Oversight of the Student Life Division during 2008-2009 was to continue to connect the strong program review foundation of the division as a whole to the specific efforts of each individual department. Although the development of learning plans was interrupted by the November Tea Fire, the response to the fire made the bond among departments in Student Life even tighter. It became even more evident that the individual departments within our division are closely linked as we seek to fulfill our division’s mission. We have a very high level of “buy in” and strong collegiality among the departments in Student Life to conduct the important work of Program Review.

STUDENT LIFE DIVISION PROGRAM REVIEW GOALS FOR 2009-2010

During the fall 2009 Executive Team retreat, Vice-President for Student Life, Jane Higa, included these goals for the 2009-2010 year related to the 6-Year Program Review cycle.

1. Respond to the suggestions made in the January 2009 Residence Life external review.
   a. Discuss the external review with both the Dean’s Council and the Student Life Committee for feedback/suggestions. Part of this discussion will include the redemptive philosophy of discipline that has been part of Westmont’s student life philosophy.
   b. Conduct internal audit of judicial process.
   c. Implement JAMS (Judicial Affairs Management Software).
2. Conduct external review of Campus Pastor’s Office. One outcome of the external review would be adopting a “learning plan.”
3. Learning plans from Residence Life, Counseling Services, and Health Services will be submitted by the end of November, 2009.
4. All departments will select an assessment tool and establish an assessment timeline for at least one learning outcome by the end of November, 2009.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 2008-2009 PROGRAM REVIEW EFFORTS

These following are the significant steps that were made by the Student Life Division in 2008-2009. The supporting documentation for these steps forms the body of this report.

1. All departments included a section on their Program Review progress in their year-end reports. This section was evaluated by the Vice President of Student Life as part of the annual performance review process.
2. The 6-Year Program Review and Assessment Plan (2008-2014) was updated. (Appendix A, pg. 9)
3. A backbone of program review for Student Life has been the commitment to external reviews of individual departments dating back twelve years to the first review in 1996-97. A team including a member from Calvin College and Whitworth College reviewed the Residence Life Department in January, 2009. (Appendix B, pg. 10; Appendix C, pg. 20)
4. Campus Life (Appendix D, pg. 21), Office of Life Planning (Appendix F, pg. 26), and Intercultural Programs (Appendix G, pg. 28) completed “good enough” learning plans. We have used the phrase “good enough” to convey that these plans are “living” and will be updated annually.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARIES INCLUDED IN YEAR-END REPORTS

1. Campus Life Office (submitted by Angela D’Amour)

The summer of 2008 was a time of intentional and careful focus on assessment, kicked off by attending the ACPA Assessment Conference in Indianapolis. Our office mission is at the core of who we are and what we do:

The Campus Life Office cultivates the willingness and ability for Westmont students to lead and learn in all areas of life. The CLO is a hub of opportunity for our students. It exists to help students connect
Our mission is fairly comprehensive, but I find it difficult to capture the breadth of the work of the CLO in the mission. For example, the mission accurately captures the work with student organization advising and leadership development and it may also capture some of the goals of our special programs, but our work with Orientation feels peripheral to our stated mission.

Our office learning plan is in its third phase (Appendix D, pg. 21) and the learning outcomes we’ve identified for our student leaders are clear, although some are difficult to measure. One learning outcome is that students will be able to “Use information from a variety of sources including in class learning, personal experience and Biblical knowledge to solve problems and make decisions (CT).” While this is an important critical thinking skill, other than self perception of their growth in this area, there doesn’t appear to be an easy way to measure this skill. This year we have successfully narrowed down our learning outcomes from 25 to 17 in order to make our focus more clear. That has been helpful, but ideally, I’d like to narrow them further to 12 or fewer. We are working on developing a clear set of learning outcomes for Orientation, but I’m unsure as to the necessity or feasibility of tying these back to our general CLO objectives. Again, Orientation feels peripheral to our other office goals.

Last year, we used focus groups to assess how effectively we reached our goals. We met with student organizations at the end of the year to gather their thoughts and feedback. This strategy was effective and helpful. This year we used two different assessment tools for gathering information. First, we used a longitudinal survey that asked students to assess themselves on our 17 learning outcomes at the beginning and end of the year. We have yet to compile and assess these results to determine how students self-reported their progress over the course of the year. Second, we used monthly reports, where we asked students to identify at least 3 things that they learned each month while serving in their leadership role. While we are still analyzing the findings, it is evident that fall training directs and guides what and how students learn throughout the year. My goal is to carefully review the outcomes of the surveys and the monthly reports to determine how effectively the CLO is assisting students achieve the learning outcomes we’ve identified. If we have not effectively reached our goals we will reconsider our strategies and as well as the outcomes themselves to determine if they are realistic. Additionally, if there are learning outcomes that are evident for students that we have not formally identified, we may consider adding those to our list of outcomes.

In an effort to gain a better understanding of recent survey statistics regarding women student's experiences at Westmont, I hosted two focus groups this spring. The groups asked women students to discuss changes to their physical and emotional health, drive to achieve and academic and personal self confidence during their time at Westmont, as well as what factors seem to dictate the quality of the student experience for women. The findings were presented at a Faculty Forum in late February (Appendix E, pg. 23).

The Director of Institutional Research and I have been working together to make recommendations to the college for change based on the findings of the two focus groups. When women were asked, "What are the most influential factors were that dictate the quality of women students' experiences on campus?" there was a consistent response. Overwhelmingly, focus group participants identified relationships with other women, strong female role models (particularly faculty and staff women), and other relationships with faculty and staff women as being extremely important to empowering women students. Additionally, participants suggested offering events where "women could talk and get to know other women; events where you feel comfortable opening up." For these reasons, a women’s retreat is being planned for September, 2009, as a catalyst to encourage such relationships to develop.

For the 2009-2010 year, I want to consider if and how the various elements of the Campus Life Office work tie back to the mission. In the past year, I’ve been honing in on women’s student experiences, and although that is undoubtedly a population that needs special attention, I want to be clearer on how this endeavor ties in to the mission of the CLO. Additionally, I often reflect on other issues and possibilities such as a leadership course, a retreat for sports captains and an outdoor adventure series all of which could be very valuable, but are they integral and necessary to the CLO mission as well as the mission and needs of the institution?

Finally, my colleagues and I dedicated a great deal of time to meeting individually with student leaders in each of our organizations this fall and spring to discuss their goals for the year, strategies for reaching those goals and pitfalls they may face along the way. While I believe this time was valuable and we certainly
enjoyed these 1 on 1 conversations, I need to be able to point to whether or not this strategy of 1 on 1 meetings is the most effective and efficient use of our time and resources.

2. Office of Life Planning (submitted by Dana Alexander)

I am pleased with the “Outcomes for the Office of Life Planning” document (Appendix F, pg. 26) which is an excellent guide for our assessment. I laid out 21 different learning outcomes and we will be using that as a way to guide our future assessments. We have a good mission statement and are beginning to get a handle on the assessment process as it applies to our area.

Assessment of Skills Workshop – This was a first attempt to gage the efficacy of a workshop utilizing the outcome criterion of what students will be able to do because of our program. It has been quite some time since we have offered a skills workshop, although it is an important part of our individual counseling with students. The session started with me asking the students to write down their top skills. Then a card sort exercise was utilized to help them sort out both the skills they felt most competent in and also enjoyed (a two part process). A list of between 12-15 was generated, as their “motivating skills.” In the final, and in some ways most important step, students were asked to write down and then share examples where they have effectively used the skills they generated. A day after the session, using Survey Monkey, participants were asked a series of questions which gave us results that indicated that they did indeed learn what we had hoped. Students indicated at least a 50% increase after the workshop in skills they could list, and whereas 100% said they were not confident in describing their skills before the workshop, 50% said they were Very Confident and 50% Somewhat Confident after. Helpful comments included the desire to have more direct help in applying these skills to a resume, and some students said they wished they could have kept the cards.

Future Assessments

- We had planned to assess the Etiquette Dinner this year but Sodexo made a critical error in not providing a full plate setting, lessening the impact and a key area of learning. This is something we will do next year.
- Assessment of Alumni one and two years from graduation. We have subscribed to Zoomerang and have created a survey (with the help Alumni Relations, Admissions, academics) that we will send out this summer. This will help us to assess our graduates’ transition, satisfaction with their work, feeling of preparedness, etc. Long overdue!
- Longitudinal Study – The up-coming senior class was given an assessment by us (My Vocational Situation) in their freshman year, designed to gauge their vocational clarity. We will be giving a re-test this year to see whether accessing our resources makes a difference in their clarity now.

