

Running Head: COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT MODEL

Increasing Accountability in Student Affairs
Through a New Comprehensive Assessment Model

Janice Davis Barham and Joel H. Scott

University of Georgia

Abstract

This article gives an overview of a new model for assessment practice within student affairs divisions. With the current increase of accountability and greater demands from higher education stakeholders, it is believed that all practitioners in student affairs need to understand how to demonstrate the effectiveness and value of their work as it relates to the mission of their department and division. We will outline how the model was developed, detail the different steps involved, and consider why this process is important.

Increasing Accountability in Student Affairs

Through a New Assessment Comprehensive Model

Assessment is not a new concept for student affairs. Many of the primary documents for the field contain language that encourages practitioners to intentionally connect assessment to performance improvement (American Council on Education, 1937; American Council on Education, 1949). In practice, however, assessment has often been viewed as sporadic and endemic to particular departments. Additionally, assessment practice has not truly represented the comprehensive nature of profession practice. For many, assessment has translated to customer satisfaction only. For others, assessment has meant examining student learning outcomes or student development outcomes. Yet it seems few have integrated the multiple dimensions of student affairs work – service, development and learning. Thus, a comprehensive assessment model that integrates the multiple facets of student affairs practice seems warranted.

A paradigm is described as a fundamental way of viewing the world (Babbie, 2004). It is a philosophical approach that guides practice, informs decisions, and serves as the backbone from which all else flows. With this in mind, it is clear historically that the profession of student affairs has had three distinct paradigms that have guided the past seventy years of practice. Service, development, and learning have all served as the primary focus of our field, and the evolution of the profession can clearly be tracked through these three “paradigms.” In fact, the name of the profession has also been guided by the philosophical shift that has occurred through the years. Student services, student development, and most recently, student affairs have all been names synonymous with those who purport to do student support type work. As we journey through the history of the profession, it is interesting to see how much each paradigm has impacted the shaping of our professional purpose, mission, and focus.

The Paradigmatic Shifts of Student Affairs

In 1937, a group of individuals gathered for the purpose of adding structure and intentionality to their emerging profession. The *Student Personnel Point of View* (American Council on Education, 1937) was created and became an operational philosophy for the profession, and has since been viewed as the springboard for the profession of student affairs. The focus of the 1937 and later 1949 “Points of View,” gave way to the first professional paradigm for student affairs: service.

Within the text of both documents, the service tenant emerged as distinct and clear. As seen in the 1949 document the cornerstone for students’ personal and social wisdom was believed to be contingent upon the presence of comprehensive and intentional services such as orientation, housing, activities, physical health, academic support, personal support, financial assistance, and career assistance to list a few (American Council on Education, 1949).

The profession continued to emerge with the integration of new students and new societal influences. In the early 1970’s the research of Skinner (1953), Maslow (1954), Perry (1968), and others psychologists began to appear in the mainstream. An insurgence of inquiry on individual development challenged the long held beliefs of educators and caused an influx of research on college students. Chickering (1969) and Kohlberg (1971) began examining the development of college aged students. Professionals began to see the importance of integrating “developmental understanding” into the day to day work of college administration.

In 1972, building on the desire to integrate developmental understanding into college administrative practice, The Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education (COSPA) convened a group to review professional preparation in college student personnel work

(Council of Student Personnel Associations, 1994). From this work, specific points of view emerged as “keystones” for the profession.

“The orientation to student personnel is developmental; Self-direction of the student is the goal of the student and is facilitated by the student development specialist; Students are viewed as collaborators with the faculty and administration in the process of learning and growing; It is recognized that many theoretical approaches to human development have credence, and a thorough understanding of such approaches is important to other student development specialists; The student development specialists prefers a proactive position in policy formulation and decision-making so that a positive impact is made on the change process. (p. 428)

Within these keystones for professional practice emerged a new professional emphasis. COSPA encouraged practitioners to shift professional focus from one of service to one that integrated student development.

Also in 1972, the American College Personnel Association commissioned Robert Brown to create a document entitled *Tomorrow’s Higher Education: A Return to the Academy* (Nuss, 1996). The document was intended to redefine the role of the practitioner in relation to the institution and encourage practitioners to intentionally integrate student development into daily practice (Brown, 1972). The work of both Brown and COSPA brought forth student development as the second major professional paradigm for student affairs.

