OVERVIEW OF 2010-2011 (Sections 1-8):

Tim Wilson, Associate Dean of Students, attended the WASC Level 1 Retreat in Anaheim, September 23-24, 2010. The retreat was extremely helpful because a session led by Dr. Mary Allen, former Director for the California State University institute for Teaching and Learning, was specifically tailored to Student Life (Assessment for Student Affairs Staff and Other Campus Professionals). Dr. Allen’s presentation expanded Student Life assessment objectives to include process objectives and satisfaction indicators in addition to learning outcomes. The new template for annual departmental reports (pgs 4-5) was updated to include all three objectives.

While attending the WASC Level 1 Retreat, Tim was mentored by Dr. Laurie Dodge, Associate Vice Chancellor on Institutional Assessment and Planning for Brandman University. Dr. Dodge’s emphasis that “less is better” reinforced input from our Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness, Dr. Tatiana Nazarenko. Dr. Dodge was most impressed with the Student Life Division’s practice of regular external reviews. As a result of her input, the new template provides a 2-year period for departments to focus totally their assessment efforts on the important step to “close the loop” on the feedback and recommendations from external reviews (page 3).

The departmental reports follow the updated template presented in Section 1. Sections 2-4 are the reports from those departments that focused on external reviews. The Campus Life Office hosted an external review in January, 2011, and Section 2 presents the full report and the preliminary responses to the recommendations. Section 3 is a progress report from the Campus Pastor’s Office one year after their external review (February, 2010). Section 4 is a progress report from Residence Life two years after their external review (January, 2009).

Sections 5-8 include the separate reports for all departments that did not have a recent external review. The reports follow the updated template (pgs 4-5) and are presented in this order: Office of Life Planning (Section 5), Intercultural Programs (Section 6), Health Center (Section 7), and Counseling Center (Section 8).

STUDENT LIFE DIVISION PROGRAM REVIEW FOCUS FOR 2011-2012 (Section 9)

Stu Cleek (Associate Dean for Residence Life) in consultation with Angela D’Amour (Director of Campus Life) laid the groundwork for this year’s focus by facilitating a number of conversations regarding programming over the past two academic years with the Dean’s Council. The Dean’s Council includes the VP/Dean of Students, Associate Dean of Students, Associate Dean for Residence Life, Director of Campus Life, Director of Intercultural Programs, Campus Pastor, and Director of the Office of Life Planning. Questions emerged about programming redundancies, potential for greater collaboration among departments, insuring alignment to institutional goals, priorities as a division, and the notion of a student life curriculum.

As a result of those conversations, the Student Life Division decided to pause for one year and not have each of the seven departments (Intercultural Programs Office; Office of Life Planning; Residence Life; Health Center; Counseling Center; Campus Life, Campus Pastor’s Office) continue their assessment work by following the reporting guidelines established by the updated template. Instead, all professional staff in the division are involved in an intensive project that seeks to evaluate and maximize the developmental impact of our programs as well as to insure alignment of departmental programming with institutional goals.

In a meeting with Tatiana Nazarenko, it became clear that Student life efforts are really focused on four of the eight institutional goals:

1. Christian Understanding/Practices/Affections: Westmont graduates will be informed about the Christian faith, and we desire that their lives be characterized by practices, affections, and virtues that grow out of a life of Christian faith. In keeping with that faith, we are committed to pursuing these goals in a spirit of hospitality and invitation.
Overview

2. **Diversity and Global Awareness**: Our graduates have the understanding and skills to engage people unlike themselves—both individuals and groups—in ways that affirm others as persons created in God’s image.

3. **Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement**: As a result of their educational program, our graduates will have the skills, attitudes and commitments that enable them to be effective in both their personal and vocational lives throughout all the stages of their lives.

4. **Physical and Emotional Health**: Recognizing that mind, body, and spirit are inseparably linked, our graduates will be equipped with the skills, attitudes and knowledge that will prepare them to pursue a life of balance—physically, emotionally and spiritually.

Section 9 includes four documents that provide a glimpse of the plan we are following this year (2011-2012). The division is indebted to Stu Cleek for his leadership in guiding this effort. The first document, *Five Conversations for Development*, outlines 4 division-wide 2-hour meetings where all professional staff work together to develop a *Blueprint for 2012 and Beyond*. The remainder of spring semester will focus on implementing the blueprint.

In addition to the 5 division-wide conversations, all professional staff have been divided into 4 small groups that are looking specifically at the 4 institutional goals listed above. The second document, *Digging Deeper in Small Groups*, outlines the process each group will follow to develop a white paper. These white papers will be presented at two of the large group gatherings (November 7 and 14).

The third document included in this section, *Student Life—Institutional Learning Goals*, provides an initial look at how student life priorities and programming efforts align with institutional goals.

The final document, *Key Current Program Strategies for Development*, will be completed by each department as one step in the process we are undertaking this fall. The completed chart will be helpful as we look more carefully at programming redundancies, potential for greater collaboration among departments, insuring alignment to institutional goals, our priorities as a division.

As a footnote to this year’s assessment focus, Tatiana has arranged for Dr. Katie Busby, Director of Institutional Assessment, at Tulane University to do a comprehensive review of this year’s annual report. Katie is responsible for planning, organizing, and directing campus-wide assessment activities at Tulane so her feedback will be invaluable as we continue our efforts in program review.
Annual Program Review Report Template
Student Life
2010-2011

Annual Program Review Report for Departments with recent External Reviews

- All reports should be written so that any reader outside of the college will be able to understand when the review took place, the recommendations, and the follow-up.
- Departments that conducted an external review in the current year will submit a report with three sections:
  1. the complete External Review (confidential personnel information need not appear);
  2. preliminary departmental response to recommendations; and
  3. an outline of how you will use the next two years to respond to the recommendations.
- In the first two* years following the external review, the report will contain these three sections:
  1. an introduction describing the external review process.
  2. response to each recommendation
     i. indicate what was done this past year and what you intend to do, if anything, in the upcoming year.
     ii. indicate which staff member will be responsible to give oversight to the follow-up planned in the coming year.
     iii. include a thorough explanation of any disagreement with the recommendation
     iv. indicate the reasons/obstacles to explain why you and your staff are not able to respond to the recommendation
  3. Summarize your plans to respond to the recommendations that were detailed in section 2. It might be helpful to create a table that shows the task, date task is to be completed, and the person(s) assigned to the task.

*NOTE: some departments will not need two years to follow-up on recommendations of external review; those departments will return to the standard report format for the Annual Program Review in the second year.

- External reviews schedule:
  - 2008-2009 Residence Life Department
  - 2009-2010 Campus Pastor’s Office
  - 2010-2011 Campus Life
  - 2011-2012 DIVISION WIDE PROGRAMMING AND ALIGNMENT PROJECT
  - 2012-2013 Counseling Center
  - 2013-2014 VP/Dean of Students Office
  - 2014-2015 Office of Life Planning
  - 2015-2016 Health Center
  - 2016-2017 Intercultural Programs
  - 2017-2018 Residence Life
  - 2018-2019 Campus Pastor’s Office

EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORTING FOR 2010-2011 INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT

Section 2: Campus Life Department (January 2011 External Review and preliminary responses)

Section 3: Campus Pastor’s Office (responses one year after 2010 review)

Section 4: Residence Life (responses two years after 2009 review)
Annual Program Review Report for all other Student Life Departments

All reports should be written so that any reader outside of the college will be able to understand all sections without additional context or interpretation.

Section I: Mission Statement

Section II: Focus of Assessment Plan
Learning Outcomes, Process Objectives, and Satisfaction Indicators

As you look at the next six years, what are your 3-5 critical* assessment objectives? You may select learning outcomes, process objectives, or satisfaction indicators, but no more than 5 total. Tatiana requests that you only focus on one critical objective in a given year so you can analyze it in depth. (*you may have other objectives that you regularly assess, but your report should only include the critical assessment objective selected for that particular year.)

Section III: Response to feedback from Program Review Committee

Include a summary of your response to any feedback received in this past year from the Program Review Committee.

Section IV: Annual Progress

A. Describe your assessment work.
   1. Include or describe the instrument/technique used to gather the data.
   2. Indicate the size of your data set(s) and describe the group from which the data was gathered.
   3. Did your work lead to any benchmark data?
   4. Did your work help you to compare against any previously established benchmarks?

B. Interpret the Results.
   1. Summarize how you analyzed the data.
   2. How effective were the assessment methods that were used? Will you conduct the same assessment again? When? Will you make any changes to the assessment instrument/technique?
   3. What conclusions did your department make based on the data collected?

C. Close the loop. What does your department plan to do in response to what you have learned?
   1. What changes, if any, will be made in light of what you have learned?
   2. What results might other student life or faculty departments benefit from knowing? How will/did these results get communicated?
   3. What is the timeline to implement a response to what you have learned? Who is responsible?
   4. What new or revised goals have been set by the department in response to what has been learned?

Section V: Program Review focus for the upcoming area

As you look at your six year plan, what is your focus for the upcoming year?
Section VI: Appendices

1. Appendix 1: Student Contact
   A. What annual data did you collect that helps quantify the student contact by your department?
   B. How does this contact compare to previous years? What conclusions did you draw from this comparison?

2. Appendix 2: Collaboration
   (provide a summary of how you collaborated with student life and faculty departments during the past year)

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW REPORTS FOR 2010-2011 INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT

   Section 5: Office of Life Planning
   Section 6: Intercultural Programs
   Section 7: Health Center
   Section 8: Counseling Center
External Review Report  
January 2011  
Submitted by  
Dr. Mark Troyer and Review Team

Review Team:  
Dr. Mark Troyer, Vice President for Student Development, Asbury University;  
Leigh Remy, Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Students, Dartmouth College;  
Dr. Jane Wilson, Assistant Professor of Education, Westmont College;  
Daniel Clapp, Resident Director of Emerson Hall, Westmont College

Introduction

The review team would first like to thank Angela D’Amour and the Campus Life Office staff for the excellent communication, preparation and hosting of the review team prior to, and during the external review process. Materials were delivered in a timely manner, and preparation and communication prior to the review were very helpful and well organized. The visit itself, though busy, was pleasant, efficient and a great experience for the team. We want to especially thank Angela for the willingness to flex and adjust the schedule periodically and for arranging wonderful weather as a couple of us came from very cold climates!

The Review Visit

It was helpful to have the materials sent ahead of time in a notebook that the reviewers could examine and form some initial understanding of the operations of the department and of the context (thanks for including the organizational charts) in which the Campus Life Office operates. Especially helpful was the history document which gave some good background on the iterations of how this office has been organized and focused in the past.

It should be noted that it was especially helpful to have a broad representation of the Westmont community invited to take part in interviews with the committee. Over 50 individuals including senior administrators, Student Life staff, faculty, administrators and students were included and invited to be interviewed by the committee. It was very beneficial to have a good representation of each of these groups with close to 20 students of varying levels of involvement with the Campus Life Office and 8 faculty members participating. It was very helpful to have Dr. Wilson and Danny Clapp as part of the team due to their tenure and broad understanding of the campus.

The committee felt that the Westmont personnel were willing to be frank, honest and respectful in the “probing” despite the team sometimes asking tough questions. It is apparent, (though not without periodic bumps and conflicts like any other campus) that the faculty, staff and students at Westmont truly respect and feel good about the Campus Life Office staff and about the Student Life office in general.

The Report

This report will be organized in such a way as to try to pull out major themes that the team observed and to give some periodic examples that support those themes regarding commendations and challenges. We realize that our overall view is limited by time and exposure to the culture of Westmont, and by the materials provided, but are fairly confident as a committee that in most areas we saw enough triangulation to affirm our summary observations.

The final section of the document will provide some considerations and recommendations based on our observations, knowledge of best practices and experience with other campuses. These recommendations should be taken as friendly ideas and suggestions for how to improve what seems to be a department that has an overall good reputation and healthy functioning on this campus. We also realize that the context and climate in which the review is being conducted is not a time where schools are significantly expanding staffing levels and funding for new programs so the team was conscious of the challenges involved in recommendations that include significant expanding of services or offerings.
Themes

The team found it challenging to address specific themes in the Campus Life Office without addressing and summarizing broader campus culture themes that help frame the context in which the staff operates. We offer these themes first.

Lots of programs, some coordination/collaboration
The committee found that Westmont is a campus where lots of things happen. There seem to be significant programming expectations across campus including Campus Life Office Student Organizations, Residence Halls, Intercultural Programs office, clubs/organizations, and academic departments. The wide range of campus events (e.g., activities, athletics, music) sponsored by faculty, staff, students, admissions, and other departments seem to compete for space, priority and PR.

Although responsibility for programming areas is broadly defined by office missions, there are areas of overlap. Community members routinely noted that although collaboration was a shared value, the organizational culture fostered collaboration primarily through relationships rather than organizational structures. The absence of a single centralized events calendar (one exists for external audiences but is focused on major campus events), the space scheduling process, and confusion about the continued existence of an annual calendaring meeting were examples staff shared of structural changes and/or tools that could foster closer collaboration at the campus level. Within Student Life, staff discussed a spring program preview for the upcoming academic year and more routine updates within the Deans Council meeting as possible tools for fostering more meaningful collaboration.

One senior administrator stated the there is a “culture of radical de-centralization” here and that the “campus fights control and formulas.” While excellent programs and events do occur, this culture makes it easy for ambiguity to be present on who is responsible for program success and allows for some randomness in program offerings.

Culture of student leadership/responsibility for events/programs
There seems to be a long-standing history of significant student initiative and involvement in leading trips, events, and programs at Westmont. WCSA, WAC, Potters Clay, Emmaus Road, WSM, SPIC, and Spring Sing all rely on significant student leadership. The committee affirms this culture, but also points out that sometimes it seems to create a tension in how to shape or develop the direction the students take with projects and events. Campus Life Office staff is charged with advising, but seem to not feel as much freedom to direct or shape programming within the student organization culture. Fiscal responsibility, safety concerns, and program quality were all mentioned as rationale for close advising of student missions and organizations.

Some staff and faculty affirmed the “intentional/philosophical” approach to allowing students to take ownership in significant programs; others suggested that with lack of large staffs this was a way to still have important co-curricular programming occur even though there wasn’t the direct staff oversight that could in fact be helpful if funding and resources were available. As staffing has been added in the Campus Life office, advisors sometimes wonder how much supervision or direction to offer students.