3. Intercultural Programs Office (submitted by Elena Yee)

Update on responses to recommendations given in ICP External Review conducted in January, 2007

Review Team: Pete C. Menjares, Biola University, Stu Cleek, Westmont College, Cheri Larsen Hoeckley, Westmont College, and Rodney Sisco, Wheaton College

The numbered items were made by the Review Team in the January, 2007, report. The BOLD responses are the updates that were completed during the past year (2008-2009).

Responses to recommendations/concerns

1. Although the broad purposes of Support, Educate, and Celebrate are understood by many, there is a lack of clarity with regard to how these purposes are actually being achieved through the various programs and activities offered by the Office of Intercultural Programs and how these achievements interface and work toward the fulfillment of college-wide commitments to diversity.

Response: Since the audit, ICP has worked with Tim Wilson and Marianne Robins to create objectives to assess students’ learning connected with ICP’s programs. ICP has used the Diversity Learning Standard as its guide for the last six years to plan programs.
2. There is a lack of understanding on the part of students, both students of color and white students, as to what specifically are “ICP programs,” their particular purposes, and how they are intended to serve the students that participate in their events. In this regard, it does not appear to be clear to white students that these programs also exist to serve them and even amongst students of color there were questions about which students in particular these programs were designed to serve. At times, students actively involved in specific ICP Programs (e.g. Saturday Connection dinners and student groups such as L.C.O and B.S.U) were not aware that those programs were the work of ICP. Student organizations need to know their relationship to the ICP so that the perception of their programs is connected to the Office.

Response: ICP is being more direct in “taking credit” for programs. In the past, ICP has chosen to stay in the background so more students were more involved. There continues to some delineation in the minds of students about ICP. ICP serves both students of color and White students. We continue to remind students that ICP serves all students. We have announced this to student leaders at training for the past two years and asked them to advocate for ICOs and ICP.

3. There appears to be some confusion about which student populations the Office of Intercultural Programs has been established to serve and why this office is expected to serve such a wide range of students on campus (historically underrepresented students, Third-Culture/MKs, Emmaus Road, International Students). There is also concern that the range of students with their individual needs may be over burdening the Director and putting undue pressure on the office as a whole.

Response: See #2 above.

4. There is concern that the Director of Intercultural Programs may need to develop the "Big Picture" vision necessary to effectively connect the work of the Office of Intercultural Programs to the broader diversity goals of the college.

Response: Even though admittedly my strength is not the “big picture,” I have kept the Diversity Learning Standard in mind when planning programs. ICP was deeply involved with the Diversity Irvine Grant to meet the goals of the college to retain students of color. What has been a challenge is that there hadn’t been a detailed roadmap established by the college for diversity at Westmont since the 1996 Long Range Plan.

5. While there have been some notable “one time” collaborative efforts between the Director and Office of Intercultural Programs and other departments at the college (i.e. The Summit for Justice, Residence Hall Diversity Programming Grants), there is a visible lack of on-going and structurally "built in" collaborative efforts with specific departments at the college who have shared commitments to diversity, particularly with the programs and services of the Department of Student Life. One obvious place for collaboration to occur would be with the New Student Orientation Program. However, there was some degree of confusion expressed on the part of individuals about the degree to which the Director should be participating in New Student Orientation and other similar events.

Response: I have raised the question of collaborative diversity efforts such as Black History Month. My office does not have the budget, staffing or authority (power) on campus to plan significant programs for MLK day, etc. There is criticism on both sides – There is no widespread acknowledgment by the campus for example Black History Month or what ICP does is insignificant and seen as being at the margins. Suggestions?

6. There is frustration on the part of students of color who believe that Westmont abdicates responsibility to them for teaching majority culture students and faculty about diversity both inside and outside of the classroom.

Response: This seems to be less the case these days although there is still a lack of collaborative effort when it comes to acknowledging holidays such as MLK day or special emphasis months (Black History, Women’s History, Asian, Pacific Islander, etc.)

7. In discussions on diversity, it is critical that the Office of Intercultural Programs and the college have a vision for diversity that is based in scripture and deeply grounded in the Christian Mission of Westmont College. It is imperative that the motivation and rationale for becoming a diverse community be directly linked to the Christian mission and that all programs and services be measured against this standard. In interviews it was made clear that it is important for students of color to know, as well as others, that
Westmont’s rationale for diversity is not about simply increasing numbers or having a good appearance on brochures or calendars. Tying the vision for diversity to the Christian mission of the college would strengthen the work of the Office of Intercultural Programs. In this regard, it is important that the Office of Intercultural Programs and its threefold purpose of Support, Educate, and Celebrate align with the overall Westmont vision for diversity and that it is clear to the Director how the Intercultural Programs are to work to fulfill this broader vision of the college.

**Response:** As of Aug 27, 2009, President Gayle Beebe requested several faculty, staff and administrators to participate in a task force to develop a biblical and theological definition of diversity. The first meeting will occur later this fall. ICP has always used the Diversity Learning Standard as its framework for planning programs and teaching students.

8. Revisit and clearly define the job of the Director of Intercultural Programs so that it is relevant to the current needs of the college, in alignment with college-wide diversity goals and expectations, and clearly understood by the Director and those she serves. As part of this process it is our recommendation that the specific roles and responsibilities of the Director be spelled out in greater detail; that the students and programs to be served by this office be clearly identified; that the required knowledge, skills, and dispositions for the Director be identified; that expectations for success be communicated; that expectations for how this office interfaces and collaborates with other departments on campus be decided; and that the parameters of authority and decision-making power the Director has to influence or determine policies that affect change be delineated. Also, if the administration should choose to expand rather than limit the Director’s current responsibilities, it is our recommendation that consideration be given to an additional support person to be added to the existing staff or that the current part-time staff position is expanded to a full-time position to provide the support necessary to adequately serve the students.

**Response:** As of September 1, 2009, Jane Higa is reviewing an update of the job description for the ICP director and will send it to Human Resources. A new administrator, Tina Valencia, was hired last year and one-quarter of her hours (5 hrs/wk) is dedicated to ICP. Julissa Delgado continues to contribute about 10 hrs/wk for ICP as agreed upon between the ICP director and OLP director.

9. As Westmont seeks to become a more diverse community, it is incumbent on the college to insure that the Office of Intercultural Programs does not become isolated from other departments and thus find itself on the margins of campus life in its service to students. It is our recommendation that the administration offer support and vision to the Director of Intercultural Programs for intentionally forming links to collaborate with other programs and groups (Student Life, student government, residence life) and to draw on other campus resources to better serve students and to achieve the mission of the program and college. For example, the presence of the Director at new student orientation events and other events that serve incoming freshmen would heighten the awareness of the Office of Intercultural Programs as well as enhance the “esprit de corps” necessary to cultivate community on campus. Additionally, interviews indicated the need for clear communications from the Office of Intercultural Programs to other groups on campus such as to the Westmont College Student Association and Residence Life about events and programs that are of relevance to them. The Director is encouraged to explore multiple venues for communicating and announcing events in addition to email. It was expressed that regular and frequent communications are appreciated but that announcements can get lost in email.

**Response:** With the hire of Angela D’Amour as the Director of Campus Life, the collaboration with her office and ICP has exponentially improved to the benefit of both departments. Regarding Orientation, there is a challenge of many staff who want access to the new students along with a full schedule for students and their families. Maybe as the Director of First Year Experience plans programs for the coming year, she can keep in mind of how to include the ICP director in ways that are meaningful and creative – thoughts from Angela? The ICP director has been posting events on the Current Students page, creating DC posters (via student leaders) and creating events on Facebook to get the word out to students apart from emails. Still not sure how to best communicate the events to Residence Life apart from emails and from using paper – would like some thoughts on this from Stu.
10. It was evident from our assessment that the Director is widely appreciated for her work and dedication to the students that fall under her areas of responsibility, as well as for her accessibility by others. However, there was also concern expressed for her heavy workload, inexperience (she is a learner who is in process herself), and easy accessibility. As a result, it is our recommendation that the Director seek an outside mentor for support, encouragement, accountability, and advice.

Response: Jane Higa contacted Dr. Yolanda Garcia, former UCSB Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Support Services, to mentor me. We have been meeting for nearly two years about 3 times/year.

11. It is our recommendation that consideration be given to finding a new location for the Office of Intercultural Programs and its staff that is more visible to the community at large, accessible to the students and faculty, and that is appropriate to support a growing diversity commitment. A new location would send a strong message to the college about the value of the Office of Intercultural Programs as well as the priority of diversity for the institution. Program offices and physical locations symbolize the commitment of the college while also enhancing the aesthetics and campus climate for students who are served by these programs.

Response: The office was moved last Nov 2008 about two weeks before the fire so some work was delayed but eventually moved in by the start of the spring semester 2009. Being in the new office has allowed for more student interaction and greater ease in working with colleagues.