The profession continued under this vein until some began to question the professional focus. Higher education, societal expectations, and the needs of students began to change. Accountability shifted from something discussed to something that was expected, and stakeholders, governing boards, legislators, parents and students began to challenge institutions to return to the primary purpose of higher education: student learning (American College Personnel Association, 1996). In addition, the two professional organizations within student affairs began to ask questions regarding professional focus. In 1996, the Association of College Personnel Administrators (ACPA) published a document entitled the *Student Learning*

Imperative (SLI). The primary purpose was to “stimulate discussion and debate on how student [affairs] professionals can intentionally create conditions that enhance student learning and personal development” (p. 1). The document sets forth the conditions that constitute a “Learning-Oriented” division. Shortly after the SLI went into circulation, ACPA commissioned a group of scholars to create principles of good practice for student affairs (Blimling, Whitt & Associates, 1998; Blimling & Whitt, 1999). The end result became a book entitled, “*Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs*” (Blimling & Whitt, 1999). While the SLI encouraged a focus on both learning and development, “Good Practices” focused solely on how to integrate learning, not learning and development, and advised practitioners to shift to a philosophy that embraces student learning. “Good Practices” was intended to further the work of the SLI by establishing the guidelines that “will move our profession forward in its focus on learning...” (p.1). Soon after, other documents surfaced. *Powerful Partnerships* (American Association of Higher Education, American College Personnel Association, & National Association of College Personnel Administrators, 1998), and *Learning Reconsidered* (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association, 2004) sponsored by the two national student affairs organizations continued to advance the need for student affairs practitioners to focus on student learning. Once again, the profession began to shift focus. The new emerging trend became student learning and this evolved into the third paradigm of student affairs.

Through the years, a case has been built as to why each paradigm is important to the profession of student affairs. Each philosophical approach has been integral in driving the evolution of the profession, and each approach serves as a cornerstone for meeting the needs of students. Yet, have we neglected the true comprehensive nature of our work by focusing only on

one paradigm at a time? In the early days the profession focused on service. During the 1970's and 1980's, the emphasis was student development, and most recently, learning has become the newest theme that overshadows the other paradigms. Clearly student affairs has a responsibility to provide quality services, practitioners have a duty to facilitate the development of students, and the profession has an obligation to enhance the learning of clientele. Yet, at no point in our professional history have we acknowledged a need to focus on all three concurrently. As seen through the history of the field, the profession has been myopic in its approach; however, we have reached a day when we need to be comprehensive, forward-thinking, and intentional about our work.

Today, student affairs success hinges on how we embrace an ever evolving higher education landscape. In the past three decades higher education has been transformed by a more diversified student population, a greater accountability of student learning, a sweeping integration of information access and technology, and most pressing today, a call for greater accountability. Each of these contributes to the growing complexity faced by student affairs practitioners. These complicating variables have challenged the profession to a new level of responsibility and accountability where an isolated focus is no longer accepted as best practice. What will be expected of student affairs is an operation that integrates comprehensively the philosophies of service, development, and learning within an accountability frame.

The Emergence of Accountability and Assessment

Without a doubt Higher Education is riding a wave of great change. Accountability, a buzzword that emerged during the 1940's, has lingered, but now it lingers with a great deal more power and punch. It has been stated, "...Accountability should be and is being defined by those who hold the purse strings" (Simpson, 2000). In the past when states were celebrating a time of

abundance, accountability for higher education was less of an issue. Today, however, in a time when resources are incredibly limited; however, the public more than ever approaches education with a consumer mentality.

Accountability needs to be understood as more than just saving money, but also as a means for ensuring quality (Rogers, 2000). Concerns are not limited to the efficiency of institutions in regard to appropriate use of resources, but also with the institutions' effectiveness in educating students (Folger, 1977). The more complex questions of efficiency and effectiveness are being raised by governors and legislators as well as presidents and provosts (Folger, 1977). Criticism is growing. Government officials are questioning the value of research and the quality of preparedness of student preparedness (Rowley, Lujan, Dollence, 1997).

In the past, institutions have been reactionary to the needs and demands of an increasingly attentive public sector (Hearn, 1988). Results have come in the form of skepticism and distrust of institutions (Rowley et. al., 1997). Miller (2000) stated that institutions have the opportunity to regain trust and prove that it is serving the public interest. By taking initiative and implementing internal measures of accountability, the academy can meet the growing demands of outside constituencies while keeping sight of its mission.

