

Midlands Technical College
Assessment of Student Development
Contact: Sandi Oliver
Vice President for Student Development Services

Summary Statement of 1997- 2000 Assessment Study

Midlands Technical College (MTC) assesses the effectiveness of Student Development Services (SDS) every three years, conducts an in-depth review of each SDS department on a five year cycle, and regularly assesses student personal development. There are three levels of assessment: (1) user satisfaction with services and service usage; (2) in-depth departmental reviews; and (3) student self-perceived growth and development.

User satisfaction is based on a series of perception surveys, with ratings compared against a standard of 90 percent or a rating of 4.0 on a 5.0 scale (3.2 on a 4.0 scale, 4.8 on a 6.0 scale and 5.6 on a 7.0 scale). Departmental reviews consist of an in-depth self-study by the department and assessment by an external review team comprised of students, faculty and staff outside the department, and a departmental director from a peer institution of similar size and mission. Ratings are based on a 5.0 scale, using guidelines adapted from the Council on the Advancement of Standards (CAS). Student growth and development is determined from a series of student self-perception surveys at points through and beyond the student's college experience. When appropriate, self-perception survey information stimulates the use of more in-depth qualitative interviews and focus group assessments. No standard has been set for student personal growth, although survey ratings at or above the national norm for two-year colleges are desired, where applicable.

With few exceptions, students, alumni and college employees remain satisfied with services, with 1997-2000 ratings similar to those of 1994-96. During 1997-2000, MTC-constructed student satisfaction surveys were replaced by two nationally referenced surveys, the Noel-Levitz *Student Satisfaction Inventory* and the Noel-Levitz *Institutional Priorities Survey*. MTC scored below national averages on student knowledge of campus information and some areas of advising. Most other areas were above the national averages for two-year colleges. Targeted surveys to actual departmental clients were conducted in some areas not on national surveys. For example, external survey evaluations of job training clients conducted by the Employment Security Commission resulted in ratings above the 90 percent standard, and internally conducted ratings on TRIO programs revealed over 90 percent satisfaction by clients.

Departmental reviews were conducted for Disability Services, Student Assessment, SDS Administration, Job Placement, Admissions, Student Records, Advisement, Counseling, Student Activities, Upward Bound, Educational Talent Search and Student Support Services. These reviews revealed ratings well above the 4.0 standard. The minimum overall rating received by any single department was 4.6, with lowest functional ratings in the areas of adequate staffing, financial resources and facilities. Midlands Technical College received a commendation for assessment of Student Development Services from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) visiting team during its 1998 re-accreditation visit. This commendation was based on the thoroughness of assessment and the use of data for improvement.

Approximately 90 percent of graduating students felt that Midlands Technical College had contributed to their personal growth on dimensions such as "learning on their own," "working cooperatively with others," and "setting life directions." Ninety-seven percent of graduating students reported that the college had helped them achieve their goals and 88 percent of non-completing students felt that MTC had contributed to their quality of life. On ACT's *College Outcomes Survey*, a nationally standardized instrument administered in the sophomore year, Midlands Technical College exceeded national norms on most areas of personal development and college satisfaction, when compared with other two-year colleges.

Findings from the 1997-2000 assessment studies resulted in (1) additional trend data on the college's contribution to completing and non-completing students (2) completion of the first cycle of student development service reviews and commencement of the second review cycle; (3) evaluation of the CONNECTIONS customer service training program for front-line personnel; (4) evaluation of student referral services and targeted interventions for probationary students, resulting a new freshman orientation seminar course for first-time freshmen and automated course pre-requisite checks; (5) increased publicity on services to students, including web pages for all service areas; (6) continued collection of data on student services usage and satisfaction, using several national norm-referenced assessments; (7) increased use of part-time personnel and training to offset staff short falls; and (8) quantitative follow-up assessments on areas with low or declining ratings, such as Student Activities.

Seven objectives identified for the 2000-2003 action plan are: (1) continue to establish trend data on the college's contribution to the personal development of completers and non-completing students, using quantitative and qualitative input in the analysis; (2) complete nine additional Student Development Services program reviews; (3) evaluate the effectiveness of the freshmen seminar course for first-time freshmen; (4) evaluate the effectiveness of student referral services and interventions for targeted groups of students, to include probationary students, first-generation students, first-time freshmen and students with disabilities; (5) continue to increase publicity on services to students; (6) transition to on-line web-based services and a new student information system; and (7) assess the effectiveness of services to distant learners.

Description of Assessment of Student Development

Assessment of student services is one of MTC's indicators of effectiveness within its institutional evaluation program. Every three years, the college engages in a comprehensive assessment of services, conducting user perception surveys with students, alumni, and college employees. Surveys contain opportunities for open-ended responses and objective items. These surveys are accompanied by focus groups, interviews, or listening sessions with pertinent groups, depending on the initial survey results. This combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment yields information for planning improvements. During the 1997-2000 evaluation period, the college used two national norm-referenced assessments instruments for student and employee satisfaction ratings instead of the locally developed surveys used in the past.

A second level of assessment is in-depth departmental reviews conducted on Student Development Services functional areas. Every SDS functional area is assessed once every five years, with two to three departments evaluated annually. These departmental reviews are modeled on the Council on Advancement of Standards (CAS) evaluation for student

development services. Each department is assessed on dimensions of mission, program, leadership and management, human resources, financial resources, facilities, equipment and technology, legal issues, access and equity, campus and community, ethics, and evaluation. CAS standards have been adapted into a criterion-referenced guide, with indicators for each assessment dimension rated on a five-point scale and accompanied by subjective input. Department staff first conduct a self-review. This information is documented and improvements suggested. A team of MTC students, faculty, and staff, and a director from a comparable department at a college of similar size and mission then conducts the review. The SDS department director responds to the review with appropriate action steps for improvement. Each subsequent review includes an evaluation section that ensures recommendations are tracked and follow-up action initiated.