Some staff and faculty were not aware of the overall responsibilities or structure of the Campus Life Office, though most who interacted directly with Angela, Michelle or Jeremy had very positive things to say about their work and impact.

“Collaboration and silos”
We often heard the term collaboration, but with mixed and sometimes conflicting reactions. The Campus Life Office staff were cited as being more than willing to collaborate and were praised for collaborative work on initiatives such as Focus Week and Leaders Retreat. Other statements about collaboration seemed to infer that it was encouraged in Student Life but tough to carry out. As a very busy office, there seemed to be a tendency to operate independently from others in the office or in the division. The term “silo” was used on a number of occasions to describe how the different offices in Student Life sometimes operated.
One staff member shared that the Dean’s council was discussing a larger “Student Life Curriculum.” The Review team strongly supports this type of effort as it would bring some practical “handles” to programming goals. It would also encourage interdepartmental and intradepartmental dialogue on how the identified issues and topics are being covered on Westmont’s campus.

**Staff well respected**
As interviewees described Angela, Jeremy, and Michelle’s interactions on campus, they were typically in very respectful and appreciative terms. Students often mentioned the mentoring aspect of their leadership and the individual attention and care given to their development. They feel known, empowered, and free to “make mistakes” which they identify as important to learning. Faculty appreciated the work of the Campus Life Office and the quality of programs that they are involved in.

**Desire for addressing relevant, contemporary topics**
Focus Week was quoted often as a good model of collaboration, an example of sophisticated programming and a thematic approach to exploring important topics. A number of people expressed interest in more campus programming around pressing current issues. Town hall meetings and rapid response-type events were cited as important to continue to develop.

**Commendations**
In this section we happily pass on some “kudos” and encouragement in areas that were consistently identified as strengths for the Campus Life Office. General commendations are those overarching positives about the personnel or programs. We thought it would also be helpful to identify some specific things that were cited as positive and those are included as well.

**General**
A mentoring mentality came across as we explored the interactions that the staff had with students. The idea that Angela, Michelle and Jeremy pour into the students with whom they have a relationships was strong. Their interest in developing students as whole people is obvious. The staff seem to spend a lot of time with individual students in advising and pouring into their life via one-on-one times, coffee chats etc. This is important, but should also be balanced with the other duties in running their programs and office.

Faculty and staff seemed to speak favorably about the interactions they had with the Campus Life Office staff and that the staff were open to suggestions and ideas. The CLO staff has done an excellent job asking for and welcoming feedback. They use the feedback to make adjustments to future programs/events Multiple people mentioned Michelle’s handling of a faculty member’s critique of orientation and that she responded in a positive and professional way; her appearance during the Faculty forum was noted as strategic, informative and collaborative. A number of staff and faculty mentioned the skill set that Jeremy brings to the missions and ministry area and are appreciative of some more active involvement and supervision in those important Westmont programs. Angela’s leadership and ideas were mentioned multiple times and faculty and staff were encouraged that she had come back to Westmont and that the office “has never functioned as well as since she arrived”.

Staff and faculty mentioned on a number of occasions they appreciated the collaboration that occurred and that activities generated through this office are generally of high quality. There was a sense that more collaboration and involvement in programs would be appreciated.

We applaud the desire to have a more specific and targeted focus and direction on programming targets and curriculum.

**Specific**
The campus life staff have initiated some new programs and continued with some traditional programs that were mentioned. We cite here some specific commendations on things we heard multiple times.

- Student Leader retreat at the Islands was a hit and should be continued.
• First year retreat was appreciated by freshmen who attended. Students liked John Young’s session about how to get the most out of Westmont and perhaps that could be added to the overall orientation schedule.
• Publicity for big events seems of higher quality lately.
• Principle of Leadership Live lunches is great, tweaking of content and who is targeted to attend may be useful.
• Focus Weeks were cited often as a good collaborative effort, potential for more of this type of programming that addresses current events and issues was mentioned numerous times.
• Taiko Drum event was great example of collaboration.
• Jeremy’s advising and work with trips to bring budgets back in to order was mentioned a number of times.

Orientation itself seems to be well received, a couple in the division mentioned they would like to have a bit of time at the event somewhere… (Intercultural Programs and Office of Life Planning) Orientation can support recent gains in diversifying the student population by underscoring the value of intercultural awareness for all students. Additionally, President Beebe expressed a long term interest in broadening the focus on life-planning. This dialogue could be introduced during Orientation.

The overall feel of the review was that the office is in a positive trajectory and that even in the last year there have been improvements and positive things happening. Angela’s leadership in the office was mentioned as a positive often.

Future Challenges

In an environment of limited resources and tight budgets that aren’t necessarily expanding, it is important to maximize time and resources and to work smarter and more efficiently in delivering quality programs and services for students. The Campus Life Office will need to continue to evaluate best ways to spend time, prioritizing what is important for the campus and to seek ways to work together with others to achieve sometimes overlapping goals and objectives.

Westmont in general is a very active campus with many educational programs being offered and often it seems that even within Student Life some departments aren’t aware of what other departments are doing. A future challenge will be to work toward a four year curriculum of student development activities and programs. Additionally, an important challenge will be to develop a more centralized calendar or system of communication where constituencies on campus can be made aware of activities, events, programs.

A specific challenge for the Campus Life Office will be to identify the niche programming for which they are responsible. With a clear focus of their programming, the Campus Life Office will want to communicate their offerings to the campus as a whole and in particular to the Residence Life Staff and other areas within the Student Life Division.

We would also encourage the staff to continue to dialogue on the balance of advising versus directing when it comes to student organizations and leaders. It seems that the historical culture has been more “hands off” with student groups sometimes to the detriment of their own leadership development. There seems to be an open window of opportunity to be more intentional and carefully directive in leading students in their own planning and programming so that leadership development is occurring while at the same time events and programs are being offered that meet the goals of the department, division and College.

Programming for first year students is a future challenge that will need some continued evaluation and recommendations. It seems on Westmont’s campus to have “multiple owners.” Residence Life has first year RDs, Michelle Hardley is involved in the academic side of supporting and advising first year students, and Michelle Mollkoy is charged with co-curricular programs supporting first year students. We also heard at least once of discussions of possible academic classes for first year students. It seems that clarification and strategic planning for this area is needed and will likely take a task force of some sort at least with the Provost’s Office, Campus Life Office, Residence Life and Michelle Hardley’s office involved.

Another challenge is to determine how to address student’s spiritual formation. We discovered at least three different departments that were attempting or had attempted to create some formal small group ministry of some
sort. Capax Dei, bible study groups out of the Campus Pastor’s office, small groups created through residence life, and small groups created through Campus Life office were all attempted with varying levels of success. As a Christian college this is an important issue and for sure spiritual formation is occurring in a variety of ways and through a broad range of people, but a potential future challenge for the Campus Life Office is to determine its role in any formal approach to spiritual formation.

The Women’s retreat was a great addition and planning could include multiple departments which would also give it more credibility and exposure. Staff expressed interest in being involved in the planning of this program. Recent work with student athletes was also recognized as worth continuing. Strong Collaborations can emerge here with staff in Athletics.

**Recommendations/Considerations**

The committee realizes that any recommendation or considerations are based solely on our review of the materials and on the visit interviews as well as some knowledge of what other campuses may be doing in these areas. The Westmont culture and approach to student life as well as any staffing strengths and weaknesses would obviously need to become the lens through which to evaluate these recommendations and considerations. With that disclaimer, the committee recommends that the Campus Life consider the following:

**Campus Activity/Programming Audit**

The committee identified literally hundreds of expected programs that were happening or planned throughout campus. It would be beneficial for someone (perhaps even a student worker, intern, student leader) to conduct an audit of all the activities or educational programs that were offered by Campus Life Office and organizations, Intercultural programs, Residence Life, Chapel topics, Life Planning office and other student development related areas. Additionally other programs through institutes, academic departments or other organizations could be added. This process will give a broad view of the types of events and programs available to students, and the committee believes it would show overlaps and possible collaborative partnerships that would allow Campus Life Office (and other departments) to operate more efficiently. It could also serve as a catalyst to revisit and improve the learning outcomes document.

Additionally, there seems to be some excellent quantitative data that could be mined through some of the national assessments that get at issues of students leadership growth and activity involvement on campus. Specific questions on the CIRP, NSSE and other instruments regularly given through the provost’s office could help to assess growth and progress.

**Leadership Training Audit/Campus Leader Inventory**

The term “Student Leader” seemed to be used at Westmont (at least through the Campus Life Office) to be those students involved in student organizations paid through student fees. In addition to the residence life staff (RAs), there are also many other “student leaders” on campus that could potentially benefit from some intentional leadership development. Athletes, worship bands, club presidents, admission office workers, even student managers in work-study positions could be considered student leaders. Additionally there are many staff and faculty on campus that are actually doing leadership training. By doing an audit or inventory of possible student participants and partners who are doing leadership training it would help the Campus Life Office evaluate the next steps in determining whether to move forward on any type of broader leadership training.

There was some level of interest expressed by the athletic department, by some students involved in clubs, and by the campus pastor’s office, and by intercultural programs to include their students in some type of common leadership event(s) or training. The trick would be to partner and maximize some of the expertise already on campus and to create a culture of leadership development.

The beginning of the year period seems like a time where many student groups are here early for training and practice and preparation. Even a common commissioning service or common devotional times with a leadership challenge or theme that is common could begin to bring a broader range of student leaders together and create a culture of leadership development.

It would also be beneficial to the department to explore curricular connections, reviewing the curriculum and developing a listing of academic courses that further an understanding of leadership. Monitoring work being done
by the experiential learning task force and staying apprised of discussions of a first-year course would also be beneficial.

**First Year Students Task Force**
We mentioned this previously in the section on challenges. In order to further define the specific first year student programs needed, it may be helpful to create a task force to meet a few times over the next semester to give direction to a more coordinated effort in supporting and programming for first year students.

**Centralized Calendar**
The Campus Life Office could be a catalyst for creating dialogue on a more centralized process for adding dates and events to a master programming calendar on campus (similar to the academic calendar and athletic calendar created in “Google calendars”). We understand that the Dean’s Council has started discussions on a Student Life Curriculum that could shape what type of programming should be occurring over the course of a year or four year period. The review team applauds this effort and encourages a broader discussion on a master calendar and even master calendar meeting that would help foster collaboration, awareness, and communication on campus events.

**Staffing Structure**
With the task areas involved in the Campus Life Office the review team felt that it would be beneficial to at least consider possibilities of organizing the office differently. This would also include creative staffing considerations such as an RD assigned ¼ time to Campus Life office, student internships assigned to particular areas within the Campus Life Office, or even Campus Life Office staff somehow intersecting more formally with Campus Pastor’s office or Intercultural Programs office.

**Faculty Involvement**
There was a pleasant surprise in that faculty were pleased when they were asked to contribute their time and expertise in areas of student programs that made sense and honored their skills. Inviting faculty to be a part of Focus Week groups, student leaders retreat, orientation program or leadership lunches could continue to enhance the credibility and relationships across campus and between faculty and Student Life Staff. Additionally, there seemed to be some encouragement from faculty to explore with the Provost’s Office the idea of allowing students to get credit for “serving society and acting justly” through participation in student ministries.

**Conclusion**
The overall impression of the Campus Life Office was that of a staff of very talented and dedicated people. The office is respected on campus even though there isn’t always consistent understanding of how the office is organized. Collaboration is attempted sometimes successfully and sometimes with tension. There is very good programming and mentoring coming out of Campus Life and there is the potential to be a catalyst for more efficient and effective cross functional teams that maximize staff and programming time and offer broader leadership development opportunities.

We were privileged to be able to spend time with the faculty, staff and students of Westmont and hope that some of the ideas and observations will be helpful in the continued growth and development the Campus Life Office. We feel that with some creative exploration in staffing and job descriptions, some higher levels of coordination and communication could occur that would result in a more efficient offering of important student programs and development.
Preliminary Departmental Response to Recommendations
by Angela D’Amour, Director of Campus Life

1. General Response

I’m surprised and challenged by how many of the barriers facing our office are external to our office, but how deeply they impact our work. From a vision for programming to the lack of a centralized campus calendar system, to a cohesive plan for the first year experience, it is difficult that the progress of the Campus Life Office depends on some systems and visions that do not yet exist. Although I see myself as an effective agent in helping to expedite certain external processes, there is only so much I can do when these challenges essentially lie outside of my sphere of influence. However, there are indeed some specific recommendations that will move the Campus Life Office forward in our work and I have listed my responses to these External Review recommendations below.

2. Preliminary responses to specific recommendations

Recommendation One: Campus Activity/Programming Audit

“The committee identified literally hundreds of expected programs that were happening or planned throughout campus. It would be beneficial for someone (perhaps even a student worker, intern, student leader) to conduct an audit of all the activities or educational programs that were offered by Campus Life Office and organizations, Intercultural programs, Residence Life, Chapel topics, Life Planning office and other student development related areas. Additionally other programs through institutes, academic departments or other organizations could be added. This process will give a broad view of the types of events and programs available to students, and the committee believes it would show overlaps and possible collaborative partnerships that would allow Campus Life Office (and other departments) to operate more efficiently. It could also serve as a catalyst to revisit and improve the learning outcomes document.

Additionally, there seems to be some excellent quantitative data that could be mined through some of the national assessments that get at issues of students leadership growth and activity involvement on campus. Specific questions on the CIRP, NSSE and other instruments regularly given through the provost’s office could help to assess growth and progress.”

Preliminary Response to Recommendation One: The Student Life Directors have met periodically this year to discuss what programs and offerings each department has contributed to student learning and from this inventory, we are working to prioritize and clarify a vision for student developmental programming that falls in line with the college’s central learning outcomes for students. As the action committee forms this year to further clarify the vision for programming and discuss implementation possibilities, it will be helpful for the committee to explore what programming is taking place through non-student life areas as well.

Recommendation Two: Leadership Training Audit/Campus Leader Inventory

“The term “Student Leader” seemed to be used at Westmont (at least through the Campus Life Office) to be those students involved in student organizations paid through student fees. In addition to the residence life staff (RAs), there are also many other “student leaders” on campus that could potentially benefit from some intentional leadership development. Athletes, worship bands, club presidents, admission office workers, even student managers in work-study positions could be considered student leaders. Additionally there are many staff and faculty on campus that are actually doing leadership training. By doing an audit or inventory of possible student participants and partners who are doing leadership training it would help the Campus Life Office evaluate the next steps in determining whether to move forward on any type of broader leadership training.