12. As the topics of diversity and intercultural learning are becoming more and more a part of the language and ethos of the college, it is not surprising that there would be questions as to Westmont’s working definition of the terms. It was expressed in interviews that “diversity” be clearly defined for students as well as the need to foster increased intercultural understanding and competencies. Therefore, it is our recommendation that the college develop strength in training for diversity by building upon the foundation of the Office of Intercultural Programs and that would extend to other units of the campus to educate students, faculty, and staff. It was evident in interviews and focus groups that training in diversity and intercultural understanding need to be ongoing and expanded to include a wide range of topics, such as white culture and privilege, social and economic class issues, ethnic identity development, and institutional and structural racism. Additionally, it was suggested that the college consider a variety of means and venues to explore these sensitive topics such as seminars, discussion forums, campus-wide dialogues, and symposia. Further, it is important that any training in diversity seek to educate for the purpose of understanding the life experiences of students and faculty from historically underrepresented groups and that any training also be focused on developing white students and faculty as well. It is vital that training and education not be perceived as a “minority” issue but rather something that is for the benefit of the entire campus community. It is not our recommendation that the Director of Intercultural Programs take charge of this full range of training seminars and discussions across campus constituencies; the Director’s job description is already too extensive. Rather, we would affirm Student Life’s on-going efforts to work with campus structures such as the President’s Staff, the Office of the Provost, and Faculty Council and Senate to enhance campus appreciation of diversity as crucial in Westmont’s desire to reflect the Kingdom of God, and to educate for the coming of that Kingdom.

Response: I’ve worked with HR, Jane and Toya to create some sort of a program for the supervisors at Westmont but I don’t have a strong sense of the impact of the one-time program. Could use some thinking around this recommendation and what should be the next steps.

Updated ICP Learning Plan

The ICP Learning Plan (Appendix G, pg. 28) was updated during the 2008-2009 year with REJ as the program to be assessed for this past year. I used a variety of tools to assess students’ learning during REJ. Students filled out a pre- and post- assessment forms. They took a quiz prior to training then after their time in Mississippi to check if their knowledge had increased. I met with part of the group for a focused debriefing session as well as conducted a large group debriefing meeting. I also met with some students in individual meetings to hear more about their experiences. As a result of the assessment, I submitted a proposal for REJ to receive G.E. credit for Serving Society and Enacting Justice, which was approved in April.
To assess the ICOs, I met with the student leaders for each ICO and we listed and assessed their programs. I asked the ICO co-directors to request feedback from the ICOs about the structure and my performance as an advisor. As a result, I updated the expectations for student leaders, clarified role descriptions, planning more effective monthly meetings, and be more efficient in my communication.

I attended the AACU conference on diversity and assessment in October 2008 and in process of examining the information and determining what would be most helpful for future assessment efforts.

4. Residence Life (submitted by Stu Cleek)

In regard to assessment, although we didn’t make as much progress as I had hoped we would at the beginning of the year. I am pleased with what we were able to do, and how we were able to accomplish these things as well. As previously mentioned, I am really pleased with our new mission statement. I am pleased not only with the end product, but with the engagement of the RDs in the development of the statement. I think it will be something that will really help us in the years ahead as we chart new growth for the department. I also like how it flows into departmental outcomes. Though we were not able to finish out learning outcomes this year.

I think we made a lot of progress, and am hopeful that we will be able to complete that work early next year.

Of course, the biggest piece of assessment for us this year was the external review. I was really pleased with the process and the outcome. I think the review accurately identified, but some real strengths and key areas for growth. Although it is still a little unclear for me what exactly our next steps will or should be, I think we have a really good map to use as we journey forward. One piece regarding assessment that I was really pleased with was just the overall growing energy on the RD staff to assess how we are doing and using that information to make changes in our program. One example of this was the extra work that Audrey and Danny did this spring to organize a focus group of RA’s to give feedback to us on the effectiveness of the RA manual. They were able to use this feedback to make changes to not only the manual, but to our whole approach to the training and development of our staff. We are shifting our thinking to having the RA’s view the manual not just for our August training, but to see it as a useful tool for their entire year’s experience. We have a lot of work to do on that, but they were able to implement the first phase of that this spring, and I think it will help us develop an even more integrated approach to developing our RA staff.

5. Campus Pastor’s Office (submitted by Ben Patterson)

We’ve instituted a log of chapel evaluations for each chapel. Also we will be “crunching” the observations and opinions recorded by students in a survey Lesa Stern conducted in one of her classes. Our office will also be hosting an external review during Spring Semester, 2010, to contribute to the Program Review efforts in Student Life.

EAR and Spiritual Formation. I wish I could say we made progress last year, but I don’t think we did. I have been encouraged by some ideas Kathy Noling has about how we can move this forward. She is finishing a DMin at Fuller, and has had great input from the likes of Dallas Willard and Roberta Hestenes on ways spiritual formation can happen in a Christian college. I am excited about the possibility of a pilot project incorporating insights from her doctoral thesis. I can give you more information later. As I was pondering the role the Campus Pastor’s Office plays in EAR, I was struck by what for me remains a discrepancy between the important and wonderful things we want to see happen for our students spiritually, and what we (or someone in the college) should be doing to bring these things about. All my training as a pastor tells me that critical to spiritual growth is growth in 1) knowledge and application of the Scriptures to life, and 2) the life of prayer. Both of these are classic, foundational means of grace; hinge or “cardinal” disciplines, on which everything else turns. For our discussion, I offer some observations, musings, opinions and judgments about what I see at Westmont:

- There is no concerted effort at Westmont aimed to promote and instruct students in these disciplines.
- Some of our discussions about the multiple varieties of ways spiritual formation may take place at Westmont have missed the point: that without the cardinal, foundational practices in place, all the varieties lose focus.
- What does happen along the lines of the foundational in spiritual formation are often haphazard and almost exclusively student-led, which usually means:
- they lack the expert, mature guidance of the elders of the community.
- they are not sustainable, since the lives of students tend to be migratory and seasonal (off-campus programs, graduation, off-campus living. Internships, general busy-ness),
- they suffer from being another layer on top of all the other things the college encourages students to do,
- they frequently tend toward the sectarian and eccentric in the ways we saw the 24/7 thing go last year.

I believe the key to the development of spiritual formation at Westmont probably lies in Student Life.
- We need to make some “room” in the multitudes of things we do to strengthen our student’s spiritual foundations.
- There would/could be great power in a program of spiritual formation that was coordinated within our efforts in the dorms, WCSA, Potter’s Clay, etc – and was shaped by the collective wisdom of the Dean’s Council.

DIVISION’S 6-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT PLAN WAS UPDATED

Last year’s report indicated that we would do two external reviews in 2008-2009: 1) Residence Life, and 2) Campus Pastor’s Office. In previous years, we had limited our efforts to a single review. The plan of doing two reviews was to accelerate the number of years it would take to cycle through all of our departments. As we moved into the fall semester, and considered the impact of the Tea Fire, it became clear that a single external review would be all the division could manage. In fact, the resulting conversations made us realize that doing two external reviews in any year is not wise. It became clear that conducting a well-planned external review, along with the necessary follow-up on the recommendations, is an effort that would be compromised if we did two concurrently.

The new 6-Year Program Review and Assessment Plan is included as Appendix A (pg. 9).

RESIDENCE LIFE EXTERNAL REVIEW

The Residence Life External Review is included as Appendix B (pg. 10) and the timeline to respond to recommendations is included as Appendix C (pg. 20).
## APPENDIX A

### STUDENT LIFE PROGRAM REVIEW PLAN 2008-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Intercultural Programs</th>
<th>Residence Life</th>
<th>Campus Pastor</th>
<th>Campus Life*</th>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>Office of Life Planning</th>
<th>Health Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETE DEPARTMENTAL MISSION STATEMENT</td>
<td>Summer ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>Summer ’08</td>
<td>Summer ’08</td>
<td>Summer ’08</td>
<td>Summer ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETE &quot;Good Enough&quot; LEARNING PLAN (revised annually)</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT TOOL &amp; IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE FOR ONE LEARNING OUTCOME</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTEND ASSESSMENT CONFERENCE (optional and as budgets permit)</td>
<td>AACCU October ’08</td>
<td>Summer ’08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENTAL EXTERNAL REVIEW</td>
<td>Spring ’07</td>
<td>Spring ’09</td>
<td>Spring ’10</td>
<td>Spring ’11</td>
<td>Spring ’12</td>
<td>Spring ’13</td>
<td>Spring ’14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATE ON EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM</td>
<td>Stu Cleek</td>
<td>Angela D'Amour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL REVIEW (action plan and review by DEAN'S COUNCIL)</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
<td>Fall ’10</td>
<td>Fall ’11</td>
<td>Fall ’12</td>
<td>Fall ’13</td>
<td>Fall ’14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLUDED IN YEAR-END REPORTS: 1) What was learned from assessment of one or more learning outcomes? 2) How will you use the results of assessment efforts? 3) What, if any, modifications to learning plan for next year?</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT PROGRESS INCLUDED IN PERFORMANCE REVIEWS</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