Developmental goals for students have been identified by the college and published in the college catalogue. Student Development Services departmental mission statements and goals have been developed to support the attainment of this desired student growth and to complement general education outcomes. Four key personal development goals for MTC students are (1) clear purpose and direction; (2) self-responsibility and self-sufficiency; (3) tolerance for diverse ideas and cultures; and (4) positive interpersonal relationships. At present, student personal development is determined at several points in the student's matriculation through the college experience. For example, student perceptions of personal growth are assessed at the sophomore level prior to graduation, and personal development items have been added to alumni surveys. Beginning in 1995 personal development items were collected on non-completing students. Focus groups and interviews are conducted as a follow-up to provide more extensive qualitative information for planning purposes. Although college managers focus on internal assessment, comparative information with other two-year colleges is used when available to provide benchmark information and to target areas where follow-up is indicated.

Achievement of the 1997-2000 Action Plan Objectives

Midlands Technical College evaluated and reported on the institutional effectiveness component of assessment of student development to the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) on July 1, 1996. The action plan cited in this report had seven objectives. The report cycle for this report was later adjusted by CHE, but the objectives remained the same. These objectives are listed, with the achievement status of each, through Spring 2000.

Objective A: Continue to establish trend data on the college's contribution to the personal growth and development of completers and non-returning students, using both quantitative and qualitative input from student focus groups in the analysis.

Status: Key student personal growth and development items are identified and published in the college catalogue, along with education core values statements. Student Development Services departmental mission statements and goals support and reinforce these personal development goals for students. Personal development items are now on graduating student surveys, non-completing student surveys, alumni surveys, and program review surveys. During the 1997-2000 evaluation period, approximately 90 percent of current and previous students indicated that MTC has contributed to their personal development in the areas assessed. For

completing graduates, over 95 percent feel that MTC has contributed to their personal development. On comparative national data, MTC has continued above the national norm for two-year public colleges on key personal development goals identified for MTC students, during the 1997-2000 assessment period (Table A).

Objective B: Complete five additional Student Development Services program reviews ending the initial five-year review cycle of all Student Development programs and begin the second five-year cycle.

Status: From Fall 1996 through Spring 2000 MTC completed twelve additional Student Development Services (SDS) program reviews. All SDS programs have now undergone at least one comprehensive program review, and the second program review cycle has begun. All programs reviewed received overall ratings exceeding the standard of 4.0 on a 5.0 scale. The lowest overall rating received was 4.6 for Student Activities. Student Records and Admissions received the highest ratings possible (Table B). Lowest component ratings were in the areas of human and financial resources. Notable gains were made for equipment/technology and facilities for those programs undergoing their second review. During its re-accreditation visit in 1998, MTC received a commendation for assessment of Student Development Services from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools SACS visiting team.

Objective C: Evaluate the effectiveness of the CONNECTIONS Customer Service Program.

Status: Each year since 1996 approximately 30 MTC employees have participated in the Noel-Levitz Customer Service Training Program, CONNECTIONS. This program is designed to improve the customer service skills of front-line employees in college and university settings. By Spring 2000, more than 80 percent of Student Development front-line staff had participated in CONNECTIONS. In Spring 2000, the Director of Campus Life conducted a survey of CONNECTIONS participants to evaluate the usefulness of the program. The program received a 90+ percent satisfaction rating by participants, and qualitative feedback from SDS Directors was positive. This program therefore will be continued, and all new SDS staff will be enrolled in CONNECTIONS training.

Objective D: Evaluate the effectiveness of student referral services and interventions for targeted groups of students.

Status: In 1995 MTC Counseling Services initiated a new referral process that included a feedback loop to faculty and staff who referred students. In 1999-2000, this referral process was evaluated to determine faculty/staff knowledge of its existence, the extent of its use and level of faculty/staff satisfaction. Approximately 75 percent of faculty and staff were aware of counseling services, and over half had used them. Of those using the referral process, 66 to 75 found the service A good to excellent.® (Table C). These results indicated that the referral process needs refinement and additional publicity. An interesting finding

was that more faculty and staff were aware of and satisfied with disability services than with career services. This is a reversal from the past and probably is due to intensive publicity and training on disability services during the past several years. Additional publicity on career services is now required.

Another intervention implemented in 1996-97 was special advisement and limited course restrictions for students on academic probation. Evaluation of this process by faculty and staff in various group meetings resulted in creation of a freshman seminar course for first-time freshmen. Course restrictions for students on academic probation also continued. From 1995-1999 the percentages of students on academic probation and suspension declined, while the percentages of students obtaining academic honors increased. Interventions appear to be working. During the next assessment period, the effectiveness of the new freshman seminar course will be evaluated.

Objective E: Continue to increase publicity on services to students.

Status: Increasing service publicity has been a Student Development Services (SDS) objective since 1992. In surveys conducted during the self-study process in 1997-98, evaluation continued to indicate the need for increased publicity of services. In 1997 each service area began web pages and identified a staff member to respond to questions on the web. Student use of the web pages has increased significantly. In 1997 when SDS web pages were first implemented, these pages received an average of 263 Ahits@ per month. By 2000, SDS web pages were receiving an average of 2,669 Ahits@ per month. In 1999-2000 departments began placing information on the college Intranet for faculty and staff, and a new student web-based orientation was designed for entering and prospective students. The effectiveness of this web-based publicity will be evaluated in 2000-2003.

Objective F: Continue to establish trend data on student services usage and satisfaction, implementing technology and training, as appropriate, to offset shortfalls.

Status: Data on service usage continued during 1997-2000, with Midlands Technical College using two new, national norm-referenced student satisfaction surveys during this assessment period instead of the locally developed MTC surveys used in the past. Therefore, national comparisons are provided rather than comparisons to trend data from the past. Overall, student satisfaction appears to be at or exceed national levels when compared to other two-year colleges (Table D1-D9). Only satisfaction with the level of student knowledge of campus events and some areas of advising fell below national levels.