There was some level of interest expressed by the athletic department, by some students involved in clubs, and by the campus pastor’s office, and by intercultural programs to include their students in some type of common leadership event(s) or training. The trick would be to partner and maximize some of the expertise already on campus and to create a culture of leadership development.
The beginning of the year period seems like a time where many student groups are here early for training and practice and preparation. Even a common commissioning service or common devotional times with a leadership challenge or theme that is common could begin to bring a broader range of student leaders together and create a culture of leadership development.

It would also be beneficial to the department to explore curricular connections, reviewing the curriculum and developing a listing of academic courses that further an understanding of leadership. Monitoring work being done by the experiential learning task force and staying apprised of discussions of a first-year course would also be beneficial.”

**Preliminary Response to Recommendation Two:** In the 2011-2012 academic year, the Campus Life Office hopes to send an on-line survey to all faculty and staff to determine who is doing leadership development on campus and what groups of students receive training as student leaders. We also hope to set up one on one interviews with faculty and staff in athletics, admissions, music and other areas that work regularly with student leaders to discuss potential partnerships and best ways to maximize the expertise on campus to create a culture of leadership development. These conversations may lead to the development of a leadership task force and ultimately to a leadership development program that could incorporate and require global study and understanding.

This August, during Student Leader Training, the student leaders within Student Life will join together to share in morning devotional times. The devotionals will highlight a campus leader sharing from Scripture on the topic of leadership development and what a few student leaders have learned over the summer.

**Recommendation Three: First Year Students Task Force**
“We mentioned this previously in the section on challenges. In order to further define the specific first year student programs needed, it may be helpful to create a task force to meet a few times over the next semester to give direction to a more coordinated effort in supporting and programming for first year students.”

**Preliminary Response to Recommendation Three:** Our work with the First Year Experience will begin this fall with a more coordinated First Year Retreat bringing in the expertise of the First Year RDs and a broader spectrum of faculty and staff. Perhaps the individuals involved in the First Year Retreat could continue to meet as members of a task force throughout the fall semester to offer direction to more coordinated programming efforts for the first year student population in upcoming years.

**Recommendation Four: Centralized Calendar**
“The Campus Life Office could be a catalyst for creating dialogue on a more centralized process for adding dates and events to a master programming calendar on campus (similar to the academic calendar and athletic calendar created in “Google calendars”). We understand that the Dean’s Council has started discussions on a Student Life Curriculum that could shape what type of programming should be occurring over the course of a year or four year period. The review team applauds this effort and encourages a broader discussion on a master calendar and even master calendar meeting that would help foster collaboration, awareness, and communication on campus events.”

**Preliminary Response to Recommendation Four:** While I agree wholeheartedly with this recommendation and have already had a lengthy meeting with Campus Scheduling on this topic, it sounds as though the initiative for such clarity with the campus calendar is already underway through the direction of Chris Call and Campus Scheduling. While I have offered to assist with this process, these are elements of improvement that are primarily outside the scope of influence of the Campus Life Office.

**Recommendation Five: Staffing Structure**
“With the task areas involved in the Campus Life Office the review team felt that it would be beneficial to at least consider possibilities of organizing the office differently. This would also include creative staffing considerations such as an RD assigned ¼ time to Campus Life office, student internships assigned to particular areas within the Campus Life Office, or even Campus Life Office staff somehow intersecting more formally with Campus Pastor’s office or Intercultural Programs office.”
Preliminary Response to Recommendation Five: We’re committed to exploring opportunities to re-organize staffing structures. The first step is to examine the current Director of the First Year Experience and Special Programs position in light of the departure of that staff member this spring. Next, we hope to explore how the Intercultural Programs Office can more closely work with the Campus Life Office in light of the departure of the Director for Intercultural Programs. These conversations may take place within the Dean’s Council Group over the course of the next year. Finally, we will also explore the possibility of student interns that are part of a student programming board for fall, 2012.

Recommendation Six: Faculty Involvement
“There was a pleasant surprise in that faculty were pleased when they were asked to contribute their time and expertise in areas of student programs that made sense and honored their skills. Inviting faculty to be a part of Focus Week groups, student leaders retreat, orientation program or leadership lunches could continue to enhance the credibility and relationships across campus and between faculty and Student Life Staff. Additionally, there seemed to be some encouragement from faculty to explore with the Provost’s Office the idea of allowing students to get credit for “serving society and acting justly” through participation in student ministries.”

Preliminary Response to Recommendation Six: The Campus Life Office regularly invites faculty to participate in focus week planning, the student leaders retreat and training, campus programs, new student orientation and the first year retreat. In virtually all of the work that we do we consider how faculty might be involved and how to maximize the resources that exist on campus. I believe there are ways to involve faculty more deliberately in new student Orientation and I look forward to exploring these possibilities in the year ahead by discussing opportunities with the new and outgoing provost and with key faculty constituents. Faculty will be invited to participate in an Orientation Enhancement Committee that will meet monthly from November through March.

Part two of recommendation six is to explore the idea of students getting “Serving Society” credit through participation in student ministries. While I would love to see this as a reality, my understanding of the nature of the curricular expectation around this priority is that students would have very specific and focused reflection on their service endeavors that would include written responses, readings and group reflection facilitated by a faculty member. At this point, the staffing and time required to accomplish this would be prohibitive and it may undermine the learning outcomes that are currently priorities for our student leaders.
RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL REVIEW AFTER ONE YEAR – Campus Pastor’s Office

Submitted by: Ben Patterson, Campus Pastor

Conducted by: Todd Pickett (Biola), Jamie Noling (Azusa Pacific University), Dana Alexander (Westmont), and Greg Spencer (Westmont).

Introduction
The external review was conducted in February, 2010. Nine recommendations were made and are listed below. The purpose of this report is to document the response to date for each recommendation. You will notice that the response to some recommendations has been postponed. The Campus Pastor’s Office also decided not to do any follow-up on a few recommendations. In those cases, the rationale for the decision not to follow-up is provided.

Response to Recommendations from February 2010 External Review
Note: Some of the recommendations come with examples that are not themselves recommendations but are meant to assist in imagining possibilities. Elaborating on these possibilities make the recommendations a bit lengthy.

Recommendation #1
Hire an additional pastoral staff member, with a view to diversity, in one or more of the following areas:
- Spiritual formation
- Pastoral care
- Student Ministries

If the budget does not allow for this presently, perhaps local college pastors could be invited into special “part-time,” “visiting,” or “guest pastor” roles that might allow them to do some pastoral counseling or mentoring with "walk-in" students for a few hours a week. The College might also consider creating a graduate student intern program, drawing students in theology or psychology who may be studying locally (although we understand that the Santa Barbara area may not be graduate-student rich). While this would require more oversight from the CPO, the benefits for the campus may justify it. Alternately, these interns could be supervised by other departments on campus. For instance, Residence Life might hire a graduate intern to assist and develop RAs or other students, training them as "floor chaplains" to help carry out the work of spiritual development. This would not only be a way of extending networks of spiritual and emotional care, but would be a work of student development as these undergraduate RAs are educated and trained in some aspect of spiritual development and neighbor love. As another example, the Office of Diversity might supervise an intern or pastor as an advisor to Catholic students, guiding and supporting them as they process the opportunities and challenges that come their way while living in a Protestant community.

Response to Recommendation #1
We’d love to do this, but we don’t have the money.

Recommendation #2
Articulate a vision and strategic plan for student spiritual development on campus that would build on existing strengths. Such a vision might recognize the potential for training RDs, RAs and student ministry leaders toward helping students broadly understand how our spiritual formation/development occurs and what role we play in that process of change (e.g. discernment, the spiritual disciplines, spiritual friendship, etc.). Here, too, some creative partnerships might be formed. For instance, a "coalition of the willing" might be discovered among faculty members who desire to grow in their spiritual mentoring of students. This could be furthered through faculty reading groups, one-day trainings in spiritual formation in the classroom/curriculum, and by dialogues with the campus pastor. To take another example, those involved in enrollment management might be interested in funding and assisting with the creation and nurture of Capax Dei-like groups that connect students more deeply to one another and to a mentor. This could serve to integrate into the community students or whole classes (sophomore slump?) who might be considered ‘at risk’ with regard to retention. In any case, CCCU schools that have spiritual or character development goals embedded in their mission and values statements are increasingly seeing that a more campus-wide approach to intentional spiritual development must be developed. These schools believe that they can no longer expect an often-small department located in the co curriculum to bear the lion's share of implementing what is for many schools a central institutional value. While there seems to be a sensitivity in Westmont's campus culture to overly programmatic approaches to spiritual formation or relationships, these "programs" could be carried out more
organically, working within already formed friendships (student ministry teams, worship teams, dorm floors, faculty-student interaction, and friendships generally) to assist them in developing these relationships to one another in a God-ward direction.

Response to Recommendation #2
This we have been doing in Capax Dei, which has included faculty, staff and RA’s as leaders. We’ve recruited and trained a number these people. Student participation in the 2010-2011 academic year went from an average of 50 or 60 in previous years to nearly 150.

We’ve implemented Chapel “blocs” – areas of focus on various themes of perennial importance to students, making sure we devote time to each in the course of a year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worship</th>
<th>Communion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior/Community life</td>
<td>Sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse/Money</td>
<td>Spiritual Formation/Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Diversity</td>
<td>World Focus/Evangelism/Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Health/Relationships</td>
<td>Career/Vocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation #3
For the campus pastor to consider how his chapel messages might be crafted in ways that help students meaningfully connect with and receive this instruction more deeply. This is not a recommendation for Ben to change the substance of his content. Again, the feedback we received affirmed Ben's messages as thoughtful, intelligent, and theologically sound, and we discerned from a few testimonies that an appreciation for his content seemed to grow as students mature. This, then, is not a recommendation to change the topics that he brings. However, like other instructional faculty at a college, Ben will need to consider how what he brings can be most effectively learned and understood by his students. This may involve:

1) Following an educational paradigm that aims at learning outcomes, not just teaching outcomes. It asks not just 'what am I teaching: but 'what are they learning: (This idea may already be embedded in Grounding Outcome #3, "Hear the foundational beliefs of the Christian faith.” Such a 'hearing: in the Hebrew sense, is an understanding so deep that it produces a turning, a metanoia.) This may involve Ben (and other regular Westmont chapel speakers) in assessing how these messages are being heard, and specifically what obstacles arise for students in hearing them. (These assessments could be as informal as lunches with students in preparation for of in debrief of a chapel message, or as formal as student reading or study groups with the pastor where he can observe how they learn and connect with the material.)

2) Discerning the heart of students by anticipating the range of things students may be thinking or feeling automatically when certain topics arise (family, the scriptures, evangelism, sin, "theology,” etc.), and how the message can "meet them there:' For the preacher, discerning and imagining the hearts of his hearers can be crucial in touching the "unconscious theology” (what we believe and feel when we're not thinking about it) that often drives the self and filters what we hear.

3) Understanding for one's self and articulating for the students the forces-cultural, historical, familial, and existential (sins and wounds--that have and are forming their spirits. (Often, this will be an 'aha' moment for students as these bring an explanatory power to why they do what they do.) This is especially important for the chapel speaker focused on the spiritual (re)formation of students.

These changes may require only adjustments to an outline of a message or sermon. Helping the students connect their minds and hearts to the material could occur effectively in short introductions that raise a dilemma familiar to students, in illustrations that students will recognize, or in implications of the message that students can imagine in their worlds. (Note: This may require Ben to come up with more stories and illustrations, not least because, according to student feedback, certain stories tend to be repeated in his illustrations. A "story-tracking system” may be necessary.)

Response to Recommendation #3
I think the year the survey was taken was a year I tried to do too much: addressing in a chapel format Augustine’s extremely difficult and massive classic, The City of God. It was a case of reach exceeding grasp, and I failed to connect this great theology and political philosophy with students’ lives.
I regularly engage students in many informal conversations about the content and application of my messages. For students who wish, audio and video recordings of chapel messages are available.

**Recommendation #4**
Create a partnership or committee that includes representatives from the CPO, Student Life departments, and other campus staff and administrators to develop a unified approach to chapel behavioral issues. This group would identify ways to enhance the environment of worship and learning in chapels and would support the Campus Pastor's Office as it calls students to present themselves wholeheartedly to God in these settings. This would require other parts of the College to wrestle with their role in supporting these all-university gatherings. This committee would also identify what behaviors need to be explicitly and programmatically addressed, and which behaviors the College may have to live with even while they discourage them.

**Response to Recommendation #4**
There have been extensive discussions in Deans Council meetings about this issue that have resulted in an agreement that the deans must be more active in calling students to a higher standard of behavior in the worship of God. We also have performed a humorous skit each year highlighting these issues.

**Recommendation #5**
Articulate a spiritual formational approach to assisting students with diverse backgrounds and experiences to grow amid the challenges and trials they face. Such trials often include more loneliness amid and less connection with the dominant community and its practices. At the same time, we encourage the Office to articulate for the dominant community how learning to love a neighbor, who may initially appear as “other,” develops and enriches the larger community’s own theological understanding and spiritual formation. Such an articulation may include working with Student Life and the Office of Diversity to establish concrete goals toward creating more diversity in chapel programming, and in reviewing that progress on a regular basis.

**Response to Recommendation #5**
The training and direction of the Worship Team is an intensive experience of all of the above.

The arrival of the newly appointed Director of the Dallas Willard Center for Spiritual Formation, Dr. Gary Moon, will help move us forward on this. September, 2011.

**Recommendation #6**
Increase the Chapel Worship Coordinator position to full time. The needs for oversight in other areas of worship (like Vespers), the room for more pastoral care of students, and the demands of producing the popular, annual worship CD make this move to full-time one that could be fruitful. Given the power and popularity of worship-in-music evident among Westmont students (according to the surveys), this position could bring instruction to more students about the role of music in the call to worship the Lord. In considering this recommendation, a comparative evaluation of the coordinator's compensation and job description against similar positions at other CCCU schools might be valuable.