WESTMONT COLLEGE
RESIDENCE LIFE EXTERNAL REVIEW - FINAL REPORT
January 2009

EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM

Jane Hendriksma, Team Lead
Dean of Students for Judicial Affairs
Calvin College

Dr. Mark Nelson
Professor of Philosophy
Westmont College

Angela D’Amour
Director of Campus Life
Westmont College

Dick Mandeville
Associate Dean of Students
Whitworth University
Residence Life External Review
Final Report

Table of Contents

I. Introduction .................................................................................................................. Page 12
II. Major Themes ............................................................................................................. Page 12
III. Commendations ......................................................................................................... Page 13
IV. Future Challenges ...................................................................................................... Page 14
V. Recommendations ...................................................................................................... Page 15
VI. Conclusion ................................................................................................................ Page 18
I. Introduction

Stu Cleek, Associate Dean for Residence Life at Westmont College, assembled the audit team for an external review of the Residence Life Department at Westmont College. The audit team was sent in advance a purpose description for the review. The review was organized to identify factors and conditions involved in the quality of Residence Life at Westmont College. The review team was asked to produce a description of Residence Life at Westmont College. The goal of the review process was to gather information and make recommendations that would enable Residence Life to more effectively respond to the needs of Westmont students.

The audit team consisted of Angela D’Amour, Director of Campus Life, Westmont College; Mark Nelson, Professor of Philosophy, Westmont College; Richard Mandeville, Associate Dean of Students, Whitworth University; and Jane Hendriksma, Dean of Students for Judicial Affairs, Calvin College.

On Sunday, January 25, 2009, Stu Cleek conducted a campus tour for Richard Mandeville and Jane Hendriksma. Each residence hall was toured, looking at public areas and several student rooms as available.

Prior to the team’s arrival on campus for the audit exercise, Stu Cleek provided the team with a notebook of contextual information regarding Westmont Residence Life including department functions, initiatives, and key responsibilities. The audit team was very impressed with the depth and breadth of the information provided. Team members especially noted the organization of materials and clarity of presentation. Each section opened with an abstract or section summary. The audit notebook contained sections covering college and Student Life overview, Residence Life overview, judicial process, professional staff development, student staff development, programming, housing and facilities, emergency readiness and response, budget and planning, and assessment. The effort put into this notebook by Stu and the Residence Life staff enabled the review team to arrive with a clear understanding of the key components of the Residence Life program and its context at Westmont College.

On Monday, January 26, 2009 the campus visit continued with the audit team meeting with the following individuals: Jane Higa, Vice President for Student Life; Stu Cleek, Associate Dean of Residence Life; Tim Wilson, Associate Dean of Students; Elena Yee, Director of Intercultural Programs; Ben Patterson, Westmont Campus Pastor; and Dana Alexander, Director of the Office of Life Planning. The audit team met with representatives from the Campus Life Office, Counseling Center, Health Services, Physical Plant, Campus Safety, Intercultural Programs Office, and a faculty focus group. The audit team conducted four evening focus groups with students: residents, ethnic residents, resident assistants, and student organizations.

On Tuesday, January 27, 2009, the audit team met to debrief day one and to focus and prepare for day two. The audit team made some minor adjustments to the planned schedule to allow individual sessions with each resident director. On day two, the audit team met with several administrators: President Beebe via polycom phone conference, and Warren Rogers, Interim Academic Dean and Bill Wright, Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Research.

The audit team divided up to interview each resident director, one-on-one. The audit team also met with representatives from the Athletics Department including the Athletic Director and several coaches. The audit team spent 2.5 hours developing a preliminary report which outlined key findings. Finally, the audit team met with Jane Higa and Stu Cleek for several hours to present and discuss key findings. There was considerable agreement with Jane and Stu on the central issues the team identified.

II. Major Themes

Westmont College is a strong residential community where students live, develop relationships, learn and grow. Students were consistent in reporting that inclusiveness marks the Westmont community. Faculty
housing adjacent to the college campus and the high percentage of upperclassmen living on campus produce a depth and breadth in the Westmont residential experience that is distinctive.

Resident Directors have a strong relational role with residence hall students and with the resident assistants. RDs are visible, respected leaders within the residence hall community. The RA position is sought after and esteemed on campus. The external review team witnessed a sense of camaraderie among the RAs and a pride in their work.

Westmont faculty and staff expressed a high value for and strong support of the residential community. Westmont people exuded joy and compassion and many stated that they loved working at Westmont. People expressed gratitude that everyone worked very hard. Interviewees focused on the value of residence life colleagues and listed their contributions and accomplishments. Interestingly, the team noticed that across the board people were quite hesitant to offer suggestions or critique. In fact, several people mentioned or clarified the confidentiality policy prior to offering critique. One person indicated that critique is not easy explaining that “Westmont is an affirming culture. Grace abounds. While this is great, the grace/truth balance is a real struggle.”

The residence hall facilities are aging and in need of major renovation. The original design across the variety of buildings reflects little intention toward facilitating community for student living space. The lack of ideal public spaces such as study lounges, kitchens and large gathering spaces inhibits interaction between residents, and limits the opportunities for shared programs between academic affairs, other student life departments and residence life. In contrast, the recent renovations to public areas and the student room/closet renovations were clearly the result of thoughtful, intentional planning for optimal community use and atmosphere.

III. Commendations

The audit team commends Stu Cleek’s leadership in Residence Life for the past ten years. The departmental materials, programs, staff and training elicits college-wide respect and provide the foundation for a superlative residence hall community living experience for Westmont students.

Stu’s leadership and accomplishments in Residence Life were widely acknowledged. People mentioned increased RD accountability, improved RA training, administrative systems for working together, strategic leadership during the fire, impressive manuals, comprehensive RA training, and innovations such as Faculty Fellows and Imprint.

The audit team discovered that RA training was robust, creative and broadly respected at the college. RAs are well prepared and well respected by students, staff and faculty. The team heard numerous positive anecdotes regarding the work and the character of the RAs. The team was impressed by the Imprint Program for RA training. Colleagues reported that Imprint was highly creative and thoroughly organized. RAs noted that Imprint was a highlight of the RA experience. The leadership time and effort to produce Imprint was noticed by students and staff.

Team members noted RA selection promotional materials were colorful, creative, and included professional graphic design. The RD/RA manuals were thorough, readable, and thoughtfully organized.

Residence Life’s work and reputation has paved the way for a very positive campus perception of the RD and RA positions. The RA position is much esteemed on campus. Some of the best student leaders are drawn to the position.

The audit team commends Residence Life for initiating the Faculty Fellows Program. The strong residential community at Westmont provides a fertile back drop for this program. As the new program continues to develop, Residence Life could use this as a template to deepen connections between the curricular and co-curricular learning activities at the college.
The emergency preparedness planning by Residence Life leadership was tested by the November 2008 fire at Westmont. Stu’s leadership during the fire was respected and admired by many. Colleagues mentioned advance planning and also credited Stu’s personal leadership qualities in the crisis moment. The RDs also deserve commendation for their quick, effective response to this potentially tragic incident.

The RD and especially the RA role was credited with key dynamic in fostering the beloved sense of community which stands as the hallmark of the Westmont student learning experience. Even with aging facilities of problematic configuration, student reports were overwhelmingly positive regarding the on campus living experience. Students recognized the fluctuation of public space and the limiting facility configurations yet perceived this as a positive. Students felt that the limits of and positives of the buildings combine to create a distinct atmosphere for each complex. Students identified benefits in choosing an atmosphere that best fits their own needs and personalities.

IV. Future Challenges

The strong Residence Life program and the defined role of RD and RA positions in fostering the student community experience have led to strong departmental identity. Residence Life enjoys college wide respect and the momentum of a strong tradition. Along with the positives of this, some unintended consequences have emerged. Colleagues within Student Life described an insularity of the department which diminishes collegial collaboration. Residence Life becomes an island unto itself. It’s an important island, because this island produces the beloved sense of belonging for Westmont students. This community developing and deep investing in individual student’s lives can capture all of the RDs’ time and energy.

The separation and insularity of a wonderful island experience undermines the college’s goal of seamless learning from classroom to living community. Promoting student learning in a joint, integrated effort with faculty and divisional colleagues will require more fluid boundaries and bridges until the island’s isolation is dissolved.

Resident Directors do have unique jobs yet they are a part of a division and a wider college community. The daily and weekly rhythm of the RDs’ schedule needs to reflect their role within a department, a division and a college.