Trend data on service usage indicates that areas such as Student Assessment continue to grow in student-staff ratio. To offset growing student needs and limited staff, Student Development Services initiated a number of technology initiatives during 1997-2000. Each Student Development Services department developed a web page informing students of services and setting up an

information contact person in each department who responds to student on-line requests within 24 business hours. Other web services now include an on-line admission application, an automated GPA calculator for student records, an on-line advisement manual for students and advisors, student access to open college course sections and several job placement services. A modular, on-line student cyberorientation has been designed for implementation during 2000-2001. Other technology initiatives included the SPEEDE automated transcript transmittal and evaluation process, electronic international student processing and transition to computer adaptive testing as the college's primary placement test. In addition, Student Development Services continued to utilize a large number of part-time personnel and to out-source some services.

Objective G: Conduct a qualitative follow-up assessment of services with low or declining ratings, such as Job Placement and Student Activities, and programs for special populations, and implement improvements based on the analysis.

Status: To obtain qualitative information on student satisfaction with services, several focus groups were conducted during 1997-2000. These focus groups included continuing students, non-completing students, Student Advisory Board representatives, and low income, first-generation college students enrolled in by two Student Support Services grants. Input from these groups led to many of the technology initiatives outlined in Objective F. In addition, resources have been added to the Student Activities and Job Placement areas which had low ratings. These additional resources were intended to increase programing in these areas. Results of focus group discussions on special populations led to development of an assigned advisor system in several academic areas, a mentoring program for low-income, first generation college students served by Student Support Services, and an International Committee, authorized by the Vice President for Education and the Vice President for Student Development Services to enhance campus global education and services to international students.

Description of the Current Assessment Study

The purpose of the current assessment study was to determine the degree to which students and other college personnel used and experienced satisfaction with Student Development Services programs and services, and the extent to which students reported personal growth and the college's contribution to this growth. Nationally accepted standards for user satisfaction with college services averages 85 percent, with lower ratings reported for areas such as job placement and financial aid. In keeping with Midlands Technical College's pursuit of excellence in education and quality services, a higher standard of 90 percent has been set. Quality ratings are set at 4.0 on a 5.0 scale (3.2 on a 4.0 scale, or 2.4 on a 3.0 scale, 4.8 on a 6.0 scale and 5.6 on a 7.0 scale).

Several national-norm referenced surveys and a locally developed survey of alumni were used to access service satisfaction. National surveys included the ACT *College Outcomes Survey*, for graduating students, the Noel-Levitz *Student Satisfaction Inventory Survey* for enrolled students, and *The Institutional Priorities Survey* for college faculty and staff and administrators. These

surveys supplied information on user satisfaction with services in a number of service areas, including admissions, student assessment, advisement and scheduling, counseling services, student activities, job placement, and other areas. This data was combined with department usage data and information from focus groups and interviews to make recommendations for improvements. Reporting actions on recommendations from previous assessments ensured the use of the assessment for continuous departmental improvement. This data is provided in Tables D1-D9.

In-depth departmental reviews were conducted for Disability Services, Student Assessment, Student Development Services, Administration, Job Placement, Admissions, Student Records, Advisement and Scheduling, Counseling Services, Student Activities, Educational Talent Search, Upward Bound and Student Support Services during 1996-2000. Each department was rated on a 5.0 quality scale (4.0 standard) in each of the twelve departmental review areas: mission, program, leadership and management, human resources, financial resources, facilities, equipment and technologies, legal issues, access and equity, campus and community, ethics, and evaluation. The review resulted in an overall rating, summative findings and recommendations for improvement. For departments undergoing their second five-year review, results of previous recommendations were reviewed for progress and ratings assigned based on current status. A summary of program reviews is given in Table B.

Student growth and development for sophomore-level students was assessed using the ACT *College Outcomes Survey*. A college-constructed survey was used to assess alumni, and a structured telephone survey of non-completing students also was conducted. No statistical comparison can be made between the three groups due to differences in instrumentation and samples; however, descriptive information on each group is available. This information includes general satisfaction with the college, student perceptions of their personal development, the college's contribution to student growth, and alumni involvement in community activities. National comparisons to two-year college student norms are available on the sophomore group, using the two-year college user norms of the ACT *College Outcomes Survey*. This instrument was developed specifically for assessment of student affective development and student outcomes. Where applicable, recommendations are made. Actions taken on recommendations from previous assessment findings are included to provide a continuous cycle of assessment and improvement.

Major Findings of the Current Assessment Study

Comprehensive opinion surveys conducted with students, college employees and alumni during 1997-2000 revealed that all groups were reasonably satisfied with student services. Most surveys which compared MTC student services with two-year colleges nationally yielded higher ratings for the MTC services. However, the internal MTC standard of 90 percent satisfaction was rarely achieved. Although comparisons to national normative data must be used with caution, this information provides an external yardstick for assessing student personal development in community colleges. Service satisfaction and usage information by department for 1997-2000 is provided in Tables D-1 through D-9.

Overall, MTC student, employee and alumni ratings fell below the established MTC standards because MTC has set higher quality standards for its services. However, MTC student and

employee ratings on the nationally norm-referenced Noel-Levitz surveys were above the national average for two-year colleges for nearly all areas. MTC yielded lower ratings than their peers nationally on Advisor approachability, Advisor assistance in setting goals, and student knowledge of what's happening on campus. These findings were reinforced in focus group interactions and department reviews. A departmental program review of student advisement confirmed strong management of the Advisement/Scheduling area; however, student groups and the review team recommended establishing a system of assigned advisors so students can establish a closer relationship with their advisors and work with their advisors to set realistic goals. A task force headed by the Vice President for Student Development Services and the Vice President for Education is now working on this.

The second area rated by students as below the national norm focuses on adequate student information. Improvement of the accuracy and accessibility of student information has been a goal since 1993, when it was addressed in previous assessment studies. Departmental reviews emphasized the need for better publicity and communications in multiple-departments. Student focus groups confirmed that low ratings of services often resulted from limited contact and a lack of knowledge about services available. A major effort is now underway to initiate on-line services for students and to put more information at students' fingertips. A new freshman seminar course also has been initiated to better inform students of campus resources.