**Response to Recommendation #6**
We increased his hours to 32, this year.

**Recommendation #7**
Place the campus pastor and his staff into more frequent dialogue with the faculty. As with any conversation, the good things that may come from this are unpredictable, but we think this dialogue might be especially fruitful in three ways:
1) For the mutual exploration and celebration of how both the academic curriculum and chapel programs are carrying out the university mission of "healthy personal development, and strong Christian commitments."
2) For exploring further the ways that student faith development in a liberal arts setting might take place in the programs and curricula of both chapels and classrooms.
3) For promoting a better understanding of the role of chapel in a liberal arts community.
The campus pastor might consider specifically (1) what faculty or campus gatherings might be most important for him to attend regularly, or (2) what forums might be created for these conversations. Faculty retreat and faculty forum are two existing opportunities, among others, where Ben might be able to engage with faculty more. These conversations may not have to involve all faculty, but perhaps a "coalition of the Willing" who have a special interest in a) faith and learning integration on campus, b) discerning the spiritual and intellectual needs of students, and c) praying for the students, staff and faculty.

Response to Recommendation #7
I have made it a priority to attend the faculty retreat each year and to seek out faculty to meet one-on-one for coffee and meals.

Each year the CPO solicits faculty recommendations for speakers.

The CPO also goes out among faculty on occasional “prayer walks,” encountering faculty unannounced and asking them if we may pray for them. These outings have been warmly received.

Recommendation #8
To identify ways that representative students can be involved in or connected to chapel planning. The fruits of this may be:

- Gaining insight into student hearts, minds, and cultures, which in turn may inform the selection of chapel topics and speakers.
- Through these representatives, exposing students generally to the thoughtful approach the Campus Pastor’s Office takes to chapel planning and programming.
- Allowing a few students to experience how a 'committee' can be, in practice, a group of people who trust and love one another as they seek the good of others.

Ideas for this may range from one or two students who join the CPO in their planning meetings to a group of mature and diverse students who can offer helpful feedback to the CPO staff.

Response to Recommendation #8
We solicit from student speaker recommendations, songs, worship team give and take.

IT shot our program down

Recommendation #9
Consider revising some of the CPO’s Grounding Outcomes that may not be supported by the Office’s actual programs. This may include:

- #4: Be presented with opportunities to love your neighbor as yourself (Mark 12:31). This suggests that the CPO is inviting students to participate in specific opportunities, rather than presenting them with examples of this through speakers from various neighbor-love ministries.
- #11: Educate and empower members of the college community in “faith that does justice.” It was not clear to us how this is currently taking place, unless it is indirectly through the challenges provided by chapel speakers.
- The CPO might consider crafting an outcome focusing on pastoral care, since this already seems to be an appreciated aspect of its work.

Response to Recommendation #9
We don’t see the need for this at the present time.
RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL REVIEW AFTER TWO YEARS – Residence Life

Submitted by: Stu Cleek, Associate Dean for Residence Life

The external review for Residence Life was conducted in January, 2009. 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.

At the end of the two-day external review, the team met with Jane Higa, VP/Dean of Students, and Stu Cleek, Associate Dean for Residence Life, for several hours to present and discuss key findings. There was considerable agreement with Jane and Stu on the findings and recommendations.

The review resulted in eight recommendations grouped into four categories:

Programming
1. Plan a college wide discussion on student alcohol use and abuse.
2. Increase educational programming efforts.
3. Fully integrate the mission statement and programming calendar so that they are known and utilized by department members.

Discipline Process
4. Audit the discipline process.

Staff Development
5. Weave Residence Life into the tapestry of Student Life Division and the College
6. Continue to develop the RD role.

Residence Hall Structure and Environment
7. Explore the integration of class years within the residence halls.
8. Establish a schedule to renovate the residence halls.

2010-2011 Response to Recommendations

Last year’s annual program review report provided an overview of the responses to the recommendations during the 2009-2010 academic year. This report focuses on the continued progress on the eight recommendations.

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

2010-11 Progress
The Residence Life department anticipated that this would be a part of the educational programming review that was to be conducted by the Student Life Division. This review was not completed this year, but should be in the year ahead. Residence Life did partner with the Campus Life Office to provide a week of Alcohol education programming in Fall 2010.

Plan for 2011-12
Residence Life plans to participate in the Student Life review of Alcohol Programming that will be conducted by select student life staff in Fall 2011. Resident Director Lyndsay Grimm will be part of the group focused on Physical and Emotional Health.

2. Increase Educational Programming Efforts

2010-11 Progress
The Residence Life department reviewed the topics of its programming calendar in an effort to match programming efforts with perceived needs. As a result, a focus week was created for Alcohol programming.

Plan for 2011-12
Residence Life has made the decision to limit current educational program requirements, and participate in the Student Life Division review of educational programming.
3. **Fully integrate the mission statement and programming calendar so that they are known and utilized by department members**

*2010-11 Progress*

The mission statement has been more widely publicized and focused on during training sessions with new resident directors and resident assistants. The programming calendar was revised to align programming efforts with perceived needs.

*Plan for 2011-12*

On hold pending results of Fall 2011 Student Life programming review.

4. **Audit the discipline process**

*2010-11 Progress*

Following up on the review work that was completed in 2009-10, Residence Life with the assistance of Tim Wilson, Associate Dean of Students, was able to identify priority items to implement. The following changes were made to the student conduct process:

- Resident Assistants were allowed to give warnings to students for very minor violations
- Changed language in the student handbook and discipline process from “Judicial” to less legalistic and more developmental “Student Conduct” language
- Clarified policies related to sexual misconduct and off-campus cohabitation
- Modified appeal criteria to narrow scope of appeal review
- Changed on-line education providers for sanctions by identifying potential options, creating a student focus group to provide feedback on options, and using the student feedback to choose a better educational option.
- Revised sanction descriptions to develop a clear and understandable link between student choices and consequences
- Modified “probation” sanction to give better clarity and levels of probation
- Increased communication between Resident Directors for the purpose of better sharing of student conduct load
- Completed a community service hours survey
- Completed draft revision of process for assigning and completing community service hours

*Plan for 2011-12*

Residence Life plans to complete the student conduct revision process in the year ahead. Specifically, we plan to:

- Develop a mentoring program as a sanction for student conduct
- Develop plan to implement an approach to student conduct meetings and sanctions that has been successful at the University of Texas at San Antonio called E.P.I.C.
- Develop more “sites” for community service opportunities as sanctions on campus

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

6. **Continue to develop the RD Role**

*2010-11 Progress*

The focus of the response to these recommendations has been in developing a culture of professionalism and commitment to team within the RD position. Some areas of development this year were adding two new staff members to the team. We developed a sense of trust among the Resident Director team by exploring similarities and differences in the Myers-Briggs Type indicator. We were able to identify conflict as an area for growth and named specific behaviors to incorporate into our interactions. In the summer, the Resident Directors participated in a professional development opportunity by each one reading a different book relevant to the field and presenting it to their colleagues when we returned from our summer break.

*Plan for 2011-12*

The plan for this year is to continue to develop a culture of professionalism and team. It is our goal to identify some continuing pockets of individualism related to running the residence halls. Also, the resident directors are fully participating in the Educational Programming Review being conducted by the Student Life Division this year.

7. **Explore the integration of class years within the residence halls.**

*2010-11 Progress*
No action taken on this item. As was discussed when the report was originally written, timing could be very important in this exploration.

*Plan for 2011-12*

It is possible that this structural change could be examined as part of the Student Life Division’s review of Educational Programming being conducted this fall. If a recommendation surfaces from this initiative, then Residence Life will explore the possibility of integrating class years for a future date.

8. **Establish a schedule to renovate the residence halls**

*2010-11 Progress*

No action taken on this item since a schedule has already been established.

*Plan for 2011-12*

No action needed.
I. Mission Statement

Our mission is to help students (1) better understand who God has made them to be, (2) discover the opportunities in our world to live out their uniqueness, and (3) discern the variety of ways those two dimensions can come together through meaningful career and life choices.

II. Focus of Assessment Plan

A. Academic/Faculty Support

1. Goal: The Office of Life Planning will build collaborative working relationships with the academic departments focusing on shared goals and objectives.

2. Objective: Office of Life Planning will collaborate with the academic departments in implementing a career-related program that supports their goal of more informed and career-focused students.

3. Program: The Office of Life Planning will develop a template for programming that can be used in any department or major. The title is “Pathways for ______ Majors” and consists of three parts: (1) recent alumni describing how they have used their major following graduation, (2) faculty in the major discussing the pros and cons of graduate school, and (3) the Office of Life Planning representatives describing the services available to students to help them in the career development process.

4. Outcome: Students will have an expanded and richer view of the options and possibilities for using their major in career and life planning, and a deeper understanding of what graduate school would entail in terms of requirements and employment options upon completion.

5. Assessment: Student participants will be given a feedback assessment at the end of the session that asks for their before and after level of understanding and knowledge. Faculty will be asked more open-ended questions in a survey after the session to seek for ways to improve the program.

B. Career Counseling

1. Goal: The Office of Life Planning will provide career counseling services that work towards improving student self-understanding and success.

2. Objective: OLP will assist students through one-on-one career counseling in developing (1) a rich understanding of their skills, values, personality and work-related values (2) skills for the job search process including resume and interview skills, (3) graduate school planning information, (4) help in their choice of major.

3. Program: Students will be seen by the OLP director and assistant director is one-on-one career counseling appointments

4. Outcome: Students will have gained specific information about their area of stated need, and will perceive that they have been helped.
5. Assessment: A career counseling evaluation form developed by Cal Poly San Luis Obispo will be used that compares pre-counseling skill and understanding level with post-counseling skill and understanding level.

C. Diversity

1. Goal: The Office of Life Planning will provide a range of programs, events and activities that meet the specific needs of individuals within our diverse student population

2. Objective: The Office of Life Planning will target diverse student needs.

3. Program: Collaborating with the Intercultural Programs Office, students and student groups will be provided career development programming that focuses on and meets their particular needs.

4. Outcome: Underrepresented students will learn of ways to understand and navigate the career development process, taking into consideration the cultural and societal issues that impinge on them.

5. Assessment: Focus groups, written feedback and individual interviews will be used to gauge the effectiveness of the programming.

D. Employer Surveying

1. Goal: OLP will assess the quality of graduates and student learning outcomes through employer surveying.

2. Objective: Employer survey results will be analyzed to confirm or disconfirm the perceived sense that many students leave Westmont with some weaknesses in job search process skills, especially in presenting themselves articulately and confidently to an employer.

3. Program: An employer survey will be developed using the expertise of other colleges and universities, and then shaped to our particular needs and requirements. The survey will then be sent to a wide sample of employers and internship supervisors in the Santa Barbara area.

4. Outcome: We will gain a better understanding and picture of how effective our alumni are in the transition from Westmont to employment. Implications for changes at the OLP and institutional level will be looked at, and potentially proposals for new initiatives developed.

5. Assessment: A full analysis of the survey will be produced.

E. “Strength Finder” Assessment

1. Goal: The Office of Life Planning will in an on-going way, seek out resources and tools to enhance and deepen our career development counseling with students.

2. Objective: The Office of Life Planning, specifically the director and assistant director, will gain knowledge and expertise in the Strengths Finder assessment for use with students.

3. Program: OLP will seek out training programs, consultation from experts, books and videos, collaboration with other colleges and universities using the Strengths approach, etc. to
incorporate this instrument into our work with students in both one-one-one counseling and in groups.

4. Outcome: OLP staff will gain certification in the Strengths Finder assessment.

5. Assessment: A time-line of tasks/activities will be developed that will lead to certification in two years.

III. Response to feedback from Program Review Committee

A. I appreciate the suggestion to make the writing presentation of data very clear, even to someone outside our “world.” I have certainly sought to do that with the assessments described this year.

B. Clearly my list of 22 outcomes was far too broad and detailed. I have narrowed that down to 5 in this report, which I believe are the most critical.

IV. Annual Progress – Two assessments

1. Federal Employee Visit

THE PROGRAM
A grant from the Annenberg Foundation and their Speakers Bureau funded a visit by an employee in the Education Department in Washington D.C. The goal was to expose students to the opportunities for employment and internships in the Federal Government and to provide them with resources to explore and pursue the many possible options. Ayesha Edwards presented in three classes and twice in workshops available to all, giving a personal description of her own career path, along with a PowerPoint presentation with details on the benefits and opportunities for virtually any major to work or find an internship at the Federal level. Participant Evaluations were given out at the two main presentations, at a lunch and a dinner meeting April 7, 2011.

THE ASSESSMENT
The participant evaluation was very simple with three parts.
Part one asked “BEFORE attending this presentation, how likely were you to seek information about and/or apply for federal job and internship opportunities?”
The options were: Not Likely, Somewhat likely, Neutral, Very likely, Definitely would
Then: “AFTER attending this presentation, how likely were you to seek information about and/or apply for federal job and internship opportunities?”
Part two asked: “What types of opportunities are you looking for? You may check one or both boxes: Full-time employment, Internships”
Part three provided a space for feedback/comments.

RESULTS
N=26
Before to the event, 53% of students said they were Not Likely to seek information about and/or apply for federal job and internship opportunities, and only 14% said they were Very Likely or definitely would
After the event, only 3% said they were Not Likely, and 46% said they Very Likely or Definitely would

REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION
92% said they would like more information on Internships
53% said they would like more information on Full Time Jobs

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS
• Great Information! Thank you so much for spending time with us!

• Our speaker Ayesha was great, she spoke on her experiences and I was able to relate my own thoughts and feelings of anxiety as a college senior. She gave me confidence that I would be a great candidate to work as a federal employee.
• Our speaker was enthusiastic, passionate, informative, and very engaging. She was very knowledgeable in her presentation and was an overall wonderful, sincere person. Her presentation was clear, informative, and very helpful.

• She showed that the federal government is flexible with their opportunities and are loyal to their employees. She was engaging and passionate about what she was talking about. I didn’t think of going into the federal government, but now I am at least open to exploring opportunities in the federal government.

• Listening to how she got to her position was very informative. Thanks Ayesha!

• Great speaker! She was wonderful! Good advice, Ayesha was well spoken! – Junior/Senior

• This was very helpful getting to hear from someone who’s gone through the system.

• She was a pretty good speaker, easy to follow, articulate…made her lecture applicable to everyone. Was very conscious of explaining things in light of how much we may or may not have known. – Freshman/Sophomore

• Very helpful lecture. Great insights on the function of the federal government that is not always available to the general public.

• Ayesha was a great speaker

• Ayesha was interesting, professional, and very informative.

• Good information/presentation.

• I came to this meeting since I think an internship and/or job with the federal government is a possibility for me. It was very helpful to get an understanding of what that may look like. The speaker was very good.

