	3.84	1.03	7	2.31	0.98
Sampling methods	4	3.64	0.99	6	2.96	0.97
Creating rubrics	5	3.62	1.03	5	3.15	0.88
Creating focus groups and individual interviews	6	3.62	1.00	2	3.34	0.96
Creating surveys	7	3.43	1.10	1	3.71	0.89

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Slightly, 3 = Moderately, 4 = Very, 5 = Extremely

### Key Takeaways:

- Respondents were moderately interested about all of the topics.
- Respondents were slightly knowledgeable about meta-analysis and sampling methods.

# Quantitative Results

## Question 50

Item	Level of Interest			Knowledge Level		
	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD
Representing data visually	1	4.38	0.74	4	3.05	0.88
Using results to improve programs and services	2	4.30	0.80	1	3.40	0.81
Strategic planning	3	4.10	0.89	3	3.19	1.01
Reporting results	4	4.05	0.86	2	3.36	0.87
Conducting program reviews	5	3.96	0.93	5	2.98	0.98
Mixed methods analysis	6	3.76	0.98	6	2.82	0.95
Fidelity	7	3.44	1.04	7	2.34	1.03

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Slightly, 3 = Moderately, 4 = Very, 5 = Extremely

### Key Takeaway:

- Respondents are **moderately knowledgeable** about representing data visually, but are **very interested** in the topic.

# Quantitative Results

## Question 52

Item	<u>Level of Interest</u>			<u>Knowledge Level</u>		
	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD
Mapping outcomes	1	3.86	0.93	3	2.96	0.98
Partnering with academic affairs	2	3.81	1.01	2	3.06	0.98
Collaboration with institutional research	3	3.76	1.05	1	3.12	1.10
Role of student affairs assessment in accreditation	4	3.64	1.14	4	2.89	1.02
How to conduct observations	5	3.48	1.02	5	2.82	1.04
Inter-rater reliability	6	3.43	1.08	6	2.62	1.07

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Slightly, 3 = Moderately, 4 = Very, 5 = Extremely

### Key Takeaways:

- Respondents were **moderately knowledgeable** about partnering with academic affairs and collaboration with institutional research.
- Respondents were **slightly knowledgeable** about mapping outcomes, how to conduct observations, and inter-rater reliability.



# Qualitative Results

What other topics you would like Student Affairs Assessment Leaders to provide Structured Conversations or materials for the Resource Repository?

## Major Themes

### Assessment strategies

- ▶ Assessment strategies encompasses collaboration strategies, strategies for assessing different populations of students, strategies for assessing various functional units.

### Assessment planning

- ▶ Assessment planning concepts for an institution of higher education, division, department, and as an office.

### Additional assessment resources

- ▶ Assessment resources are tangible examples that could help guide assessment practices in student affairs.
- ▶ Some of the resources mentioned by respondents include assessment manuals, key indicators or metrics, and helpful websites.

One respondent stated that the field of student affairs should “guide novices to resources to show them that programs, interventions, & products are being rigorously studied and are based on theory. They shouldn’t be starting from scratch.”

# Qualitative Results

Provide any other information or thoughts about assessment needs or items related to the Student Affairs Assessment Leaders.

## Major Themes

- ▶ Appreciation the practicality of the information on the listserv
- ▶ The community and ability to connect with other assessment practitioners
- ▶ Overwhelmingly positive and expressed gratitude for listserv

*“I’m grateful for the organization. Assessment is emerging in student affairs and while it is deliberate and tailored, it is mighty good to belong to a group whose challenges are similar, regardless of campus differences.”*

- ▶ Challenges that two respondents mentioned were keeping up with the communication.

“I have a hard time keeping up with reading all of the messages. Sometimes I’ll read a few weeks at a time and respond. I feel bad but I’m the only assessment person in my division and I don’t have the ability to hire a person to work in my area year-round.”

- ▶ SAAL should keep in mind different time zones when planning events

# Putting it all together: Findings

## Topics of Interest

- ▶ Technology & Assessment
- ▶ Using Existing Data Sources
- ▶ Sampling Methods & Meta-analysis
- ▶ Representing Data Visually
- ▶ Collaboration with academic affairs, institutional research, and other student affairs professionals
- ▶ Assessment strategies, assessment planning, and other additional assessment resources

## Challenges for Respondents

- ▶ Timing of programming
- ▶ Frequency in email communication.

# Recommendations and Actions:

## Recommendation #1 - Consider Terminology

- ▶ Many groups within the College Student Personnel (CSP) Program noted that the questionnaire should consider further defining the terms to make questions clear to less experienced individuals.
  - ▶ For example, many graduate students in the CSP class did not understand the term fidelity in question 50.

## Recommendation #2 - Consider Additional Trainings and Resources

- ▶ Consider providing more information regarding the following topics:
  - ▶ Meta-analysis, sampling methods, representing data visually, mapping outcomes, partnering with academic affairs, collaborating with institutional research, role of student affairs assessment in accreditation, how to conduct observations, and inter-rater reliability.
  - ▶ Strategies, planning, and resources in the area of assessment
    - ▶ Many members described starting their assessment from “scratch.”

# Recommendations and Actions:

## Recommendation #3 - Consider Collaboration Opportunities

- ▶ Many respondents identified a desire to work and learn from other people in the field in the form of programs, trainings, publishing, and mentorship. Consider offering more opportunities for individuals to collaborate with other individuals in the field.

## Recommendation #4 - Consider Timing of Communication and Programming

- ▶ Consider offering multiple sessions of the same training or program
- ▶ Consider recording a session that members can view at a later date and time
- ▶ Consider offering different options for email frequency such as daily, weekly, bi-weekly or monthly emails

# Panel questions

- ▶ What advice or recommendations do you have for individuals as they embark on a mixed methods assessment project?
- ▶ What particular considerations must be made when conducting a mixed methods assessment?
- ▶ Are there topics/results that you as panelists were surprised to see or not to see?
- ▶ Where do you think SAAL goes from here with these results?

# Questions?

## Thank you!

Next SC

“Data Storytelling Using Design Thinking Models”

Tuesday December 5, 2017; 12 PM EDT

Lesley D’Souza, Manager of Student Affairs Storytelling for  
Ryerson University &

Julia Smeed, Innovation Hub Project Officer in the Division of  
Student Life at the University of Toronto

# References

- ▶ Creswell, J.W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry ad research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- ▶ Penn, J. (2014). Mixed methods assessment: The odd couple, or a match made in heaven [PowerPoint Slides]? Retrieved from [https://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/vpsa.ndsu.edu/Assessment/Mixed\\_Methods\\_Assessment\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/vpsa.ndsu.edu/Assessment/Mixed_Methods_Assessment_FINAL.pdf) (is it appropriate to use [Bitly](http://bit.ly/2hDP9ut) shortened link here? <http://bit.ly/2hDP9ut>)