On the positive side, both student and employee ratings of Student Assessment was significantly above the national average. Alumni graduating after the current placement testing process was initiated yielded increasingly positive satisfaction with course placement. While not at the desired 90 percent standard, the current 87.6 percent rating was significantly higher than the 55 percent satisfaction rating of student testing and course placement procedures reported by 1989-90 graduates, who entered the college before the new student assessment process was implemented.

Students, faculty and staff also gave positive ratings to the environment provided by the college's new student centers. Student areas had received low ratings in the past. Student focus groups confirmed these findings and produced only minor suggestions for enhancements. Students did, however, stress the need for additional student activities programming. The department review for Student Activities also emphasized additional programming and resource needs in this area.

Service usage continued to increase while staff resources remained constant or rose only slightly. This situation led to questions regarding the level at which service quality can be maintained with a growing gap between resources and student needs for services (Tables D1-D9). Service usage, resources, and student perceptions of services became a focus of the in-depth departmental reviews conducted in 1996-2000. Cross-training, interdepartmental sharing and planning, increased use of technology, growing reliance on part-time personnel, outsourcing of some services, and a revitalization of the CONNECTIONS customer service program were initiated to bolster service quality and attempt to accommodate growing student enrollments in an environment of fiscal constraints.

Departmental reviews in Disability Services, Student Assessment, SDS Administration, Job Placement, Admissions, Student Records, Advisement/Scheduling, Counseling, Student Activities, Student Support Services, Educational Talent Search and Upward Bound (Table B) revealed quality ratings of 4.6 or higher on a 5.0 scale for each department evaluated. This was

well above the 4.0 standard. Lowest functional ratings were cited for staffing and financial resources, with recommendations to seek additional funds to offset shortages in state appropriations. Areas such as technology/equipment and facilities improved for departments undergoing their second review cycle. Departments generally received strong ratings for mission, program, leadership and management, ethics, access and equity, and legal issues (compliance with guidelines, regulations and educational law).

Assessment of student personal development (Table A), revealed that 97 percent of alumni felt MTC had contributed to their quality of life, and 94 percent of sophomore students nearing graduation said the college had helped them meet the goals they came to achieve. This latter assessment, using the ACT *College Outcomes Survey*, yielded a quality rating of 4.53 on a 5.0 scale. This rating was considerably higher than the 4.16 average rating for two-year colleges, according to the 1999 user norms for two-year public community, technical and junior colleges published by ACT. Non-completing students also expressed positive views of MTC's contribution to their development, with 95 percent reporting that they had made or were making progress toward their goal and 88 percent stating that MTC had contributed to their quality of life.

On both the locally developed alumni survey and the national standardized outcomes survey for sophomore-level students, students-reported highest growth on personal and career development dimensions such as "setting life directions", "learning on their own", "developing self-confidence", "increasing their intellectual curiosity", "improving their ability to relate to others", and "becoming academically competent." Social development at the societal level reflected the lowest-rated growth, as reflected on items such as "understanding different philosophies and cultures". These findings are similar to national findings for community college students. Overall, MTC students reflected higher scores than the average for two-year college students on most personal development dimensions reported in the *ACT Student Outcomes Survey* research report. This pattern has persisted for each assessment conducted from 1992 to 1999.

2000-2003 Action Plan Objectives

- Objective A:** Continue to establish trend data on the college's contribution to the personal development of completers and non-completing students, using both quantitative data and qualitative input from student focus groups in the analysis. (Responsibility of the Vice President for Student Development Services)
- Objective B:** Conduct nine additional Student Development Services program reviews, completing the second five-year review of all Student Development Services programs and beginning the third five-year cycle. (Responsibility of the Vice President for Student Development Services)
- Objective C:** Evaluate the effectiveness of the Freshman Seminar Course for first-time freshmen. (Responsibility of the Vice President for Education and the Vice President for Student Development Services)
- Objective D:** Evaluate the effectiveness of student referral services and interventions for targeted groups of students such as probationary students, students with

disabilities, first-time freshmen, and first-generation college students.
(Responsibility of the Vice President for Student Development Services)

Objective E: Continue to increase publicity on services to students. (Responsibility of the Vice President for Student Development Services)

Objective F: Transition to on-line services and a new student information system.
(Responsibility of the Vice President for Student Services and the Director of Information Resource Management)

Objective G: Assess the effectiveness of services for distant learners. (Responsibility of the Vice President for Student Development Services and the Director of Assessment, Research and Planning)

TABLE A
STUDENT PERSONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

In 1997-2000 alumni and sophomore-level students preparing to graduate were assessed on personal growth and involvement. Highlights of these findings are presented. Non-completing students assessed via a structured telephone survey were also included in this study. Information from previous assessments are provided to yield trend data.

ALUMNI

1997-99 information represents 151 alumni responses to 867 surveys (21.8 percent response rate) mailed to Midlands Technical College graduates who graduated in 1994-95. Information on previous alumni surveys is also included for comparison purposes. College contribution to personal growth is based on the percentage of graduates answering 'Very Much' or 'Somewhat'. Involvement reflects the percentage of alumni responding that they are involved in specific post-graduate activities weekly or monthly. Satisfaction with college reflected by the percentage of graduates answering 'Yes' to specific items about Midlands Technical College.

College Contribution to Personal Development

<u>Highest</u>	<u>%</u>			<u>Lowest</u>	<u>%</u>		
	<u>1995</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1999</u>		<u>1995</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1999</u>
Learning on your own	.90	.93	.90	Understanding different philosophies and cultures	.78	.77	.80
Working cooperatively with others	.90	.91	.87				
Self-Confidence	.89	.88	.90				
Problem-Solving & Critical Thinking	.90	.91	.91				

Involvement

Life-long learning/personal enrichment	.70	.58	.79	Social/recreational organization	.47	.30	.80
Support for participation in the arts	.19	.16	.23	Voting in elections since graduating	.80	.73	.82
Volunteer, Public or Community Service	.31	.23	.30				

Satisfaction with College

MTC experience improved quality of life	.94	.94	.97	Would send children to MTC	.97	.95	.97
Would recommend friends and acquaintances to MTC	.98	.98	100				

SOPHOMORE-LEVEL COMPLETERS

Data is based on student responses on the ACT *College Outcomes Survey* for students who had already graduated or planned to graduate in 1992, 1995 and 1999. Highest and lowest levels of personal growth are presented on a 3-point rating scale in 1992 and on a 5 point scale in 1995 and 1999. Student satisfaction with college is rated on a 5-point scale. Comparative data from a national sample of two year colleges on the same instrument, compiled by ACT, is provided. The student's perception of the college's contribution to developments is in parenthesis ().