The aging facilities need extensive renovations. Students noted heating and plumbing issues and slow repair response. The halls are worn and tired. Residence Life will need to continue to advocate to the cabinet to ensure that the college prioritizes funding the revitalization of the residence halls.

Residence hall programming is well received by students. As the team explored programming, we found that social programming dominated the efforts. Educational programs were rare despite the organization of the programming calendar and requirements. Residence hall staff reported that program requirements vary from hall to hall. While educational programming needs improvement and expansion, both Student Life colleagues and faculty expressed a strong desire to partner with RDs’ in educational programming efforts, but were not aware of how to initiate collegial programming efforts with RDs’ or the Residence Life office.

Faculty expressed an interest in more structured opportunities to be involved in residence hall communities. They suggested Residence Life offer honorariums for faculty presentations or involvement. Faculty noted that faculty evaluation process no longer specifically rewards outside of classroom contributions. Some noted that the faculty fellows program asked much more than reasonable based on the current compensation.

Alcohol education emerged as a concern area. Administration, faculty and coaches longed for a more open discussion regarding alcohol issues. Unidentified or unspoken barriers to this discussion seem to exist. Residence Life and Student Life could initiate this discussion and find broad based willingness, even eagerness to join the conversation. Many faculty noted the lack of open dialogue or training for faculty and staff on alcohol issues that affect college students. There was widespread agreement that alcohol problems are on the forefront and need to be discussed openly and focused efforts initiated across campus. Westmont people want to ask hard questions and new questions regarding the use and abuse of alcohol by students.
The discipline system was a significant concern for students, staff and administrators. Everyone on campus seemed to be aware to some extent of a major behavioral incident that occurred last spring. The general impression was that the consequences were not sufficient for the behavior or were inconsistently applied. All of the interviewed groups mentioned that the emphasis was on grace versus truth. People at Westmont desire to work together to find that delicate balance of showing grace and speaking the truth into students lives. Students need the opportunity for accountability and corrective action even if it means negative consequences.

Students also mentioned the need to improve setting standards and holding students accountable. Students gave accounts of inconsistencies in enforcement and sanctioning among RDs’. Students expressed frustration that more serious drug and alcohol offenses are overlooked because RDs’ do not follow-up. Students recalled hearings that occurred 45-60 days after an open house violation. Students related situations where others were inconvenienced when there was no accountability. Students voiced strong support to continue the open hours policy and community life standards. A few students were troubled that some students got away with so much. One person told of scenarios where students gave convincing apologies to staff but never changed their behavior. Students suggested a “three strikes and you’re out” rule, citing other colleges with such policies. Students thought violations of the same or similar policies should receive the same sanction. Students suggested that standard sanctions be published as part of the Community Life Statement.

The short-term suspension practice received widespread critique. Many saw major philosophical problems with the concept and difficult issues in implementation of this sanction. Some of the concerns were: the implementation is difficult for RDs’ who are asked on very short notice to make off-campus accommodations for students; faculty don’t know the details of what happened and don’t see a clear connection between the violation and the students’ class absence; and off campus hosts who cannot be made aware of the details of the incident that caused a student to be staying in their homes; it is more like a vacation or an adventure than a sanction.

The audit team heard that Student Life “bends over backward” to keep students at Westmont. Many commented that Westmont is great on grace and suggested that it is important not to miss out on the truth piece. People noted, with some exasperation, that it is virtually impossible to be kicked out of Westmont. Concern was raised that students need the opportunity for ownership of choices and mistakes. Questions surfaced regarding the structure and staffing of current Student Life committee hearings and the appeal process. People observed that the discipline committee seems to take an inordinate amount of time perhaps because of internal struggle to sanction students or due to a perception that fairness requires a long process.

V. Recommendations

The audit team offered some suggestions to continue developing the already thriving Westmont Residence Life Program. The first two recommendations seem to us the most important and the most daunting. We recommend pacing the implementation of any recommendations so that you can continue to sustain the excellent existing program.

1. Plan a college wide discussion on student alcohol use/abuse.

Phase One:
Appoint a task force that includes faculty, staff, coaches and students.
Utilize a national survey to determine campus climate and issues regarding alcohol.
Begin a campus wide discussion of the results.

Phase Two:
Recommend, approve and implement a multi-faceted alcohol education and intervention program that addresses existing issues and supports student learning and success.
2. **Audit the discipline process.**

Phase One: Audit the process with a college wide committee of faculty, students, and staff.

Phase Two: Identify issues and explore best practices.

Phase Three: Implement changes.

The audit team did offer a variety of specific recommendations regarding student discipline:

*Consider sending Stu and/or Audrey to the Student Conduct Hearing Administration training course held annually in June at the Gehring Academy.*

*Consider having Stu and/or Audrey attend the February annual ASJA (now ASCA) conference.*

*Review conduct policies and community life agreement using the Model Code by John Lowry.*

*Create standard sanctions for common offenses. Publish standard sanctions. Require RDs to utilize standard sanctions.*

*Create a disciplinary hearing board with faculty, staff, and student representatives. Have Audrey or Stu serve as non-voting convener and trainer of the hearing board.*

*Create an appeals committee comprised of faculty, staff and students. Jane Higa could serve as nonvoting chair of the committee.*

*Implement a gradation of sanctions such as: Warning Probation, Personal Probation, Disciplinary Probation, and Suspension (for one semester or one year). Tie the loss of athletic participation and ineligibility to travel on off campus programs to the levels of probation.*

*Develop and utilize a fine system which is published. Use fine money for programming and creative educational efforts.*

*Discontinue the use of short-term suspensions.*

3. **Weave Residence Life into the tapestry of Student Life Division and the College.**

The shadow side of a muscular Residence Life program can be departmental insularity and a weakening of collegial connections within the Student Life Division and the college. Make 2009-2010 the year of building bridges and seeing the big picture. In collaboration with one director of another student life department, devise a plan for each Resident Director to plan and implement one educational program annually so that each department in Student Life is paired with one Resident Director.

Add an educational session with Intercultural Programs staff during RA training. Look for topics for other Student Life Staff to present in RA training.

Form “Action Teams” comprised of RDs’ and mid level Student Life staff to focus on divisional projects or entrepreneurial efforts. Expect that everyone in the division participate in one project each year.

4. **Continue to develop the RD role.**

Clarify and highlight professional expectations of RDs. Monitor compliance with performance evaluations. Develop written expectations for dress code, email turnaround, and phone call response time. RDs’ peripheral vision needs to expand so that they are contributing and collaborating within the division and college.
Develop mechanisms to regularly introduce RDs to faculty and coaches.

Returning RDs need to shoulder some departmental responsibility through centralized annual assignments.

Assign summer projects to RDs that allow them to lead or contribute to important departmental initiatives.

Formalize RD professional development and involve the RDs in producing an annual professional development plan.

Utilize Faculty Lunch Forums, professional conferences, professional articles or book reading discussions. Organize opportunities for your RDs to interact with the RDs at other institutions near your campus known for quality and professionalism. This might include a one day shared in-service, or an overnight trip visiting two or three campuses to walk through facilities and interact with RDs and student staff from the other institutions.

5. **Increase educational programming efforts.**

Educational programming structure exists and needs to be implemented more consistently in each building. Appoint an RD team to evaluate and maximize connections to Westmont’s academic curriculum. Encourage RDs to involve faculty and divisional colleagues.

Have each RA think about a professor or two whom they know to be good presenters. Assign each RA the task of inviting one faculty member to give a program in their hall. You may want to coordinate this so that popular faculty are not deluged with requests. Consider recognizing faculty for their presentation or participation with a gift card or honorarium to thank them for the extra effort.

6. **Fully integrate the mission statement and programming calendar so that they are known and utilized by department members.**

Design a training activity for RDs and RAs to commit the departmental mission statement to memory. Revisit the mission statement at regular intervals during each academic year. Engage the department in developing annual learning outcomes for residence hall students.

Require RDs and RAs to utilize the programming calendar and submit monthly program reports tied to a stipend for extra floor funds. Recognize excellence in educational programming with an annual award or cash prize.

Find a creative and memorable way to communicate Imprint goals and learning outcomes so a majority of RAs can articulate these at the end of first semester. Everyone’s talking about Imprint, so it’s a great vehicle to broadcast how Residence Life promotes student learning.

7. **Explore the integration of class years (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors) within the residence halls.**

The impetus behind this suggestion came mainly from faculty and those that long for students to receive mentoring from upperclassman.