CONCLUSIONS
I felt this program was very successful and am pleased with the assessment results. Clearly, students do not think of the federal government as an option for either internships or employment and providing this exposure served a useful purpose. We will need to find ways to keep students informed in an on-going way and will be developing marketing plans to do that.

2. My Vocational Situation

THE ASSESSMENT
My Vocational Situation has three parts. The sections gauge:

1. Vocational Identity (18 questions) – the possession of a clear and stable picture of one’s goals, interests, personality and talents. This relates to vocational attitude, vocational commitment and desirable career beliefs. The higher the score, the greater the Vocational Identity.

2. Information (4 questions) – This section asks about whether the responder needs help in finding information about how to find a job in their chosen career, what kinds of people enter different occupations, employment opportunities, and necessary training in a chosen career.

3. Barriers (4 questions) – Gets at possible doubts a person might have regarding their ability to finish education or training, finding the financial resources, whether they have the necessary talent, and whether a influential person may not support their choices.

THE PLAN
Two groups of students were given this assessment in their first year of their college experience, and then in their senior year. One group (A) accessed our services in some way during their time at Westmont, and a control group (B) took the assessment in the same way, but they did not access our services in the four years they were at the college. We wanted to see if there was a difference between the groups, and whether our services made a difference in the scores of the group we focused on.

**RESULTS**

Group A (N=40) - Students who used the services of the Office of Life Planning (at least two visits)
Group B (N=11) - Students who did not use our services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS**
The results are disappointing in that it did not appear that accessing our services made a significant difference between groups. In Vocational Identity there was an 8% difference, but in Information it was a negative difference and in Barriers a small difference of 3%. This was our first attempt at a longitudinal study and there may have been some flaws in our approach. I am glad we did it, but I think we learned that such an endeavor is more sophisticated than we have the expertise for, and we will not try this kind of assessment again.

V. Program Review Focus for the upcoming year. – I would very much like to focus on the Strengths Finder goal (I see that as having a two year time frame), but I believe we can develop the “Pathways for ____ Majors” program next year also.

Appendix 1: Student Contact – in the first two charts (A & B) having to do with students coming into our offices, there is not an appreciable difference compared with last year, but I am pleased with our numbers. In the final chart (C) that compiles student contact from programming (including classroom visits) there is somewhat of a downward tick. I think that may come from the fact that the senior class decided not to have an etiquette dinner, and although we had a Junior class event, it was not a large scale barbecue as in the year before.
Chart A

Number of Students Seen in Office of Life Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart B

Number of Student Appointments in the Office of Life Planning

![Graph showing the number of student appointments from 2007-08 to 2010-11. The numbers of appointments are: 396, 457, 475, and 471 for the respective academic years.](image-url)
Appendix 2: External Review

I. Our last review was in November of 2000.

II. Our next is for scheduled for 2012-13

III. I have just received the updated (July 2010) *Self-Assessment Guide for Career Services* from the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, which was very helpful in the last External Review. I will be looking that resource to help guide my thinking about areas that should be focused on for the review.

Appendix 3: Collaboration

I. **Departments/Majors of Significant Collaboration/Consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Pre-Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages (Spanish)</td>
<td>Urban Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Totals are more than our student body because we add all events together and there is overlap from students who attend more than one event)
II. Collaborative Events with Student Life (Celia and Dana unless noted)
   A. Skills and Values with Student Leaders
   B. Myers Briggs and Students Leaders Training
   C. Etiquette Dinner in Clark (Celia)
   D. RA applicants Interview and Resume workshop
   E. Spring Gathering dinner for RA’s on values
   F. Myers-Briggs with WCSA President and his council (Celia)
   G. Marriage event with Campus Life
   H. Two RA focus Groups (Celia)
   I. RA workshop on Transferable skills
   J. Myers Briggs with RD staff
   K. Marketing Your Leadership with Campus Life (Angela)
I. Mission Statement

Currently the mission statement is, “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.” This summer the Intercultural Programs Office is embarking on a year long strategic planning process to revise the mission and vision statements and goals to be aligned with the college’s most recent educational vision and institutional goals for students’ learning and growth in diversity and global awareness, Christian understanding/practices/affections, active societal and intellectual engagement and physical and emotional health.

From the homepage for ICP, the following statement further describes the mission:
“Intercultural Programs is called and tasked to educate the student body on diversity, social and racial justice, to increase students’ intercultural maturity and competence, and to support students of color, international, and missionary and third culture students in their academic success, spiritual growth and social well-being. Intercultural Programs also works with faculty and staff to support students of color, and international, missionary and third-culture students in their classes and co-curricular activities.”

II. Focus of Assessment Plan

Learning Outcomes, Process Objectives, and Satisfaction Indicators

1. Educate the student body on diversity and social and racial justice.
   Learning Outcomes:
   - There is an increase in the number of White majority students and assimilated minority students participating in the Racial Equality and Justice seminar from the current 6 to 8 to 12 to 15 within four years.
   - Twenty-five percent of student leaders will have attended the Student Congress on Racial Reconciliation (SCORR) at Biola or a Dismantling Racism workshop once during their four years at Westmont.

2. Increase students’ intercultural maturity and competence.
   Learning Outcome:
   - Student leaders are able to incorporate the newly approved biblical and theological foundations on diversity into one program per year.

3. Support students of color, international, and missionary and third culture students (MK/TCKs) in their academic success, spiritual growth and social well-being.
   Learning Outcome:
   - There is 50% increase in the number of students of color, international and MK/TCKs participating in the programs organized by the Intercultural Organizations.
   - There is a 25% increase in the number of students of color, international and MK/TCKs that are student leaders beyond Intercultural Organizations and Racial Equality and Justice (REJ), e.g. WCSA, WSM, and RAs.

III. Response to feedback from Program Review Committee

Below is the feedback I received from the Program Review Committee:
- Are there ways to solicit feedback on the impact of your meetings with the 125-150 students each year?
- Developing a reliable assessment instrument for REJ is a worthy goal. Perhaps students could write a reflection paper and a rubric could be developed to identify progress toward intended learning outcomes.

I have not formally solicited feedback from students whom I’ve met with for an individual meeting. It’s an interesting question to consider whether a one time meeting with a student makes a difference on how they view diversity and Intercultural Programs. What I have heard from students are statements as “I’m so glad that we met as
I haven’t had the opportunity to talk about my cultural background and what that means for me,” “I really haven’t really thought much about what I wrote for the Cultural Diversity Award but I’m glad you asked,” or “I’m glad we met. I wished I did this sooner.”

This past year I conducted focus groups and some of their feedback was “Keep being intentional with students. Meeting with them for coffee, dinner, etc.,” “And dates with Julissa, Tina and Elena. It’s great having older women to mentor us on important subjects,” …what has helped me most is people checking in on me. MKs, Nomads leaders and Elena’s interest in me is what mostly motivated me as an MK.” From the ICO leaders they gave the following feedback: “Elena should continue taking students out for coffee, get to know them more on a more personal level,” and “Have one on one meetings with us to see how we are doing.” I plan to be more intentional to get immediate feedback from students about the value of these meetings and possibly survey these students at the end of year for feedback.

For the past two years, I established REJ learning outcomes for students. To assess their learning, students are required to write two self-reflection papers, twelve to fourteen journal entries, and fill out a self-assessment based on the learning outcomes at the start and at the end of the semester. This past year I asked students to take the Intercultural Developmental Indicator (IDI) at the start and at the end of the semester as well.

IV. Annual Progress
A. Describe your assessment work.
1. Include or describe the instrument/technique used to gather the data.
2. Indicate the size of your data set(s) and describe the group from which the data was gathered.
3. Did your work lead to any benchmark data?
4. Did your work help you to compare against any previously established benchmarks?

This past year I conducted three different focus groups to answer the following questions:

- How would you describe the multicultural climate on our campus?
- What should we keep doing in Intercultural Programs?
- What should we keep doing in (named Intercultural Student Organization, i.e. Latino Cultural Organization, Asian Student Association, Nomads)?
- What should we do differently in ICP?
- What should we do differently in (named Intercultural Student Organization)?

These additional questions were asked at the Asian Students Focus Group:

- How can we get more students involved and engaged in diversity?
- There is low attendance at ICO events. How do we get students to attend?
- Why are minority students not applying for Leadership positions other than ICO’s?
- Should be mandatory for RA’s, student leaders, etc. to attend SCORR at Biola?
- Do you feel supported by the ICO’s?

The focus groups were for Asian American students, Latino/a/Hispanic students and International and Missionary/Third Culture students. There were five to ten students depending on the group. We met with each group off campus with two staff as facilitators. I’ve attached to this report the feedback from these focus groups.

Another assessment method is that at the end of every year, I ask ICO and REJ student leaders to assess ICP and my leadership through anonymous evaluation on 3x5 note cards. I also meet with each ICO at the end of the academic year to list and assess each of their programs.

The assessment work for this past year did not so much establish new benchmarks but confirm my suspicions about the current state of the ICP and ICOs’ decreasing effectiveness at the college on a broader level. The question was is the next step to reverse this downward trend and for the ICOs and ICP be considered as a legitimate resource and contribution to the college’s mission.

B. Interpret the Results.
1. Summarize how you analyzed the data.

2. How effective were the assessment methods that were used? Will you conduct the same assessment again? When? Will you make any changes to the assessment instrument/technique?

3. What conclusions did your department make based on the data collected?

With my colleagues and student leaders, we read the results and discussed possible next steps. What concrete step was to submit a proposal to the student leaders based on their feedback and facilitate a meeting to discuss the proposal. The ICO director was then asked to facilitate a meeting with only the student leaders to decide whether to institute any changes for the next year. They decided to essentially maintain the status quo structurally but to have the ICOs as one organization to plan, promote and put on one or two major programs per semester that would be inclusive and inviting to the campus.

Focus groups are a good way to collect data although it is limited due to the small number of students who participate. Next year we will have focus groups for African American students, White students and students from Hawaii. Rather than off campus we will meet on campus for greater ease and higher participation. I’d also be interested in doing an all campus survey three to six months prior to the next external review for more comprehensive data.

My conclusion is that the current structure for ICOs and ICP is not effectively meeting its goal to “educate, celebrate and support.” It is clear to me that there needs to be some bold re-envisioning for the student leaders and for the office to move forward more productively in meeting the college’s recommended institutional goals for Student Life to address, i.e. diversity and global awareness, Christian understanding/practices/affections, active societal and intellectual engagement, and physical and emotional health. I need to further discuss and hopefully implement the feedback and suggestions from the focus groups and the marketing report from Fall 2009 with the new ICO leaders before they plan any programs.

C. Close the loop. What does your department plan to do in response to what you have learned?

1. What changes, if any, will be made in light of what you have learned?

2. What results might other student life or faculty departments benefit from knowing? How will/did these results get communicated?

3. What is the timeline to implement a response to what you have learned? Who is responsible?

4. What new or revised goals have been set by the department in response to what has been learned?

In response to what I learned I’m more motivated to move forward on a strategic planning process for ICP to establish a new mission, vision and goals. By having such a plan in place for the next three to five years, it will help guide my decision for programming – experiential, relational and informational. At the same time I want to discuss with student leaders on how they may step into making structural changes so they’re more effective in reaching goals based on data from students, faculty, staff and current practices and trends in the field. My timeline is start the strategic planning process this summer and to have a plan in place by fall of 2012.

V. Program Review focus for the upcoming area: As you look at your six-year plan, what is your focus for the upcoming year?

This year my program review focus is to address increasing students’ intercultural maturity and competence with the learning outcome of teaching and training student leaders on how to incorporate the newly approved biblical and theological foundations on diversity into one program per year.

Appendix 1: Student Contact

A. What annual data did you collect that helps quantify the student contact by your department?

I count the number of individual meetings I have with students, meetings with student leaders and attendance of events and activities on campus. I met with 127 students in individual meetings, facilitated a weekly book group in the spring semester with five to ten students, met with the ICO and REJ leaders directors twice/month and all the ICO leaders once/month, and meet with each ICO leader at least once/semester. I attended one to two programs per month supporting the ICOs, REJ and another student organization, Student Life or academic department.
B. How does this contact compare to previous years? What conclusions did you draw from this comparison? The contact was less as compared to last year due to my mother’s failing health and personal health issues.

Appendix 2: External Review Update
A. When was your last external review?
It was conducted in January 2007 with the report sent to ICP in May of 2007.

B. When is your next external review?
The stated timeline is for year 2014-2015, which is four years from now.

C. What planning are you doing for your next external review? Are there any particular aspects of your program that you would like feedback from the external review team?
I’m planning to establish a strategic plan with a new mission, vision and goals, create a steering committee of Student Life staff, faculty and student leaders to regularly advise ICP on its programs and decisions, and to conduct an all campus survey three to six months prior to the external review.

The feedback I would like from the external review team is how effective am I in teaching and training student leaders in meeting goals based on institutional commitments to diversity and global awareness as well as how is ICP is known and perceived at the college on all levels since the last review.

Appendix 3: Collaboration: Provide a summary of how you collaborated with student life and faculty departments during the past year.
This past year I worked with several faculty departments for programs such as helping to partially fund the Middle-East music concert with Sociology or meeting with new faculty member, Dr. Jamie Friedman, to discuss a possible speaker for next year’s women’s tea. Another way I have collaborated with some faculty is to address a student’s experience in her interaction with them. What was most encouraging to me is that faculty has initiated with me more than I did so with them for possible collaboration. Last I continued with my practice of meeting with new faculty to welcome them to campus, to share how my office may support their efforts and answer questions. This year I plan to give each new faculty a copy of Dr. Claude Steele’s Whistling Vivaldi and Other Clues on How Stereotypes Affect Us. For me it’s a small investment in providing a very practical resource for how faculty may best support students who deal with stereotype threat may it be due to race, gender, class or any other marginalized identity.

Working with Student Life staff, I had several opportunities to work with RDs to discuss and/or plan programs in the residence halls or to discuss students’ experiences in the halls. As I noted in my end of the year report, one of most meaningful collaboration was meeting with Stu Cleek to brainstorm alternative ideas to support students of color and the ICOs.