Personal Growth

<u>Highest</u>	1992 (N=199)		1995 (N= 182)		1999(N=112)		
	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>	
Setting life directions	2.62 (2.37)	2.52 (2.17)	4.24 (3.90)	3.91 (3.21)	4.23 (3.90)	3.63 (3.53)	
Becoming academically competent	2.58 (2.57)	2.42 (2.31)	4.12 (3.98)	3.94 (3.69)	4.37 (4.28)	3.95 (3.74)	
Developing self-confidence	2.55 (2.32)	2.41 (2.14)	4.06 (3.75)	3.88 (3.44)	4.12 (3.78)	3.92 (3.50)	
Increasing intellectual curiosity	2.52 (2.42)	2.44 (2.30)	3.96 (3.65)	3.93 (3.65)	4.25 (4.06)	3.94 (3.68)	
Implementing long-term life goals	2.52 (2.29)	2.41 (2.16)	4.09 (3.68)	3.97 (3.45)	4.23 (3.90)	4.00 (3.53)	
Improving ability to relate to others	2.45 (2.23)	2.36 (2.11)	4.00 (3.72)	3.83 (3.44)	4.01 (3.67)	3.88 (3.53)	
Taking responsibility for own behavior	2.45 (1.98)	2.41 (1.93)	3.96 (3.46)	4.00 (3.28)	4.25 (3.56)	4.03 (3.38)	
Increasing self understanding		2.45 (2.15)	2.35 (2.03)	3.87 (3.59)	3.79 (3.27)	4.18 (3.65)	3.94 (3.36)

1992

<u>Lowest</u>	1991 (N=199)		1995 (N=182)		1999 (N=1999)	
	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>
Becoming more aware of local regional and international issues and events	2.06 (1.88)	2.06 (1.89)	3.49 (3.02)	3.47 (3.09)	3.65 (3.25)	3.39 (3.11)
Becoming more aware of political and social issues	2.09 (2.00)	2.09 (2.00)	3.39 (3.00)	3.40 (3.06)	3.61 (3.20)	3.31 (3.00)
Preparing to participate effectively in the electoral process	1.88 (1.60)	1.91 (1.71)	3.18 (2.78)	3.22 (2.81)	3.65 (3.13)	3.18 (2.87)

Student Satisfaction with College

	1992		1995		1999	
	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>MTC</u>	<u>National</u>
I am proud of accomplishments made at this college.	4.67	4.25	4.62	4.26 4.63	4.30	
The college helped me to achieve the goals I came to achieve.		4.57	4.09	4.49 4.09	4.53	4.16
I would recommend this college to others.	4.56	4.13	4.52	4.05 4.54	4.08	

NON-COMPLETING STUDENTS

In Spring 2000 students who entered MTC in Fall 1996 and who did not graduate or continue in enrollment at the college by Fall 1999 were identified. Ten percent of this non-completing cohort to participated in a structured telephone survey, which included information on student personal development items and the college's contribution to their growth. Comparisons to the 1992-95 cohort is provided.

	<u>MTC 1992-95 Cohort</u>	<u>MTC 1996-99 Cohort</u>
! Improved quality of life	87%	88%
! Enhanced self-confidence	88%	89%
! Improved decision-making	94%	90%
! Improved ability to communicate clearly	93%	94%

TABLE B
Student Development Services Department Evaluations
(Ratings on a 5-point Scale Standard = 4.0)

Review Component	1996-97			1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000		
	DIS	AST	ADMIN	JPL	ADM	SR	ADV	CNS	SA	UB	ETS	SSS
Mission	4.6	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0
Program	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Leadership/Management	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0
Human Resources	4.8	5.0	4.0	3.8	4.5	5.0	4.6	4.2	4.0	4.8	4.2	4.2
Financial Resources	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	2.0	4.0	4.5	4.2
Facilities	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	3.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Equipment and Technology	5.0	3.5	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5
Legal Issues	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Access and Equity	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0
Campus and Community	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Ethics	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7
Evaluation	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Overall Rating	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.8
Recommendations	\$Increase human and financial resources	\$Increase space on Beltline Campus	\$Increase human resources	\$Define services to different populations	\$Increase staff resources	\$None	\$Increase staff resources and advisement training	\$Increase human resources	\$Define Programs	\$Increase human and financial resources	\$Add some program-ming	\$Increase human and financial resources
	\$Publicize services in community	\$Convert to computer adaptive testing	\$Implement on-line web-based services	\$Increase on-line services	\$Increase space on Beltline Campus		\$Implement on-line services	\$More staff training in legal issues	\$Reduce leadership turnover	\$Increase space on Airport Campus	\$Add human and financial resources	\$Increase space on Beltline
		\$More research	\$More staff training	\$Increase staff				\$More work with	\$Increase programs for special needs			

Define Abbreviations: DIS = Disability Services, AST = Student Assessment, ADMIN = Administration, JPL = Job Placement, ADM = Admissions, SR = Student Records, ADV = Advisement, CNS = Counseling, SA = Student Activities, UB = Upward Bound, ETS = Educational Talent Search, SSS = Student Support Services