8. **Establish a schedule for the renovation of residence halls.**

Residence Life will need to advocate for a share of the college’s budget or capital funding priorities. The department can lead the effort to establish a schedule for the renovation of Residence Halls.
VI. Conclusion

Westmont College Residence Life Department planned an external audit review process in January 2009. Stu Cleek, Associate Dean for Residence Life invited Angela D’Amour, Director of Campus Life, Westmont College; Jane Hendriksma, Dean of Students for Judicial Affairs, Calvin College, Richard Mandeville, Associate Dean of Students, Whitworth University; and Mark Nelson, Professor of Philosophy, Westmont College to serve as the audit team. Westmont provided background and contextual information for the review team to read prior to the audit campus visit. The team spent two days meeting with students, staff, faculty and administrators at Westmont to gather information, evaluate the department, and make recommendations to the department as they continue to serve the Westmont community.

The team found that the residential living community of Westmont College is vibrant. RDs play a key role in establishing this community by investing deeply in relationships with students. The RA position is esteemed and valued by the entire campus community. RA training is robust and creative. Students report high satisfaction with their residence hall experiences even though the facilities are aging and in need of major renovation. The team commended recent projects that renovated student rooms and public space.

The leadership of residence life is highly respected across campus. The department materials, programs, staff and training activities provide the foundation for a superlative community living experience for Westmont students. Colleagues were impressed by the faculty fellows program and the RA Imprint training program.

The Emergency preparedness planning by Residence Life leadership was tested by the November 2008 fire at Westmont. Stu’s leadership during the fire and the RDs quick response were important in addressing this potentially tragic experience.

Residence Life enjoys college wide respect and the momentum of a strong appreciated tradition. Some unintended consequences have emerged. Colleagues in Student Life described an insularity, which diminishes collegial collaboration. This tendency to insularity also undermines the college’s goal of seamless learning from the classroom to the living community. The audit team challenges Residence Life to adjust in the future by promoting student learning in joint integrated efforts with faculty and divisional colleagues. The team urges residence life to expand existing social programming efforts to include creative effective educational programming.

Community and relationship development captures most of the RDs’ time and energy. Resident Directors do have unique jobs yet they are part of a division and a wider college community. The daily and weekly rhythm of the RDs’ schedule needs to reflect their role within a department, a division and a college.

The facilities need extensive renovations. The halls are worn and tired. The configuration of the public space inhibits optimal use for student community living. Given the current economic climate, residence life will need to compete on the college agenda for funds to revitalize the buildings.

The Westmont community wants to discuss student alcohol use and abuse and campus issues related to it. Westmont people also would like to explore some innovations to the college disciplinary system. People are eager to engage together in these difficult topics in order to strengthen students learning and growing opportunities.

The team offered some suggestions to continue developing the already thriving Westmont Residence Life program. The team recommends pacing the implementation of changes so that residence life can sustain the excellent existing program.

The team recommendations are:

1. Plan a college wide discussion on student alcohol use and abuse.
2. Audit the discipline process.
3. Integrate Residence Life more fully into the Student Life Division and the College.
4. Continue to develop the RD role.
5. Increase educational programming efforts.
6. Fully integrate the mission statement and programming calendar so that they are known and utilized by department members.
7. Explore the integration of class years within the residence halls.
8. Establish a schedule to renovate the residence halls.

Residence Life is already a strong and vibrant department. These efforts to evaluate, reflect and plan for the future will ensure that Residence Life will continue to promote student learning in the residential living communities.
APPENDIX C

RESIDENCE LIFE EXTERNAL REVIEW RESPONSE PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED ACTION</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plan a college wide discussion on student alcohol use and abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Audit the discipline process.</td>
<td>Phase I &amp; II</td>
<td>Phase II &amp; III</td>
<td>Assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Weave Residence Life into the tapestry of Student Life Division and the College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continue to develop the RD role.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase educational programming efforts.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fully integrate the mission statement and programming calendar so that they are known and utilized by department members.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Explore the integration of class years within the residence halls.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish a schedule to renovate the residence halls.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOALS FOR 2009-10

Audit the Discipline Process (#2)
- Conduct former RA survey (done summer '09)
- Conduct survey of students
- Conduct RA focus group
- Conduct student focus group
- Share results with Student Life Committee and solicit feedback
- Audrey and/or Stu attend Judicial Conference
- Develop recommended changes to discipline process

Enhance Program Development Through Better Coordination and Collaboration (#3 & 5)
- Improve Collaboration & Communication with Athletic Coaches and AD
- Partner with Elena Yee to develop diverse programs and interventions designed to support and educate students
- Continue and expand opportunities for joint educational programming efforts with Campus Life Office
- Provide expanded programming related to sexuality, alcohol and illegal drug use

Develop Resident Director Position as Professional Student Affairs Staff (#4)
- Develop written standards for dress, email/voicemail response, and timeliness (done)
- Spend January Day Away on campus visit to sister institution
- Align RD job description with NASPA Professional Development Matrix
APPENDIX D

Campus Life Office Learning Plan
Draft, July 2009

MISSION STATEMENTS

Westmont College

The mission of Westmont College is to provide a high quality undergraduate liberal arts program in a residential campus community that assists college men and women toward a balance of rigorous intellectual competence, healthy personal development, and strong Christian commitments.

Campus Life Office:

The Campus Life Office cultivates the willingness and ability for Westmont students to lead and learn in all areas of life. The CLO is a hub of opportunity for our students. It exists to help students connect intellectual, spiritual and personal growth, to collaborate effectively and to cultivate effective leadership development.

OBJECTIVES

Student Life Division Objectives

- Ability and willingness to Embrace and Navigate change
- Ability and willingness to take initiative to Add Value
- Ability and willingness to foster a Redemptive Community

College-wide Learning Objectives

- Christian Orientation
- Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking
- Diversity
- Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement
- Written and Oral Communication
- Research and Technology

Campus Life Objectives

- Connect intellectual, spiritual and personal growth
- Collaborate effectively
- Cultivate effective leadership development

STRATEGIES

A partial listing of current strategies to specifically address the campus life objectives, while at the same time, seeking to support student life and college-wide learning objectives, are included below:

- Pre-semester leadership retreat
- Assigning a specific advisor to each student organization (WCSA, WAC, WSM, etc.)
- Monthly leadership lunches
- Advisors meeting weekly with leadership of organizations
- Monthly Group Leader trainings
- Student staff completing monthly reports
- Leadership Summits

Measurable Learning Outcomes

Students will evidence behaviors linked to the following outcomes as a result of participating as student leaders within the Campus Life Office. The following abbreviations for five learning domains have been used
to map each behavior to those domains. These domains come from a DRAFT document showing some preliminary success in combining the independent learning outcomes work of CAS and NASPA’s *Learning Reconsidered* into one framework:

- **Personal Development/Self Awareness (PD)**
- **Practical Competence (PC)**
- **Interpersonal Competence (IC)**
- **Effective Leadership (EL)**
- **Critical Thinking/Knowledge Acquisition (CT)**

*Students will demonstrate the behaviors listed below each of the Campus Life objectives:*

**P (Priority) = H(high), M(medium) or L(low)**

**Connect intellectual, spiritual and personal growth**
1. Maintains or improves GPA while serving in student leadership role (PD) **P: L**
2. Identifies the connections between their faith, intellectual development and personal development (CT) **P: M**
3. Uses information from a variety of sources including in-class learning, personal experience and Biblical knowledge to solve problems and make decisions (CT) **P: L**
4. Maintains a perspective that God is in control and responds to challenge and difficulty with hopefulness (PD) **P: M**

**Collaborate effectively**
5. Looks out for the well-being of others and helps those in need (IC) **P: M**
6. Engages in constructive conflict resolution (IC) **P: H**
7. Gives and receives constructive feedback (IC) **P: L**
8. Avoids engaging in gossip (IC) **P: M**
9. Seeks and values the involvement of others and learns from their contributions, their values and their experiences (IC) **P: H**

**Cultivate effective leadership development**
10. Understands and articulates personal skills, values, beliefs and growth areas (PD) **P: H**
11. Identifies and communicates a worthwhile vision that encourages commitment and action in others (EL) **P: L**
12. Follows through; delivers on commitments and brings projects to fruition by prioritizing, setting and pursuing goals (PC/EL) **P: M**
13. Humbly acknowledges and admits mistakes (PC) **P: L**
14. Accesses support and advice during difficult times (PC) **P: M**
15. Manages time wisely and does not over-commit (PC) **P: H**
16. Demonstrates a commitment to spiritual growth by practicing spiritual disciplines or by asking probing faith related questions (PD) **P: H**

**Assessment Observations**
- All categories need to be modeled by CLO. When we’re teaching, use examples from our lives
- Fall training focuses need to be readdressed at various intervals throughout the year
- Discuss learning outcomes regularly with student leaders
APPENDIX E

Faculty Forum by Angela D’Amour

The Student Experience for Women at Westmont
2/26/09

If you came to hear about Leadership Development Theory, I apologize. I have shifted gears in light of information I’ve recently gathered.

If you came in spite of the topic, then you may be pleased to hear that I won’t be discussing the progression of leadership development throughout the ages.