Appendix 4: Results from Focus Groups and Feedback from ICO and REJ leaders

Focus Group for Latino/a/Hispanic Students
Conducted on November 30, 2010
5 students, 2 staff

How would you describe the multicultural climate on our campus?
- What multicultural climate? I don’t think it is even noticeable on campus.
- Not sure what that means, that is a hard question to answer
- We don’t really have a big criteria because we are so small a campus. It’s hard to say because we are not large like UCSB.
- I never identified myself as “multicultural” growing up. I never really felt closeness to my culture or heritage because my family doesn’t speak Spanish at home, or engage in any “Mexican” traditions so I never felt I needed to participate in any events held on campus because I thought I wasn’t really “Mexican” enough. Once I came to Westmont I realized maybe I should have been more aware of my heritage.
- I wonder if Westmont is against group solidarity. There are not really any “groups” of ethnicity on campus. Everyone just sort of does his or her own thing.
- Maybe we should make our events more non-committal. I think we would have a better turn out.
I never attended any events or even got involved because I thought it didn’t apply to me because my family is more “Americanized” than “Mexican” – but hearing your stories, I now see that I am like you and you are like me and I should have gotten involved because I had the wrong idea about what ICP and LCO was all about.

Group agreement:
- We should have an event like Kristin Lo had on “Being Japanese” – But not have it about going over stereotypes, we should focus on wanting to learn the different ethnic groups backgrounds.
- Like hearing everyone’s story whether they are Cuban, Guatemalan, Mexican, South American, etc. There are so many different cultures under LCO. We are not all Mexican.

What should we keep doing in ICP?
- Keep being intentional with students. Meeting with them for coffee, dinner, etc.
- In order to achieve widespread community, focus on the community of leaders. So keep creating a strong community between the leaders.
- We should continue having events that help facilitate discourse about the importance of diversity: race, sex, identity, culture, and home on campus.
- Events!!! And dates with Julissa, Tina and Elena. It’s great having older women to mentor us on important subjects.
- Making your selves known. I don’t really know all the details about what you guys do so I can’t say much more.
- I think the cultural programs and events are good at engaging various cultures and promoting events that are unique to learning specifics about culture. Keep high engagement activities. Keep Julissa!

What should we keep doing in LCO?
- Partner with others like Potter’s Clay!
- Events with multiple cultures undivided
- Dinner parties
- Don’t know what’s already being done so I can’t really answer that question
- Go to Dia de los Muertos in Hollywood again!

What should we do differently in ICP?
- Try to get more people as leaders who are excited about informing people of the Latino Culture
- More promotion!
- Incorporate doctrine/faith relevance in diversity issues and cultural studies
- More on campus events between different backgrounds
- LCO is broad but explain fun differences between Hispanics, Latinos, Spanish backgrounds
- Maybe let the students know or give them a better picture of what ICP is and what their mission is. Emphasize that it’s not just for people who are the “cookie cutter” picture of diversity
- Better advertisement of events – posters, not just emails
- Set up a fundraiser days to raise money for organizations that aim to advocate for diversity as well

What should we do differently in LCO?
- Same as above. Have more low-key events. Make it known that you don’t have to have any specific or extravagant culture experience or completely identify with your heritage. Make it an educational thing
- LCO might try teaming up with the West Side Ministry & Village Apartments with the Latino population there in bringing Westmont students into more interaction with their culture.
- Hold events together. Collaborate – make it about all cultures. Don’t be limited to any one group like “LCO” or “Hawaii”. If people are interested in the Italian culture, then make that an event and learn about that culture.
- Maybe a program called “We’re Not All the Same” to address the diversity within Latin cultures.
- Maybe a program about identity for Latino/Hispanic students - What does it really mean to be Latino/Hispanic? What does it mean to have “checked off the box” for Hispanic? What does it really mean when someone says, “I don’t look Mexican?”
- Maybe a program about perception by others because of our last names, skin tone, facial characteristics, accent, dress, etc. despite what we believe about ourselves. Address complexities of identity.
- Limit programs for an hour at the most and/or make them more of a “drop-in.”
Focus Group for International, MK and TCK students  
Conducted on December 8, 2010  
9 students, 3 staff

What is the multicultural environment like at Westmont?
- Hasn’t heard much about Nomads (1st yr. student)
- International student: not comfortable in her original culture (Korean), was told we should speak English, transition was hard
- Neither negative or positive
- Felt very welcomed (white student)
- Was expecting more culture shock but didn’t happen as much; was expecting the transitions would be greater to college life
- Feel that MKs have found each other with out Nomads
- Still a strange connection back home
- Different personalities due to country background
- Really liked the people, very welcoming
- Not made to feel awkward
- Going home is going to be hard if it’s your permanent home
- Westmont is a 4 year “camp” experience
- Seemed okay to be in a majority white setting initially but realized people were looking at her.
- Felt somewhat like an outsider - closed off. Acknowledged it may be due to her “insecurity”. Affected her more than she thought in 1st year. Learned more about American culture in college. “Figure of Speech” is unfamiliar at times.

What should Nomads and Intercultural Programs keep doing?
- Keep having events that bring together people from different cultures
- I don’t know. I’ve participated in some events but I don’t have the grand picture
- I am not familiar with any of the programs ICP or Nomads has put on
- I don’t really know about ICP or Nomads and haven’t really been involved in anything to know how to answer
- I have no idea, I haven’t done anything with either of these but I do think the cultural events are cool, being that this allows others to see the awesome cultures that exist.
- In both cases, what have helped me most are people checking in on me. MKs, Nomads leaders and Elena’s interest in me is what mostly motivated me as an MK. Previous to tonight, I hadn’t attended any other event.
- Keep creating events for not only MKs, TCKs and International students to enjoy and share stories but also for students who never experienced that.
- The study breaks with ASA provides a chance for students to learn more about other cultures.
- I haven’t been involved and I don’t really know much about the intercultural programs in Westmont, including Nomads but I would definitely like to have more information about it and about getting involved.

What should ICP/Nomads do differently?
- Not sure
- It would be nice to have some orientation and adjustment sessions for Nomads. Not all of ICO.
- Also is there a retreat or a big event would be good.
- Not sure
- I have not really been involved in any programs but I like what we are doing tonight.
- Again, I’m not familiar with what you do. But would love to hear more about programs and events. Maybe just informing students more about what goes on.
- I have not attended anything. But I think more just being together and talking and hanging out would be nice.
- I haven’t attended either, so I don’t know - sorry!
- My fear or hesitation in becoming very active in either is that I don’t want to be cliquey or rely on MKs for friendship because it was easier. I tried to cultivate relationships with people that shared more than a background with me.
- To have smaller groups (like tonight) and share experiences.
I think there could be more emphasis on culture and less difference of ethnicity. A lot of Westmont’s community feels like they are not a part of ICP because they are not ethnically diverse.

Focus Group for Asian American Students
Conducted on March 24, 2011
3 students, 2 staff

Diversity: How can we get more students involved and engaged?
- It should come from the leadership, from Res life. They should be the ones to promote more programs about diversity since they have a captive audience every day.
- It should be a part of their training, and then imparted into the students they oversee in the dorms on a consistent basis throughout the year. Then the minority students in their dorm would feel supported by the whole, and not just their own constituencies. If they were hearing it from all areas on campus, it wouldn’t be so needed in the first place.
- Also, it should come from leadership on campus. From Beebe, from staff, faculty, etc… if it’s not a priority for the whole campus, then we are like fish swimming against the stream.
- There should be a forum for students to hear theologically why diversity is important to us and to God. For the majority of students on campus to hear stories from students of color, their experiences, where they came from, what they have encountered being in on this campus, etc. White students need to hear their peers’ stories so they can put a face to diversity, multi cultures, multi ethnicity, etc.

Low attendance at ICO events – how do we get students to attend?
- There is so much to do already; I think students just don’t want to go another thing. There is so much going on with studying, classes; other events on campus, that I think students are just too busy.
- I think students don’t want to feel uncomfortable in another setting – where they might not know anyone that’s going to be there, or even what it’s going to be about. So they decide to not go or get involved.
- We need to focus on having more “big events” for the whole campus. It’s less intimidating for students of color if there is a larger group. To go to the smaller events just makes them stick out more and feel uncomfortable.
- We need to be careful of the types of events/programs that are being put on by ICO’s – to make sure the movies being showed are not perpetuating Asian stereotypes or that critical discussions are actually taking place to dissect the issue. i.e. Disney movies portraying different cultures but in a very stereotypical portrayal.

Why are minority students not applying for Leadership positions other than ICO’s?
- Students of color have a different view of “leadership”. Also, they don’t feel comfortable being in another setting where they are the “minority” of the group.
- (When I was at the Leadership Training it was very uncomfortable for me to be there and to be in that setting. Looking around and being the only Asian student was not a good feeling.)

SCORR:
- Should be mandatory for RA’s, student leaders, etc.
- We need the majority students of the campus to hear and experience this conference, not the students of color who attend. It’s like preaching to the choir – students of color already know the necessity of the conference and diversity on our campus. The ones who need to hear it don’t attend. How do you change that?

Do you feel supported by the ICO’s?
- The time has past for issues of diversity to be “comfortable” - now we needed to be able to talk about diversity even if it is going to be difficult for others. Also, how some students might be participating at different times in their journey here at Westmont because it takes them time to become comfortable with being the minority- specifically the Asian American students since they have a tendency to assimilate. I didn’t really feel comfortable being the ‘student of color’ until after my sophomore year and because of this I sought out support from other Asian friends not necessarily a "club or organization".
- I go to other Asian students for support, and to ICO events for fun or fellowship – not for support.
- Again, if the importance of Diversity was being discussed and shown the importance of in the dorms, from faculty and staff and all areas of Westmont, then we really would not need to “find support” elsewhere.
Feedback from ICO and REJ leaders
Feb 2011

What is the one thing that the ICP director (Elena) should continue doing?

- Elena should continue encouraging and providing opportunities for the ICO’s to collaborate with each other and especially with other student groups, faculty, and take advantage of nearby resources such as UCSB Multicultural Center.
- Elena should continue taking students out for coffee, get to know them more on a more personal level.
- Your excitement and dedications to ICO’s.
- Support and encouragement
- Continue to be part of Westmont, continue to have support for the minorities
- Great encouragement level! And good involvement level in organizations.
- Continue giving abundant amounts of encouragement to the student leaders and being intentional about meeting with them.
- Good communication efficiency with emails and such
- Being the wonderful, selfless encourager and women of God that she is!
- Have one on one meetings with us to see how we are doing

What is one thing Elena should change?

- Rethink the structure of ICP – in order to make it more effective
- Change the aspect and how ICP approach the student body….so far not really effective
- Relationship with other groups on campus
- Accountability? Maybe encourage different ICO groups to attend each other’s events!! And help with publicity
- I don’t really see anything that needs to change
- Elena should try to integrate the ICO’s with other student-led groups more (specifically with training)
- Really get at the core of what is not working with the program and determining what the problems are before coming up with solutions
- Being intentional about getting more feedback about the program from students of color on campus to really glean what the students’ needs are so as to serve the students more effectively.
- Rethink the entire structure of ICP
ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW REPORTS – Health Center

Submitted by: David Hernandez, Director

Section I: Mission Statement

The Health Center believes a student’s physical, emotional and spiritual needs are intertwined. We are committed to both providing exceptional care and to preparing students for life-long wellness.

Section II: Response to feedback from Program Review Committee

The recommendation regarding clarity of mission statement has been noted and used in revision in mission statement as noted above. The revised statement highlights two major objectives. One objective is to care to students as they present to the Health Center during their 4 years at the college. The second objective is to prepare them to tend to their health care needs after they leave Westmont.

A recommendation was made as to establish a benchmark for students understanding of their diagnosis and treatment plan. This benchmark has been established at a minimum of 95% of students indicating that they would either “strongly agree or “agree” that they understood their diagnosis and treatment plan.

In response to your recommendation that meeting the needs of non-Caucasians, plans will be developed in the Fall as to how to best assess our performance in this area.

Section III: Annual Progress

In an effort to meet our mission statement goals the Health Center chose to assess students understanding of their diagnosis and treatment plan. It is a well established fact that when a patient understands the nature of their illness, and the treatment required, compliance increases and does success in treating the illness. Antidotal evidence has raised concerns that perhaps students were not always sure of their diagnosis and treatment plan and thus an attempt was made this year to qualitatively investigate this matter.

Two assessment methods were entertained. One method would have involved surveying students, with a written questionnaire, at time of discharge from the Health Center. The other method would involve surveying all students via email. The latter method was chosen. A 10 question survey was sent via email to all Westmont students. One question asked the student to rate from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” that they understood their diagnosis and treatment plan at time of discharge. The survey was mailed to all students with 257 students responding as noted below:

For understanding of diagnosis:

- Strongly agree: 38%
- Agree: 55%
- Disagree: 6%
- Strongly disagree: 2%

For understanding of treatment plan:

- Strongly agree: 42%
- Agree: 52%
- Disagree: 6%
- Strongly disagree: 0%

A benchmark of 95% of students saying that they either or strongly agree or agree that they understood their diagnosis and treatment plan has been established.

Analysis:
Survey data analysis was performed by means of Health Center staff discussing tabulated data and brainstormed ideas as to how to improve performance. I discuss recommendations below. I was satisfied with responses rate. I have concerns about the time between time of services at the Health Center and time of survey. Students are being called upon to recall an encounter that may have occurred up to 6 months prior to survey. For this coming year I would like to look into developing an immediate post-encounter survey. I am somewhat satisfied with students reported understanding of their diagnosis and treatment plan but still see room for improvement.

In response to these finding the Health Center staff have met and have agreed to be more intentional at providing students with either verbal or written information as to their diagnosis and treatment plan. If the health care provider has any doubt as to the students understanding of diagnosis and treatment they are to have the student repeats back to the provider this information. In the next year we will hopefully have access to electronic health record software which will simplify assessing written diagnosis and treatment plan information.

The number of student visits to the Health Center is tabulated every year. This years their were 3,451 encounters. This is down from last year. Given that last year was the year of the Influenza Pandemic it is not surprising to see this number down. One needs to look at the past several years to be able to note obtain valid data as to trends on Health Center usage. This data shows that the number of student encounters has remained somewhat stable over the past 4 years.

**Student encounters by year:**

- For the year 2006-2007 student encounters was 3,942.
- For the year 2007-2008 student encounters was 4,096
- For the year 2008-2009 student encounters was 3,580
- For the year 2009-2010 student encounters was 3,939
- For the year 2010-2011 student encounters was 3,451

**Collaboration**

Collaboration between the Health Center and the Student Life Department at large has increased as a result of the Care Team. Meeting with various facets of the Student Life team on a as needed but regular basis has resulted in a more efficient use of our resources. Meeting with Troy Harris has resulted in progress being made in preparing for a disaster relief.