TABLE C

COUNSELING SERVICES REFERRAL PROCESS EFFECTIVENESS
N=272 SURVEYS RETURNED OF 1,054
CONDUCTED SPRING 2000

Percentages indicate faculty/staff who responded positively

	Counseling Services	Career Resource Center	Disability Services
Faculty/Staff Awareness of Referral Services	80.0%	72.0%	77.3%
Percent of Faculty/Staff Who Referred Students to Services	68.4%	56.8%	54.0%
Percent of Faculty/Staff Who Referred Students to Services and Found the Services A Good to Excellent.@	74.8%	66.0%	72.1%

TABLE D-1
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY
ADMISSIONS

USER SATISFACTION				
Quality ratings on 1-7 scale. Percentages represent responses of A Good to Excellent@				
	Standard	MTC (1999)	National	
Student Satisfaction with A Knowledge of Admissions Staff@ N = 601	5.6	5.25	5.24	
Faculty Staff Satisfaction with A Knowledge of Admissions Staff@ N = 144	5.6	5.84	5.56	
Alumni Ratings of A Good to Excellent for Quality of Admissions N = 455	Standard	1995	1997	1999
	90%	91.2%	92.3%	96.5%

USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY			
Item	1995	2000	Change (%)
Clients Served	13,000	13,940	+7.2
Staff	11	11	0.0
Client/Staff Ratio	1,182:1	1,267:1	+7.2

Assessment Summary

\$ All ratings met the standard during 1997-2000 except student perception of admission staff knowledge. The admissions area remains one of the highest rated service areas in the college, based on both student satisfaction and program review data.

\$ Usage increased while staff resources remained constant. Services were expanded to include state-required residency reviews, enhanced services to international students and admissions support for Life Scholarship determinations.

Actions From Previous Assessment

\$ Explored ways to expand technology, streamline internal processes, and maintain service quality.

\$ Continued to enhance communications on procedures.

\$ Involved staff in additional training on knowledge of programs, services, and processes.

Recommendations for 2000-2003

- \$ Continue to improve communications on admissions procedures and general admissions.
- \$ Expand technology to include implementation of admissions component of a new student information system and services to distant learners.
- \$ Involve staff in additional training on knowledge of programs, services, and processes.

TABLE D-2

**STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY**

STUDENT ASSESSMENT CENTER

USER SATISFACTION				
Quality ratings on 1-7 scale. Percentages represent responses of A Good to Excellent®				
	Standard	MTC (1999)	National	
Student Satisfaction with A the reasonableness of course placement procedures® N = 601	5.6	5.27	5.13	
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction with A the reasonableness of course placement procedures® N = 144	5.6	5.84	5.56	
Alumni Rating of A Good to Excellent® for Quality of Student Assessment N = 430	Standard	1995	1997	1999
	90%	75.4%	80.8%	87.6%
USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY				
Item	1995	2000	Change (%)	
Clients Served	34,000	52,000	+33.3	
Staff	3	4	33.3	
Client/Staff Ratio	13,000:1	13,000:1	0.0	
Assessment Summary				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Student and alumni rating falls slightly below the standard satisfaction, alumni satisfaction increased steadily from 1995 to 1999, and was significantly above the 59% rating in 1989-99 before ASSET testing was initiated. § Students and faculty/staff satisfaction with the reasonableness of course placement requirements was significantly above the average for two-year colleges. § Usage increased dramatically while staff resources increased by one, yielding no net change in student-staff ratio. 				
Actions From Previous Assessment				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Continued activities to better communicate testing procedures and results. § Explored ways to accommodate resource-usage gaps and maintain service quality. § Increased use of part-time personnel and transitioned to walk-in computer adaptive testing in placement testing. Increased hours of coverage to accommodate distance learning. 				
Recommendations for 2000-2003				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Continue to improve communications on procedures and findings from student assessment research. § Continue to find ways to accommodate the resource-usage gap and maintain service quality. § Implement the assessment component of the new student information system and services to distant learners. 				

Table D-3

**STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY**

STUDENT ADVISEMENT AND SCHEDULING

USER SATISFACTION				
Quality ratings on 1-7 scale. Percentages represent responses of AGood to Excellent®				
	Standard	MTC 1999	National	
Student Satisfaction with:				
\$Approachability of advisor	5.6	5.27	5.34	
\$Advisor helping to set goals	5.6	4.87	4.84	
\$Advisor caring about individuals= success	5.6	4.90	4.95	
\$Advisor knowledge of program requirements	5.6	5.32	5.28	
\$Advisors knowledge of transfer requirements (N = 601)	5.6	5.03	4.94	
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction with:				
\$Approachability of advisor	5.6	5.60	5.44	
\$Advisor helping to set goals	5.6	5.13	5.05	
\$Advisor caring about individuals= success	5.6	5.48	5.41	
\$Advisor knowledge of program requirements	5.6	5.6	5.39	
\$Advisors knowledge of transfer requirements (N = 144)	5.6	5.08	4.91	
	Standard	1995	1997	1999
Alumni Rating of AGood to Excellent® for Quality of Academic Advising (N = 455)	90%	82.3%	78.7%	85.4%
USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY				
Item	1995	2000	Change (%)	
Clients Served	14,100	22,000	+56.0	
Staff	5	6	+20.0	
Client/Staff Ratio	2,488:1	3,667:1	+47.0	
Assessment Summary				
\$ Ratings were somewhat below established standards.				
\$ A program review documented positive perception of advisement and scheduling services. The need for additional advisor training and a system assigned advisors was indicated.				
\$ Client usage and service productivity increased significantly from 1995 to 2000, outpacing staff increases and resulting in higher client/staff ratios.				
\$ Comparative data with national norms on advising in two-year colleges revealed MTC student and employee ratings of advisement to be above the national average, except for student perceptions of advisor approachability and care for them as individuals.				
Actions From Previous Assessment				
\$ Increased cross-department communication and training on advisement information. Set-up regular training sessions, implemented an on-line advisement manual, established an advisor list-serve, and used the on-line degree audit.				
\$ Established a college-wide Advisement Action Committee chaired by the VP for Education and the VP for Student Development Services. Began assigned advisors for the AA-AS program.				
Recommendations for 2000-2003				
\$ Continue to improve cross-department communication and training.				
\$ Expand the system for assigning advisors to additional departments.				
\$ Assess the effectiveness of advisement systems and services to distant learners.				
\$ Implement advisement and scheduling components of the new student information system and web-based advisement and scheduling services.				