Shortly after I arrived on campus 1.5 years ago, I began to hear concern from a variety of faculty and staff about the results of a campus survey done regarding women student’s experiences. What I heard was that survey results seemed to indicate that female students experienced a decline in self confidence during their 4 years at Westmont

This notion surprised me in some ways and in other ways it didn’t.

While I had a primarily positive experience as a Westmont student, I wouldn’t say it was particularly easy to be a woman at Westmont, despite the higher numbers of female students on campus. As I think back, I attribute my own challenges to a number of things including:

- The move from a large secular, public high school to a smaller Christian college where I felt less unique than I had in my past.
- Unrealistic expectations about academic rigor, relationships
- Living in close proximity with many other women. I grew up with a brother and it was a huge change to live with so many other women.
- The rigor of a college sport

So, in hearing from faculty and staff the results of this research, I began to dig in to look at these survey results.

- Senior Survey: 2006, Page 14, Leadership Abilities, Page 15, Social Self Confidence
- Longitudinal Study, 2006, Page 7, Drive to achieve, physical health, emotional health

So, I held focus groups. 2 groups of 8 women each. Ranged in majors and class years.

1. At the end of your first-year were you satisfied with the Westmont experience? Why or why not?
   - Yes, first year fun difficult and challenging. “I grew up a lot”
   - One woman said, “I was pleasantly surprised”
   - Almost everyone still closest friends with people they lived with first year.

2. Let’s do a quick round robin. Fill in the blank for this sentence:
   a. I enjoy being a woman on the Westmont campus because
   b. I do not enjoy being a woman on the Westmont campus because

   - Friendship with other women. The community
   - Proud to be a woman here because my ideas are respected by faculty, staff & peers (more so than they would be on a secular campus)

   - Guy-girl ratio; Lack of guy/girl relationships; underlying competition with other women “I need to put in a solid effort to be asked to a dance”
   - Stereotypes and lifestyle of SB (body type, abilities, etc)
• Expectations to be married, especially as a senior, expectation to succeed in all areas of life
• Body image issues are prevalent here.

3. What are the three most influential factors that dictate the quality of the student experience for women on campus? Think broadly to in and out of classroom experiences, living situations, relationship dynamics, demographics, cultural factors, etc. [Write your responses on your index card. Rank your responses]

• Faculty and staff empowering women students; Feeling trusted by faculty and staff and getting to know them outside of the classroom. “Being invested in by faculty.” Could be through research or advising or mentoring.
• Relationships with other women. “The Ratio” (either causes drama & competition or great support from female friends)
• Strong female role models (mostly faculty and staff, although students can help too)
• Having a good RA & living situations; learning to live with other people
• Athletic teams, small group opportunities
• Choice of a major
• Expectations entering Westmont—are you looking for a boyfriend, looking to get straight As

4. How do the experiences of male and female students differ at Westmont?
• Women tend to be looking first for a good education, then a good time, men search for these in the reverse order
• Mention of men respecting women at Westmont because men stand up on the shuttle and allow women to sit
• Perhaps closer bonding of all men on campus because there are fewer of them. Two events identified of which there’s no female equivalent: pillow fight, and the Viking feast
• Men surrounded by great women and they tend to hang out with other guys & play video games. Because it’s intimidating, lots of pressure, expectations about being serious about a relationship right away.

5. On your index card please number 1-5 and rate whether you have improved, declined or stayed the same in the following areas during your time at Westmont. If there are items that most students report a decline in discuss why.

   a. Emotional health
   • Most reported improvement in this area due to becoming more independent, learning to live with other people
   • For those who reported a decline, it tended to be those who had significant cultural changes to adjust to. Either different faith experiences, perhaps growing up internationally, being in the racial socio-economic minority

   b. Physical health
   • Busyness tends to keep people from focusing on physical health.
   • Many women were active in high school and are no longer so. They’re too busy and not involved in a sport.
   • Difficult to find time to see doctor for preventative health & some faculty are skeptical of students’ need to be away from class for medical reasons
   • Quality of gym poor—very uncomfortable to go in there with some men lifting. Also “Girls prowling over elliptical machines”. Hard to get one.
   • DC and all you can eat meal plan makes it difficult to have a healthy diet
   • More of an acceptance for poor sleep patterns. People go to bed too late and it’s ok to pull an all nighter
   • Few options for women’s athletics outside of PE requirements or varsity sports.

   c. Drive to achieve
• Declined at first due to the make up of the class—everyone was smart and a leader of sorts—had to figure out a new identity.
• Choosing a good major helped increase ambition and confidence
• drive to achieve declined—burned out.

d. Academic self-confidence
• Women taking higher level science or math courses tend to struggle with academic confidence. They often feel that they don’t belong. Many of the women in these classes are from a variety of majors and don’t know one another. The men tend to come from similar majors and have formed study groups and cohorts and they support and encourage one another in achieving academic success. Sometimes they’re encouraged to focus on areas of study that feel more comfortable. For example, you like poly sci. and education and if they feel better why don’t you focus on them instead. It’s the path of least resistance. They really need encouragement from faculty that they can do it, that they are expected to ask questions and that no question is stupid, to visit office hours and to connect with women who have successfully completed that course in the past.
• work load great and so I’ve declined in academic self confidence

e. Personal self-confidence
• Many women have learned what it really means to be self confident and that it isn’t about being better than others but knowing who you are, accepting it and being able to articulate that to others. Also, learning to accept others.

6. How can the student experience for women at Westmont be improved?

• Increase the number of women faculty—should come closer to matching the % of women students on campus. Although, this was a double edged sword because women faculty seemed to be harder on women students; perhaps because the women faculty really wanted the women students to do well
• Comments from professors mean so much. Receiving positive feedback and encouragement on papers or in person is extremely helpful. Just hearing, “I think you can do this” is so empowering. Being believed in. When you see something outstanding in your students point it out
• Women students want women mentors. Some really miss having older women in their lives investing in them
• Appreciate that students are referred to as women and not girls here
• Suggestions for programs: Women’s retreat-- Wanted events where you can talk and get to know other women. A place where you feel comfortable opening up.
• Also, need more long term programs to address women’s issues including eating disorders and relationships with men—support groups throughout the year. Perhaps topical study groups. Focus weeks good but when they end people feel stuck.
# APPENDIX F

## OUTCOMES FOR OFFICE OF LIFE PLANNING

Last revised June 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Strategies (Activities) – How do we help them develop these skills?</th>
<th>Measure of Success – How will we document this skill?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepare an effective, targeted resume</td>
<td>Attend a resume workshop, “resume doctor,” career class, or receive individual instruction</td>
<td>Resume approval from a staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Articulate the key features of an effective job search</td>
<td>Attend a job search workshop or career class</td>
<td>Post workshop assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competency in answering behavioral question in a job interview</td>
<td>Attend an interviewing workshop or program (e.g., WBIC’s sponsored event), or career class</td>
<td>Demonstrated ability as evaluated in a mock interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to choose a major</td>
<td>Access one-on-one career counseling, attend “choosing a major” workshop</td>
<td>Student will successfully choose major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop a career plan or set of goals</td>
<td>Take “Career and Life Planning” class, access one-on-one career counseling</td>
<td>Student will write (or verbalize) a statement reflecting a plan/goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Be able to articulate work-related skills</td>
<td>Skills exercise in class or counseling</td>
<td>Student creates a list of their top motivating skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Be able to articulate work-related values</td>
<td>Values exercise in class or counseling</td>
<td>Student creates a list of their top values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Understand and be able to articulate key personality characteristics</td>
<td>Personality assessment in counseling or class</td>
<td>Student affirms and articulates a personality profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Understand and be able to articulate work-related interests</td>
<td>Interest Inventory in counseling or class</td>
<td>Student affirms and articulates their key motivating interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Access information on jobs and how to find them</td>
<td>Provide students with resource of NACELink</td>
<td>Determine from website how many students are accessing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Understanding of their career decision-making process</td>
<td>Workshop, one-on-one counseling, or career class</td>
<td>Student reflects understanding verbally or in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Be able to articulate work-related strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>Interviewing workshop, career class, individual counseling</td>
<td>At the end of program or activity, student displays ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Knowledge of graduate school decision-making process, application and information access</td>
<td>Graduate school workshop, special grad school information programs, individual counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ability to conduct an informational interview</td>
<td>Instruction in career class, individual counseling</td>
<td>Student reports back on interview experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Through work study program, students will learn basics of job acquisition, job etiquette and effective work skills</td>
<td>Dolphin Center child care program overseen by our office, in conjunction with Cold Spring School</td>
<td>OLP staff member evaluates student performance as does on-site supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. OLP student workers will learn basics of work skills</td>
<td>Instruction and oversight by OLP staff</td>
<td>Staff evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Students will receive instruction on a biblical view of work and God’s will</td>
<td>Individual counseling, career class, workshops and retreats</td>
<td>Assessments following activity/instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18. Ability to function comfortably and appropriately at a business meal</strong></td>
<td>“Etiquette Dinner” for seniors, and programming at resident halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19. Make wise career and life planning decisions</strong></td>
<td>One-on-one career counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20. Gain a deeper understanding of the importance of knowing and affirming difference</strong></td>
<td>Myers-Briggs Type Indicator given and processed in a variety of settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21. A majority of recent alumni have attained employment that is meaningful and satisfying</strong></td>
<td>All of our workshops, handouts, one-on-one counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>22. Resident Assistant candidates will be able to effectively present themselves in their application process both in their resume and in the interview</strong></td>
<td>Attendance at a specially designed workshop to help RA candidates in resume and interviewing preparation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: Intercultural Programs Learning Plan