**Plans for the future:**

The Health Centers External review is 2013-2014. No plans have been implemented. Some time should be set aside this Spring to discuss who will be performing this review. I am hoping that we will have implemented the usage of electronic health records by that time. It will be important that this be evaluated at the time of our review.

Following are three critical aspects that I would like to look at over the next few years.

- Use of electronic health records.
- Educating students about use of their medical insurance
- Professional development
Annual Program Review Report – Counseling Center

Submitted by: Marcy O’Hara, Director

Section I: Mission Statement

Westmont College is a unique Christian and academic community dedicated to the development of the whole person. The mission of the Counseling Center is to come alongside students in their process of becoming healthy adults, offering them a place to receive both nurture and challenge. The Counseling staff provides high quality, short-term, professional counseling services. The Counseling Center welcomes all students, treats all students with respect and dignity, and upholds a professional ethic regarding confidentiality.

Section II: Focus of Assessment Plan

1. **Objective:** Do students understand the process of therapy, expectations of what an appointment may be like, and what to do if they are not satisfied with their therapist? **Strategy:** Create document of FAQ’s (frequently asked questions) to be added to website and to intake materials given to students and reviewed in initial session. **Satisfaction indicator:** Response to related survey question. **Benchmark:** 85% of students express satisfaction by responding agree or strongly agree to survey question.

2. **Objective:** Have students increased their efficacy of managing whatever issues they came in with? (for example, increase in coping skills, awareness of patterns contributing to problem, increase in communication and assertiveness skills, decrease in feelings of depression or anxiety. **Strategy:** Review basic counseling strategies with staff including brief therapy techniques; increase case consultation time; review protocol for closing of cases. **Satisfaction indicator:** Response to related survey question. (note - long term goal would be to have computer systems to enable students to take pre-counseling and post-counseling inventories, that would give us this information in detail and could be compared across colleges). **Benchmark:** 85% of students express satisfaction by responding agree or strongly agree to survey question.

3. **Objective:** Is the counseling center serving a similar percentage of multicultural students as is reflected in the college population? **Strategy:** Add category for diversity and multiculturalism to links page on website, increase case consultation time, continue keeping stats. **Process indicator:** Compare stats of counseling center to stats of college. **Benchmark:** Percentage of non-Caucasian students seen in counseling to be within 8 points of college percentage that year.

Section III: Response to Feedback

1. Revised mission statement by omitting last sentence about confidentiality.
2. Created assessment objective in area of diversity.
3. Included statistics in report reflecting percentages of non-Caucasians seen in counseling.

Section IV: Annual Progress

A. Assessment work

1. The Counseling Center uses two tools for assessment: utilization statistics and satisfaction surveys.
Counseling Center

- **Utilization statistics** are extremely helpful in noting trends of presenting issues that students bring to counseling sessions and trends in the numbers of students who are seen each semester. The numbers of students seen helps us determine if we have adequate staffing. We maintain a 10-year utilization chart for comparative purposes. The chart is attached.

- Each semester **satisfaction surveys** are sent to all students who were seen in the counseling center. Many of the questions remain the same year after year to get longitudinal comparisons, but we also add new targeted questions each year to give feedback on a particular area of interest. Though we have always studied results to inform our work, we have not until this year formally established “benchmark data”.

2. We are in the process of establishing benchmarks.

**B. Interpret the Results**

1. Each year the **satisfaction survey** results are reviewed by the staff. For example in 2009/10 when we made the change to “brief therapy” with limited sessions we wanted to know how the students responded to it. We asked specific questions related to the changes and received very clear feedback regarding their satisfaction, (which was positive).

2. **Utilization statistics** are gathered from each therapist at the closing of each semester and compiled by the office manager. Statistics include: gender; year in school; ethnicity; total # of students; total # of sessions; no-shows; average # of sessions; diagnostic categories; hospitalizations; psychiatric referrals; and use of psychotropic medications.

3. The **satisfaction survey** and the **utilization statistics** have been effective and we will use them again next year. This is the first year we did one **satisfaction survey** for the whole year, instead of one each semester. We also used an improved online survey site which streamlined our results and was more time efficient for all. **Utilization statistics** will continue to be compiled at the end of each semester. As already mentioned, a change I would like to see in the near future is to implement an electronic case management system (e.g. Titanium is used by many college counseling centers) where statistics can be easily customized and tallied, with greater accuracy and uniformity, and can be produced at any time rather than waiting until the end of the semester.

4. The reliability of the **satisfaction survey** was good because we had a 34% response rate (56 responded of the 154 students who used our services).

5. The **satisfaction surveys** we provided evidence that our students are overwhelmingly satisfied with our services. It also pointed us to a few items with room to improve. This year’s results have led to assessment objectives 1 & 2 (see Section II).

**Brief summary of 2010/11 satisfaction survey data (more detail in appendix 1):**

The following percentages reflect students who expressed satisfaction by agreeing or strongly agreeing with the following:

1. Comfort in waiting room and front desk staff: 98%
2. Appointment scheduled in timely manner: 100%
3. Confidence regarding confidentiality: 100%
4. Counselor was professional and compassionate: 100%
5. Counselor was sensitive to differences (ethnic, etc.): 100%
6. I am satisfied, would recommend counseling center: 98%
7. I am satisfied with my own effort in counseling: 92%
8. **My stated focus and goals were addressed: 95%**
9. **My confidence has increased in handling my concerns: 86%**
Here’s a sample of some of the positive comments from the satisfaction survey:

1. “Thank you so much for everything, you’ve helped me find more about myself and dealing with everyday circumstances” (Karen)
2. “I really appreciated my counselor’s calm professionalism” (Karen)
3. “My counselor was great and helped me through a lot last semester with time management and stress management. I am completely blessed to have someone help me learn to run my life better” (Karen)
4. “I especially appreciated the friendly response to emails” (Claire - office manager)
5. “I really appreciate Claire’s discretion as she sends us back and the timely manner in which she schedules the appointments. She’s always friendly and helpful”. (Claire)
6. “I really appreciate how my counselor was open to everything I had to say and how they would try to understand me better. I am thankful for the wisdom/feedback they offered”. (Erin)
7. “My counselor was wonderful and such a blessing” (Erin)
8. “My counselor was very wise and very kind. I feel now have a friend and advocate who I can turn to in times of need. Thank you!!” (Susan)
9. “I felt very cared for, listened to, and often did discover new insights by talking things out.” (Susan)
10. “Advertise the pre-engagement counseling more, it has been very helpful for my fiancé and me”. (Debbie)
11. “My counselor did an excellent job. This was my first time seeing a therapist and they were a HUGE help for me.” (Ed)
12. “My counselor was wonderful and I really appreciated it because I’ve had such a difficult time this year. They were great at listening, but also good at going further and giving affirmation and advice. They were very caring and empathetic, and I really feel like they understood what I was going through.” (Marcy)
13. “I was highly hesitant going to the Counseling Center and being involved with a counselor, but I can honestly say that it was one of the best decisions of my life.” (Marcy)

The utilization statistics provide a helpful summary of the most common issues that students bring to the counseling setting, which is also the most common questions asked of counseling centers. Over time we have seen a clear picture of the top five issues: 1) affective disorders; 2) anxiety disorders; 3) relationships; 4) identity/self esteem; and 5) eating/body issues. Utilization statistics also reveal cluster issues in any given semester, such as grief and loss, or sexual identity, and finally help us follow current trends and demographics.

Notable 2010/11 statistical data (For complete statistics see appendix 1).
Non-Caucasian students: Fall - 24%  Spring - 26%
Students on psychotropic medication:  Fall - 25% Spring - 23%
Students referred to or already seeing a psychiatrist during semester: Fall - 12%  Spring - 13%

C. Close the Loop
1. Changes:
   ● Refocus with staff on the priority of therapy, case consultation, and training. Specifically receive training in the area of sexual identity with Mark Yarhouse (fall 2011); restructure staff meetings to allow a minimum of 30 minutes for case consultation; revisit brief therapy and limited sessions and it’s impact on the therapeutic relationship; plan training opportunities together as a staff.
   ● Rewrite survey questions related to objectives 1 & 2.
   ● Write FAQ’s for website and to be given with intake forms (objective 1).
   ● Add category and links to website for diversity and multicultural issues, increase case consultation in this area (objective 3).
2. Results impact on others:
● The better the statistics the better the information regularly imparted to faculty and student life staff (conversations, meetings), resident assistants (trainings), and parents (orientation).
● Confidence in our renewed focus on students needs.
● Limited, focused collaboration and outreach due to time constraints.

3. Timeline:
● Make a recommendation in the fall budgeting process for the purchase of Titanium software
● Add FAQ to Counseling Center website by December 2011

4. New goals and dreams:
● If assessment is the future, a new goal is to have an online management system specific to college counseling centers, including dedicated computers/ipads in the waiting room. Students would be enabled to enter all pertinent information, take pre and post inventories before and after counseling to better access their improvement, and provide us with state of the art standardized utilization and satisfaction data that can be compared across years, across campus and across colleges.
● Add diversity statistic to 10-year comparison chart.

Section V: Program Review focus for the upcoming area

Appendix 1: Student Contact
A. 1. Statistical data, Fall and Spring (see hard copies)

B. 2. Annual Survey data (see hard copy)

Appendix 2: External Review Update
A. 1999
B. 2012
C. I have selected and invited 2 directors from the 5C’s (Coalition of Christian College Counseling Center Directors). The 2 directors wholeheartedly replied yes! They are: Janice Holton from Gordon College and Doug DeMerchant from Wheaton College. (Doug successfully utilizes an online case management program called “Titanium”). This fall I will select and invite one Westmont faculty member and one student life staff to also be on the review team.

I would like the review team to help us zero in on structural advice - naming the highest priorities within the mission of our counseling center given our particular college administrative/organizational system, campus culture, and size. Prioritizing includes: Counseling students; training of counselors; supervision/case management with counseling staff; programming choices related to outreach/education/prevention (Student Health 101, Mental Health Screening, suicide prevention); collaboration; consultation; policy writing; website maintenance; transitioning to online case management system.

Appendix 3: Collaboration
● Campus Life: Student leadership presentation; Focus week screening and discussion of film “The Playground”.
● Alumni and Parent Relations: Presentation to Parent’s Council; Parent’s info session at orientation; added page just for parents on website.
● Residence Life: RA Training; Poster Session; Joint staff meeting with RD’s; Welcome meeting to introduce new RD’s to Counseling Center.
● Risk Management: Arranged for Dr. Van Brunt to come to campus to speak about recognizing aggression and preventing violence; researched risk of suicide in relationship to new bridge.
Counseling Center

- Security: Investigated ways to make Counseling Center safer, such as “panic button”.
- Intercultural Programs: Invited Elena Yee to give in service at staff meeting.
- Administration and Faculty: Care Team member, Faculty Forum presentation, Lesa Stern class presentation.
- Office of Life Planning and WCSA: “Sophomore Night” participation.
- Student Life: Shared life story moments at All Student Life Staff meeting; Dean’s council meetings regarding Mark Yarhouse visit and issue of sexual identity; Care Team.
- Off Campus Programs: Discussion of mental health needs for students abroad.
- Counseling center staff initiated or responded to meetings with various campus people such as David Hernandez, Ben Patterson, Michelle Hardley, Jeremy Fletcher, Mitchell Thomas, Andrea Gurney, Dana Alexander and Celia Howland.

### Counseling Center Utilization
#### 10-Year (2001-2011) Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Served at Counseling Center</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions/Students (average)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Students</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Served Returning</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sessions</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Student Body Served</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Served at Counseling Center</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions/Students (average)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning Students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Served Returning</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sessions</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Student Body Served</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Five CONVERSATIONS for Development

**Student Life Programming Review:**
*From PURPOSE to PONDERINGS to POSSIBILITIES to PRIORITES to PLAN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation #1</th>
<th>Sept. 5</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Westmont?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Revisit Educational Vision &amp; Institutional Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Student Life?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Areas for Student Life Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Programming?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Programming Content Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Programming Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Developmental Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Programming for Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PONDERINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Develop clarity on what we mean by development in a particular area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do we know?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Create clear link between Student Life programming area &amp; Westmont's Educational Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What else could we know?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Review current “interventions for development”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So What?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Explore possible new &quot;manipulation of variables&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now What?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation #3</th>
<th>Nov. 7, Nov. 14</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSSIBILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have we learned?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Working groups present “white paper”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the implications?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Discuss possible program implications and/or ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Describe why they are “committed but not attached”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* What seems to resonate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* What questions are generated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Are there common themes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation #4</th>
<th>Nov. 28</th>
<th>Draft Blueprint for 2012 and Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Agreement on good enough consolidated “white paper”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is most important?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Programming ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the challenges?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Strategies for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where are opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Measuring effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide Bar</th>
<th>Dec.</th>
<th>Dean’s Council Day Away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Determine priorities &amp; structure for programming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation #5</th>
<th>Jan. 23</th>
<th>Blueprint for 2012 and Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Present plan decided by Dean’s Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What makes sense moving forward?</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Determine responsibilities during Spring semester for Fall 2012 implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Digging Deeper in Small Groups**

*An Opportunity to Professional Development & Contribution*

**GOALS**

- Develop Clarity on what we mean by “development” in a particular area
- Create a clear link between Student Life developmental programming areas and Westmont’s Educational Vision/Goals
- Identify current “interventions for development” that effectively meet Student Life’s developmental programming goals
- Explore possible manipulation of variables (prayer, physical space, policies, services, social arrangements, role models/staffing, planned gatherings) for effective implementation of student life educational goals.
- Produce a draft 1-2 page “white paper” that articulates the group’s thinking regarding the above points

---

**Digging Deeper #1 – “Scratching the Surface: What do we know?”**

- Give an opportunity for each member to share from their perspective what is important to consider when thinking about your focus area
  - What is it?
  - What are critical competencies?
  - What are signs that development is happening?
  - Summarize collective theme(s) that seem to be emerging
  - Assign outside reading to enrich next session(s)

**Digging Deeper #2 – “Turning the Soil: What else could we know?”**

- Start by having each member share from their assignment (developmental reading)
- Discuss how this information affirm, question, or expand our collective wisdom from first session of the issues?
- Develop a “wet cement” attempt at naming the developmental issues and our goals for education

**Digging Deeper #3 – “Planting Seeds: So What?”**

- Review “wet cement” goals and adjust as further reflection seems appropriate
- Review “populated cells” of current interventions and discuss:
  - How do current interventions (manipulation of variables) align with new goals for focus area?
  - Does it seem to make sense to suggest an adjustment of some interventions?
  - Brainstorm possible new interventions that could result in great success
  - Identify possible suggestions

**Digging Deeper #4 – “Cultivating New Growth: Now What?”**

- Review possible suggestions & decide on a few to present to larger group. Review “white paper” draft.
- Agree to “good enough” version of the white paper (committed but not attached) to present to larger group

**Digging Deeper Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christian Understanding &amp; Practices</th>
<th>Diversity &amp; Global Awareness</th>
<th>Active Societal &amp; Intellectual Engagement</th>
<th>Physical &amp; Emotional Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Patterson*</td>
<td>Jane Higa*</td>
<td>Dana Alexander*</td>
<td>Tim Wilson*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Bairam</td>
<td>Joshua Canada</td>
<td>Danny Clapp</td>
<td>Amy Gammelgard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Fletcher</td>
<td>Deanne Liu</td>
<td>Angela D’Amour</td>
<td>Lyndsay Grimm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Patterson</td>
<td>Jon Young</td>
<td>Jeremy Fletcher</td>
<td>David Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celia Howen</td>
<td>Marcy O’Hara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chairperson

A white paper is a short article that states an organization’s position or philosophy about a subject. Typically, a white paper explains the results, conclusions, or construction resulting from some organized committee, research collaboration, or design and development effort, and often provides a guide that helps solve a problem. It is often a prelude to the final policy document, and it contains proposals for the specific policy area. Several drafts of a white paper may be distributed for final comments before it goes for approval to the apex body.