TABLE D-4
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY
COUNSELING

USER SATISFACTION				
Quality ratings on 1-7 scale. Percentages represent responses of AGood to Excellent®				
	Standard	MTC (1999)	National	
Student Satisfaction with:				
\$ Counseling staff care about students as individuals	5.6	5.13	5.02	
\$ Adequacy of career services to help in deciding on a career	5.6	5.24	5.03	
\$ College's commitment to students with disabilities (N = 601)	5.6	5.47	5.30	
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction with:				
\$ Counseling staff care about students as individuals	5.6	5.99	5.62	
\$ Adequacy of career services to help in deciding on a career	5.6	5.93	5.12	
\$ College's commitment to students with disabilities (N = 144)	5.6	6.14	5.56	
Alumni of AGood is Excellent Rating for Quality of Career Counseling (N = 291)	Standard 90%	1995 61.2%	1997 61.7%	1999 61.7%
USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY				
Item	1995	2000	Change(%)	
Clients Served	30,751	29,610	-3.7	
Staff	7	8	+14.3	
Client/Staff Ratio	4,393:1	3,701:1	+15.8	
Assessment Summary				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Student and alumni ratings continued to fall below the standard but student satisfaction with services and care about them as individuals was above the average for two-year colleges. \$ Employee ratings were above the standard and above the average for two-year colleges. \$ Interviews with faculty, department chairs and student groups reflected concerns about the need for increased publicity and the need to improve counseling resources for to at-risk students. \$ The student per counselor ratio declined due to additional staffing resource for students with disabilities. 				
Actions From Previous Assessment				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Increased publicity on services included revised counseling brochures, and advertisement on student success services workshops, and a counseling web page. \$ Evaluated the student referral system for counseling. \$ Continued to enhance services to students with disabilities by hiring a Disability Services Coordinator and creating an assistive technology training center. \$ Accommodated the service-usage gap by hiring a Disability Services Coordinator and relieving counselors from some of these duties, outsourcing services and using part-time staff for paraprofessional functions. 				
Recommendations for 2000-2003				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Continue to enhance publicity on services. \$ Evaluate counseling services for distant learners. \$ Train counselors in the use of the new student information system and implement counseling web-based services, where applicable. 				

TABLE D-5
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY
CAMPUS LIFE/STUDENT ACTIVITIES

USER SATISFACTION				
Quality ratings on 1-7 scale. Percentages represent responses of A=Good to Excellent®				
	Standard	MTC (1999)	National	
Student Satisfaction with the Student Center as a comfortable place for them to spend their leisure time.	5.6	5.38	4.91	
Student Satisfaction with knowledge of what's happening on campus (N=601)	5.6	4.67	4.77	
Faculty Satisfaction with the Student Center as a comfortable place for students. (N=174)	5.6	6.19	4.66	
Alumni Rating of "Good to Excellent" for Quality of Student Life Programs and Services (N=301)	Standard 90%	1995 63.3%	1997 79.2%	1999 74.4%
USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY				
Item	1995	2000	Change (%)	
Clients Served	24,700	30,850	+24.9	
Staff	3.5	3.5	0.0	
Client/Staff Ratio	7,057:1	8,814:1	+24.9	
Assessment Summary				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Student ratings fell below the standard but above the national norm on comfort of the Student Center. \$ Student satisfaction was below the national average on knowledge of campus information. \$ Student usage continues to outpace staff resources. \$ Interviews and group sessions with faculty and students supported the need for enhanced campus life functions and publicity on opportunities for involvement. Growing numbers of young, full-time and college transfer students have higher expectations of student activities and desire more involvement. 				
Actions From Previous Assessment				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Increased publicity and publications for student activities, including a Student Activities web-page. \$ Continued to increase student leadership activities and actions to involve students in programming. Started student leadership retreats. \$ Involved more students in orientation, including the planning of an orientation video and cyber-orientation and participation in the freshman seminars course. 				
Recommendations for 2000-2003				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Continue to increase student leadership and student involvement initiatives. \$ Increase student activities publicity and web-based information. \$ Expand resources and student programming in the Student Activities area, and involve students in the planning of Student Activities functions. 				

Table D-6

**STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY
CAMPUS LIFE/JOB PLACEMENT**

USER SATISFACTION				
Quality ratings on 1-7 scale. Percentages represent responses of >Good to Excellent-				
	Standard	MTC (1999)	National	
Student Satisfaction with the help they need to find a job@ (N = 660)	5.6	4.95	4.88	
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction with the help students need to find a job@ (N = 144)	5.6	5.54	5.08	
Alumni Satisfaction with the Quality of Job Placement Services= (N=301)	Standard	1995	1997	1999
	90%	47.3%	57.7%	60.9%
USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY				
Item	1995	2000	Change (%)	
Clients Served	5,000	8,650	+73.0	
Staff	2	3	+50.0	
Client/Staff Ratio	2,500:1	2,883:1	+15.3	
Assessment Summary				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Students and faculty rated assistance in helping students find a job above the national level for two year colleges ratings on the locally developed Alumni Survey increased. \$ Job Placement data for 2000 indicated that 99 percent of graduates were employed or continuing their education. This rate was higher than 1991-1998. This increase was due to improved employment tracking through the initial use of ETROD data from the SC Employment Security Commission. \$ Although staffing in this area increased, clients served continued to outpace staffing increases. 				
Actions From Previous Assessment				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Job Placement publicity was accomplished by new brochures for students and employers, implementation of an on-line ADial A Job@ service and web-based services on the Job Placement Web-Page. \$ The Cooperative Education was assessed positively by students, employers and academic departments. These services expanded during 1997-2000. 				
Recommendations for 2000-2003				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Continue to increase publicity through web-based applications. \$ Assess job placement for distant learners. \$ Continue to improve student employment tracking through use of ETROD. 				