Mission, Objectives, Strategies, Learning Outcomes, Assessment

Mission: the overriding purpose of the program
Objectives: general statements to indicate what the program intends to accomplish
Strategies: specific programming, policies, and procedures used to meet the objectives
Measurable Learning Outcomes: a measurable description of what students should know or do as a result of the strategies
Assessment: systematic collection, review, and use of information undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development (Marchese, Thinking about Learning…, 1998)

A. What is the department’s mission statement?

VISION
For Westmont to be the kind of place where we can share the fullness of our experiences and are supported, validated and encouraged in our journey of faith and life.

MISSION STATEMENT
To provide resources to cultivate open dialogue, encourage healthy debate and deepen relationships surrounding the challenges and realities that come with living in an increasingly diverse campus, society and world.

B. List 6-8 general objectives for your department. (EAR and the college’s six learning standards are shared objectives within the Student Life Division and do not need to be listed. Use E, A, or R to note the ones that support EAR. In the same way, note those that any that support Christian Orientation, CO; Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking, CT; Diversity, D; Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement, AE; Written and Oral Communication, C; and Research and Technology, RT. These examples of the ways your department supports EAR and college learning standards will be used to map the Student Life Division’s support of these broader objectives.)

OBJECTIVES
1. To foster an environment in which students, staff and faculty live out their faith while impacting our global society. A,R,D
2. To create opportunities to share and express our own unique and individual backgrounds. A,R,D
3. To encourage students to embrace their cultural heritage while accepting others. R,D
4. To build God’s global kingdom for his glory. E,R,CO
5. To seek justice and equity for all through our attitudes and actions. R,D,AE
6. To seek racial reconciliation as directed by biblical principles. R,D,CO
7. To take initiative in our learning about historical and current racial, ethnic, cultural or gender based injustices. R,D,AE

C. Please list the strategies (programs, policies, procedures, etc.) that your department utilizes to meet your objectives in “B” above. Feel free to use or delete sample strategies.

STRATEGIES
1. Racial Equality and Justice (REJ): A student-led group, which educates students about current race relations, racism, white privilege and racial justice through films, group discussions, readings and an annual spring break service learning project to Jackson, MS and Birmingham, AL.
2. Intercultural Organizations: Student-led groups that plan monthly programs focused on race, culture and/or ethnicity as a means of supporting and educating students. Examples are the Asian Student Association, Black Student Union and the Latino Cultural Organization.
3. ICP Reading Circles: Every semester, ICP chooses a book for students to read and discuss.
4. Faculty Partnerships for programs such as speakers, theatre and music.
5. Special Emphasis Months or Holidays such as MLK day, Hispanic Heritage Month, etc.
6. Student Life Partnerships for programs such as Section Connections (Residence Life) and Campus Life Office (Women’s Tea and Student Leaders Training)
7. Conferences: Bring students to the annual Student Congress on Racial Reconciliation (SCORDR) at Biola
8. Workshops: Attend or facilitate workshops to address dismantling -isms such as racism or sexism.

D. List 6-8 measurable learning outcomes for your department. (If the learning outcome supports one of the college’s 6 learning standards or student life’s EAR objectives, please note.)

**MEASURABLE LEARNING OUTCOMES**

As a result of students participating in REJ, they should be able to:

1. Describe the general history of race and racism in the U.S.
2. Name three major figures and events in the Civil Rights Movement.
3. Articulate a biblical mandate for diversity, racial reconciliation and social justice.
4. Discuss issues of race, race relations and racism with diplomacy and composure.
5. Express their perspectives with freedom and without fear of rejection and judgment.
6. Share with peers outside of REJ about their experiences and what they are learning.

E. Pick one learning outcome each year from the above list, choose an assessment method, and report your findings below.

Questions to ask about the method (Bresciani, *Outcomes assessment in student affairs*, 2002):

1. Will the assessment method help me understand what it is that I am doing that is contributing to the end result stated in the learning outcome?
2. Will the assessment method help me understand why I am delivering the services in the way that I am?
3. Will the evidence collected from this method help me make the decisions I need to improve my program or help me understand how to maintain the status quo?

**ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES**

1. Fill out quiz on first day of training about Civil Rights Movement.
2. Fill out a form to assess their knowledge of the Civil Rights Movement in US prior and after their experience in Mississippi and Alabama.
3. Journal their experience prior to, during and after their experience.
4. Debrief the team for a session to discuss their experience.
Thank you for submitting your September report. The report reflects an excellent review of both assessment and program review. Your report is well organized and comprehensive. You have continued your strong program review history and have made good progress this year toward meeting your goals for your six year review in 2014. We want to affirm the efforts of the division in articulating outcomes and connecting them clearly to the mission and learning objectives of the division and college. We also affirm your ongoing work in assessing these outcomes.

**Division Program Review Goals for 2009-2010**

We appreciate the way you have responded to the suggestions made by the January 2009 external review of Residence Life, and also your intent to conduct an external review of the Campus Pastor’s Office. We note that learning plans are expected from Residence Life, Counseling Services, and Health Services, and we would like to review those documents. We also note that all departments are scheduled to select an assessment tool and establish an assessment timeline, and we would like to follow up on that as well.

**Division Program Review Efforts for 2008-2009**

You have responded to feedback from your 2008 annual report and clarified the Six Year Program Review and Assessment Plan (Appendix A, page 9), making it more readable and informative. Thank you for your efforts in presenting this information and for providing a long term schedule and vision for program review. We also affirm the efforts to complete learning plans for Campus Life, Office of Life Planning, and Intercultural Programs. We note your statement that all departments included a section on their program review progress in the year-end reports, but we do not see updates from Counseling or Health Services, and we would like to follow up on that.

**Departmental Program Review Updates**

**Campus Life**

We would like to praise the Campus Life Office for excellent work in the areas of program review and assessment. We appreciate your clear thinking and diligent efforts. Here are just a few comments:
mission statement: we again would like to ask whether the expression “all areas of life” is too broad? Also, we again ask whether the mission statement should speak of the department’s collaboration with other departments?

learning outcomes: we affirm your efforts to narrow down your learning outcomes and to prioritize them. Perhaps a next step would be to map these outcomes to college-wide standards; this may also help to clarify and condense them. New forms are available for this purpose from the Program Review Committee.

longitudinal survey and monthly reports: we affirm these assessment efforts and believe that the results will prove very helpful.

Individual meetings with student leaders: we affirm this practice, although time consuming, as an important part of what you are doing.

**Office of Life Planning**

We commend the efforts of the Office of Life Planning in developing a comprehensive set of learning outcomes. We also affirm your activities in assessment of the skills workshop. Here is some feedback:

Outcomes: We recommend that you continue to work on these outcomes, condensing them, prioritizing them, and relating them to the college-wide learning standards. We suggest that you consult with the Campus Life Office for strategies in condensing outcomes, as this is a process in which they have recently engaged.

**ICP**

We would like to affirm the significant efforts of the Intercultural Programs Office in writing detailed responses to each of the recommendations of the external review. We also affirm your assessment of the Racial Equality and Justice (REJ) program. Here is specific feedback:

Response to external review recommendation 12: A possible next step to work toward campus-wide diversity training would be to discuss it with your mentor Yolanda Garcia and College Vice President of Administration and Planning Chris Call.

**Residence Life**

The committee praises the efforts of Residence Life in undergoing an external review and in writing a detailed plan and time table for responding to the recommendations of the review team. We commend Residence Life for the positive feedback the office received from the reviewers. We would like to meet with you to discuss the development of your learning plan.

**Campus Pastor’s Office**

We would like to affirm the plan of the Campus Pastor’s Office to undergo an external review this year. We also affirm their instituting of a log of chapel evaluations and ongoing work with Professor Lesa Stern.

The program review committee again thanks and commends the Student Life Division for the quality of your work in program review and assessment.