Prelude to the final policy document, it contains proposals for the specific policy area suggested during the consultation process initiated with the publication of a green paper. Several drafts of a white paper may be distributed for the final comments after which it goes for approval to the apex body such as a Parliament before it becomes the official policy.

A white paper is an authoritative report or guide that helps solve a problem. White papers are used to educate readers and help people make decisions, and are often requested and used in politics, policy, business, and technical fields. Policy makers frequently request white papers from universities or academic personnel to assist policy developers with expert opinions or relevant research.
### What are the Key (5 or Less) Program Initiatives Currently Being Utilized by Your Department to Bring about Student Development in Each Category?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Program Review Focus: 2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Key Current Department Program Strategies for Development**

(From May 2011 Deans' Council Retreat)
Introduction
Upon request by Tatiana Nazarenko, I reviewed the Division of Student Life 2010-2011 Annual Program Review Report. My observations and recommendations are included in this review summary.

Overview of the Report
The Annual Program Review Report is a well-written and well-edited document consisting of the program review reports from the seven departments within the division. All student life departments utilize an Annual Program Review Report Template. This template was developed and refined with the assistance and feedback from WASC experts such as Dr. Mary Allen and Dr. Laurie Dodge. The report template seems to be effective for each of the units. I recommend continued use of the template as well as continued refinement of the template to meet the needs of the division.

The use of external program review in the Division of Student Life is laudable. Program review is a best practice process and is not widely utilized in divisions of student life/student affairs across the country. Participating in this process brings consistency to the assessment efforts within the division and across campus.

COMMENDATIONS
Several units exhibited assessment best practices in their Annual Program Review Report and are worthy of mention in this review.

- The Office of Life Planning (OLP) clearly outlined unit goals, objectives, actions/programs, outcomes, and measures.
- OLP aligns programs to each of its goals/objectives.
  - This alignment can be referred to as an engagement map (similar to a curriculum map used in academic programs) and depicts the program/intervention designed to meet the stated outcome.
- OLP presents longitudinal data so that trends over time can be examined.
- The Office of Intercultural Programs utilizes the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to measure student intercultural competence.

RECOMMENDATIONS/CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Template
The report template seems to be effective for each of the units. I recommend continued use of the template as well as continued refinement of the template to meet the needs of the division.

Visual appearance of the report
The report is a reasonable length and easy to read. However, reading through the two most recent external reviews was a bit dense. There are a couple of typographical errors (a couple of missing periods) in the
report, and although these minor errors do not detract from the work, they should be corrected. Overall, the document is well-written and well-edited.

This report is text heavy and dense. It would be worthwhile to consider how the data can be presented in a more digestible fashion. The use of visually-pleasing graphs and charts could be included in the overall summary report as well as in each unit’s report. For example, the Office of Life Planning included three graphs depicting usage trends, and this visual depiction of the data was very helpful.

These graphs and charts could also be used in other settings as well. For example, the graphs could be included on the unit’s or division’s website, in recruitment materials, as well as the existing program review reports.

**Report Audience**

It was difficult to ascertain the intended audience for this report. It appears to be an internal report that can also be used for accountability purposes (WASC accreditation, other reporting requirements). This conclusion is based on the fact that the Office of Intercultural Programs and the Counseling Center included nearly raw data in the results section of the report.

If the intended audience extends beyond internal division personnel, I would strongly recommend presenting results from focus groups and other assessments in aggregate. In addition, the amount of text may not be easily reviewed by, or appropriate for, all audiences. For example, a senior college administrator may not want to read the details of the program review report, but would prefer a short one page summary of the division’s progress over the past year.

If it has not already been done, I would recommend creating multiple reports appropriate for different audiences. This recommendation is not intended to make busy work for any staff member(s), but rather, it is an opportunity to use this information fully and share it with a number of varied audiences. These groups may include college administrators, faculty, students, parents, and peer institutions. For example, preparing a brief one-page infographic for students can help them realize that their feedback has been utilized which may engage them more in the assessment and evaluation process on campus.

As the division refines the report format for different audiences, I also suggest contacting WASC to ensure that the annual reports are consistent with and can be used for accreditation purposes.

**Organization of the Report**

The reviews are presented in a chronological order by external review with the unit participating in most recent external program review listed first. This chronological order, and the organization of the report, is well described and clear.

However, the most effective organization of the report may depend on the audience of the report. Again, the chronological order seems to be more meaningful for an internal audience whereas a broad overview followed by more specific reports may be more meaningful for an external audience.

As an outside reader, it would have been helpful to have an overall introduction, a snapshot of the division, number of staff members, diversity of staff, etc. for context.

It would also be helpful to include a broad description of the theoretical and practical models that are used in the development of student programs and services. Most of the work of student life/staff affairs
professionals is based on student development theory and it would be beneficial for that connection to be reflected in the annual report.

Many student life/student affairs professionals are active contributors to the field through organizational memberships, presentations, publications, and professional service. A summary of the professional activities of the staff members should also be included.

Observations about the Report Sections

The sections of the report did not differ greatly in tone and content although I suspect they had different authors. This observation is a compliment to the report editor, as that can be a challenging task.

The sections did differ based on which report the unit was to complete (one year following review, two years following review, or other cycle). Again, this difference was clearly articulated.

The Campus Pastor’s Office second year report had a tone that implied displeasure with the program review process. For example, terse responses such as, “IT shot our program down” and “We don’t see the need for this at the present time” may indicate a perfunctory attitude toward the process. Although these reactions are genuine and should be heard without “spin” not all audiences need to be privy to those comments.

Student learning outcomes aren’t as developed as they could be and in some cases aren’t learning outcomes at all, but rather they are program outcomes (process objectives) or metrics. For example, the Office of Intercultural Programs includes “There is 50% increase in the number of students of color, international, and MK/TCKs participating in the programs organized by the Intercultural Organizations” as a learning outcome in Section II, part 3 of their report. This outcome is a program outcome, not a learning outcome. Learning outcomes and process objectives should both be included, but it should be made explicit that these are not the same things.

There appears to be a reliance on surveys and focus groups as the primary outcome measures. Whereas these are good measures, staff should consider alternate forms of evaluation whenever possible. The use of the IDI by the Office of Intercultural Programs and the presentation of longitudinal data by the Office of Life Planning are good alternatives to surveys and focus groups.

It would be advantageous to have both survey and focus group results presented in a summary format. For example, the Health Center and Counseling Center could depict survey results graphically and the Office of Intercultural Programs should report the themes of the focus groups rather than the quotes and notes from the focus group itself. It is appropriate for department-level reports to include more raw data, but the annual report should include aggregate results.

The inclusion of the “closing the loop” section is commendable and it is apparent that units review their data and prepare action steps for the upcoming year. However, some individual unit sections lacked a strong emphasis of interpretation and use of the results for improvement. However, these sections can be strengthened easily with explicit and direct responses to questions such as “what do the data indicate”, “what will we do about it” and “how will we know our planned actions made a difference”. The units that are responding to program review recommendations seem to do a better job with utilizing the results, but the units not in program review are less likely to define explicitly how they will “close the loop”.
**Additional Observations**

There are several references to excessive programming and duplication of efforts in the review team reports. I could not determine the number of programs offered and the number of students served through those programs in this report. It would be worthwhile to include an accounting of the number of programs, type of programs, and number of students served. This information could be used to determine if the number of programs or a particular type of program is excessive.

The division does not appear to have a coordinated plan of annual or semi-annual activities. The review team recommended that a calendar of activities be developed, and I support that recommendation.

The relationship between body of campus programming and student learning is not addressed explicitly in the report. It could be quite informative and useful to determine to what extent and in what ways campus programming contributes to the academic progress of students.

The OCL review team indicated tension in relation to “collaboration and silos”. If the ability to collaborate within the division and across campus is a priority for the division then it should be explicitly addressed at the division level in the annual report. In the case of co-curricular programming, units should include programs facilitated in conjunction with academic units as well.

The annual report is a compilation of unit activities and lacks an overarching student perspective. Broad research questions related to student learning and student development are not included in this report. For example,

- To what extent does the Westmont experience impact students’ spiritual development?
- Are under-represented students fully utilizing campus programs and services?
- Are Westmont students active and engaged citizens?

Including evidence in support of broader questions can support the Division of Student Life’s contribution to the four institutional learning goals.

**Recommendations for Future Reports**

- Continue to utilize the annual report template and revise template as needed.
- Include more visually-appealing features in the report (e.g., present data using graphs or charts)
- Prepare multiple versions of the report for varied audiences.
- Ensure that information presented in the report(s) does not compromise student confidentiality.
- Include appropriately worded student learning outcomes in addition to process objectives.
- Consider sources of data such as benchmarking measures, portfolios, and others as assessment processes mature.

**DEVELOPING A COHESIVE PLAN FOR THE DIVISION OF STUDENT LIFE**

The description of the 2011-12 program review and assessment focus for the Division of Student Life is very promising and will likely result in the development of a cohesive action and assessment plan for the Westmont College Division of Student Life. I strongly encourage the division staff to maintain this focus and offer some suggestions to assist with that process.

Woven throughout the 2010-2011 Division of Student Life Annual Program Report are references to the *Blueprint for 2012 and Beyond*. The plan, as well as the process used to develop the plan, has the potential
to transform the Division of Student Life. This plan, if constructed carefully, purposefully, and based on
evidence, can reduce duplication of effort and burden on an already stretched staff, increase effectiveness
of programs and activities for students, and maximize limited resources by allowing resources to be
allocated to the most effective programs and initiatives.

The pieces that are critical to the effort are stated within the annual report, but deserve emphasis in this
review:

- Ensure alignment of departmental programming with institutional goals
- Examine programming redundancies
- Evaluate and maximize the developmental impact of programs
- Examine of potential for greater collaboration among departments
- Determine divisional priorities

**Ensure alignment of departmental programming with institutional goals**
As stated in the Annual Program Review Report, the Division of Student Life identified four of the eight
institutional goals to which it contributes through programs and services. These four institutional goals
should serve as the overarching goals for the division’s efforts.

**Examine programming redundancies**
A recommendation made by the Campus Life Office (CLO) review team in January 2011 was to conduct a
campus activity/programming audit. I agree with the review team’s recommendation and advocate that
this audit take place as suggested.

It appears that the *Key Current Departmental Program Strategies for Development* document can
contribute to that audit. However, the *Key Current Departmental Program Strategies for Development*
document asks for each unit to list 5 or fewer program initiatives for each category. I suggest that all
programs be included to make the audit complete.

Completing this document is tantamount to developing an engagement map or alignment matrix (these
terms refer to the same thing). An engagement map in co-curricular programming is equivalent to a
curriculum map in an academic program. The process and the product allow the division to determine
which institutional goals are appropriately addressed through programs and services and which goals may
be receiving too much or too little attention.

This process allows for rich discussion about programs and the intended purpose of those programs.
However, the process may not be easy for all staff members. In some cases, staff members have a deep
sense of ownership toward programs they proposed and/or developed and discussions about the intention
and viability of those programs can be internalized by staff members. Sometimes staff members act
defensively or cease to participate in the process because they fail to separate the program discussion from
a personal discussion.

In order for this process to be successful, the facilitator of the session should be neutral and be perceived as
trustworthy by the staff. Ground rules should be established and followed to ensure that the process is
successful. I encourage the staff to be open to changes and adjustments based on this work.

**Evaluate and maximize the developmental impact of programs**
The final map, the product, will be an important tool in developing the Blueprint and assessment plans. The
map can also provide a framework for staff members who make decisions regarding programs and services.
That is, intentional decisions about which programs should be offered, based on which outcomes they impact, can be made by staff and administrators.

**Examine of potential for greater collaboration among departments**
The process of developing the map and utilizing the map to make decisions can also be an opportunity to cross silos, enhance collaboration, and strengthen the efforts of the division. This work may also inform how the annual reports and program reviews are conducted, and will certainly impact the emphasis of learning outcomes and process objectives.

**Determine divisional priorities**
Program resources could be allocated accordingly and a robust process of planning, implementation, assessing, improvement, and resource allocation can develop.

**Next Steps**
The program audit/engagement map process is just one step in the planning and assessment process, albeit a very large step. It is likely that the staff will realize a great level of redundancy that calls for combining long-standing programs and/or eliminating some student-led initiatives. Following the mapping process the staff will need to make some difficult decisions about the number and type of programs that are offered. The mapping process will likely yield a centralized events calendar which will also address a recommendation made by the CLO review team in January 2011.

Once the programs and services are aligned with the institutional learning goals, staff members should identify appropriate measures to be used for assessing those outcomes. The measures should not be limited to surveys and focus groups, but may include institutional data and direct measures of student learning.

Assessment measures should be implemented and the results gathered and analyzed. Those results should be presented in a manner that is appropriate for the intended audience and protects the confidentiality of the students. The results should be utilized in decision making processes as programs and services are improved, redesigned, discontinued or developed.