Table D-7

**STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY
SPECIAL PROGRAMS/ON-CAMPUS
(Center for Adult Learners and JTPA)**

USER SATISFACTION

The MTC *Alumni Survey* did not include evaluation of services for targeted populations, nor did the national ACT *College Outcomes Survey*, nor the Noel-Levitz *Student Satisfaction Inventory*.

Internal department surveys and JTPA client surveys conducted by the South Carolina Employment Security Commission yielded positive satisfaction above the 90 percent standard.

Student outcomes, in terms of program completion, employment rates and salary at employment entry, consistently ranked above the standards set by the local service delivery area and the Perkins Grant. The JTPA EDWAA program received the award for the Outstanding Job Training Program in South Carolina for 4 of 5 years from 1996 to 2000.

Student survey and outcomes data was reviewed by the program review team and reflected in the AProgram® and AEvaluation® rating in Table B.

USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY

Item	1995	2000	Change (%)
Clients Served	1,634	1,485	-12.1
Staff	20	8	+20.0
Client/Staff	163:1	186:1	+14.1

Assessment Summary

- \$ These programs were not assessed on nationally-normal, standardized surveys so no comparative data exists.
- \$ Internal survey and departmental reviews yield ratings above the standard.
- \$ External surveys of JTPA clients by the Employment Security Commission continued to reveal a plus 90 percent satisfaction rating. JTPA student outcomes were best in the state, for the past five years.
- \$ Client/staff ratios fluctuated as JTPA was downsized in preparation of the new Workforce Investment Act, and Carl Perkins programs were replaced by Perkins III legislation.

Actions From Previous Assessment

- \$ Increased service publicity.
- \$ Improved client employment efforts and supporting documentation, resulting in student outcomes exceeding outcome standards.
- \$ Involved staff in CONNECTIONS training and other professional development activities.
- \$

Recommendations for 2000-2003

- \$ Successfully transition services to new Perkins III legislation and the Workforce Investment Act.
- \$ Monitor client outcomes and service satisfaction under the new legislation.

Table D-8

**STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY**

**SPECIAL PROGRAMS/OUTREACH
(TRIO Programs - Educational Talent Search, Upward Bound, Student Support Services)**

USER SATISFACTION

The MTC *Alumni Survey* did not include evaluation of services for special populations and community outreach programs, nor did the national ACT *College Outcomes Survey* on the Noel-Levitz *Student Satisfaction Inventory*.

All federal TRIO programs (Upward Bound, Educational Talent Search and Student Support Services) are required to conduct internal client satisfaction assessments and to report outcomes annually to the US Department of Education. From 1996 to 2000 all TRIO programs have met or exceeded program standards. Student survey and outcomes data was reviewed by the program review team and is reflected in the AProgram[®] and AEvaluation[®] components of the program reviews on Table B.

USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY

Item	1995	2000	Change (%)
Clients Served	1,200	1,500	+25.0
Staff	8	15	+87.5
Client/Staff Ratio	150.1	100.1	-33.3

Assessment Summary

- \$ Student Support Services programs were added on each campus to serve low-income and first-generation college students enrolled at MTC.
- \$ Midlands Technical College students did not rate outreach programs in 1995-2000 on college surveys.
- \$ Program reviews conducted for UB and ETS in 1995-96 revealed ratings well above the 4.0 standard.
- \$ Internal program assessment indicated client satisfaction above the 90 percent standard.
- \$ Federal reports to the U. S. Department of Education reflected client retention and enrollment in higher education met or exceeded program goals for Upward Bound, Educational Talent Search and Student Support Services.
- \$ Federal monitoring requires that TRIO client-counselor ratios not exceed established federal standards.

Actions From Previous Assessment

- \$ Monitored client, parent and school/community satisfaction with services.
- \$ Assessed client retention/post-secondary enrollment rates and academic progress. Added a Student Support Service Program on each campus to assist low-income, first-generation college students at the post-secondary level.

Recommendations for 2000-2003

- \$ Continue to monitor the satisfaction of clients and schools/community agencies served.
- \$ Focus assessment on educational outcomes of clients served, to include retention in education, post-secondary enrollment rates and academic gains, where applicable.

Table D-9

**STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
USER SATISFACTION AND USAGE/PRODUCTIVITY
STUDENT RECORDS/REGISTRATION**

USER SATISFACTION				
Quality ratings are on a 1 - 7 scale. Percentages are responses of A Good to Excellent.®				
	Standard	MTC (1999)		National
Student Satisfaction with Registration Effectiveness (N=660)	5.6	5.25		5.25
Faculty/Staff Satisfaction with Registration Effectiveness (N=144)	5.6	5.74		5.35
Alumni Satisfaction with Registration Processes (N=478)	Standard	1995	1997	1999
	90%	79%	83.9%	84.1%
USAGE PRODUCTIVITY				
Item	1995	2000		Change %
Client Transactions	94,000	107,684		+14.6
Staff	7	8		+14.3
Client/Staff Ratio	13,429.1	13,461.1		+0.2
Assessment Summary				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Student ratings of the registration was at the national average for two-year colleges. Alumni reported growing satisfaction from 1995 to 1999, and MTC employees rated the process better than community college employees nationally. \$ The number of student transactions handled by the staff increased significantly. \$ Staff participated in customer service training, including the CONNECTIONS training. \$ Enrollment audits by SBTCE revealed a 99.9 percent accuracy rate on student enrollment transactions. 				
Actions From Previous Assessment				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Increased staff to accommodate the new service center on Airport Campus and the growing numbers student of records transactions. \$ Applied technology and streamlined processes to off-set limited staff so high levels of effectiveness could be maintained. Implemented a GPA calculator on the web page and electronic are transcript transmittal process. \$ Staff participated in customer service training, including the CONNECTIONS training. 				
Recommendations for 2000-2003				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ Implement the records module of the new student information system. \$ Initiate on-line registration and other web-based student records services. \$ Evaluate the effectiveness of services to distant learners. 				