Assessment is the clear link in demonstrating greater responsibility. Upcraft and Schuh (1996) made reference to this by stating that student affairs will have to respond to external and internal pressures of accountability by providing evidence that funding for nonacademic programs is wise. According to Schuh and Upcraft (2001), assessment is a means by which student affairs can demonstrate its importance and worth. It is a means by which we can measure the quality of programs and services, and is the way in which we measure students' development and learning. They further state, "Assessment efforts can and will demonstrate the effectiveness

and worth of student services and programs, and show positive relationships between students' out-of-class experiences and use of student services and programs and student learning, including academic achievement and retention" (2001, p. 10).

The concept of assessment is not a new phenomenon, but was a concept discussed in many of the primary documents previously covered. In the 1937 Student Personnel Point of View, the group stated that personnel workers should evaluate and improve services. "...Student personnel services will never develop as they should unless extensive and careful research is undertaken" (American Council on Education, 1937, p. 48). In fact, the writers proposed research to be done on students' in-class and out-of-class experiences. Throughout the 1937 document it is evident that assessment was recognized as an important tool in the service areas and the development of the profession (American Council on Education, 1937).

Assessment is also documented in the 1972 philosophical statement by the Council of Student Personnel Associations, stating, "The commission hopes that this document will be used for the profession as a point of departure for assessment, innovation, and development" (Council of Student Personnel Associations, 1994, p. 429). In *Tomorrow's Higher Education*, Brown (1972) also discusses the importance of assessment. He provides an outline of what is commonly known today as outcomes assessment, and provides guidelines for first understanding students' current level of development, then designing programs and services that facilitate enhanced development. Lastly, he proposes that students' progress should then be measured.

As seen, assessment has been viewed as a means for advancing the field of student affairs. We can also see through the historical references that service, development and learning are each integral to student affairs work and to the advancement of the profession. It is for this purpose that a new approach to assessment is needed, one that integrates the philosophies of the

past into a new comprehensive paradigm which also incorporates accountability. The future of student affairs rests in our ability to embrace and implement the proposed model systematically into daily practice.

The Development of the Model

The new comprehensive assessment model for student affairs was born from a series of discussions around the question: What should an assessment model look like for a division seeking to become “premier?” Three themes emerged in the responses and subsequent review of the literature. First, the model should be comprehensive. As mentioned earlier, though the history of the field has progressed through three distinct philosophies: student service, student development, and student learning (American Council on Education, 1937; American Council on Education, 1949; American College Personnel Association, 1996; National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association, 2004), the promotion of holistic education, mind, body, and soul, is still at the heart of student affairs and thus warrants an assessment model that will comprehensively integrate all three philosophies. Further, each philosophy is equally important to the field despite the recent singular focus on learning, and should be addressed and assessed with equal rigor in order to meet the growing demands of our student population. Second, the model should be intentional and systematic in guiding practitioners to realistic and relevant student outcomes. A strong assessment model should provide a step-by-step sequential process in order to ensure accuracy and success of implementation by practitioners. Finally, embedded in the systematic approach of the model, the assessment process should be iterative. By directing evaluation findings (top of the model) back to the foundation of the model (the mission and strategic plans for the division or department) practitioners have opportunities to know when, where, and how they are demonstrating

organizational effectiveness, thus increasing divisional accountability (see Figure 1). This is often referred to as “closing the loop,” a practice emulated and affirmed in recent assessment literature (Bresciani, Zelna, & Anderson, 2004; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001).

A New Comprehensive Assessment Model for the Division of Student Affairs

Insert Figure 1 here

Foundation

The base or foundation of the model heralds the mission of the university, the mission of student affairs and a division’s strategic goals. Within this foundation, although unlisted, is each departments’ interrelated mission and objectives. The model’s fluidity hinges on the cohesiveness of the foundation. As departments consider their mission and objectives, it is critical that each department be fully aligned with the mission of their division and the university before engaging in assessment. If a department moves forward with assessment and is unaware or unsure of its place in the foundation of the model, subsequent objectives and outcomes could be fundamentally misguided. Alignment of goals and objectives is a critical component in student affairs supporting the mission and objectives of the institution (American Association of Higher Education, American College Personnel Association, & National Association of College Personnel Administrators, 1998) and is an essential foundational step to this model.

Another critical component of the foundational phase is the use of professional standards to guide assessment efforts. While different functional areas of student affairs have their own standards and guidelines, most have been developed in concert with the Council on the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). The CAS standards not only challenge

practitioners, but they also serve as a map that guides the work that enhances institutional effectiveness. The standards also propose to develop students through opportunities that challenge and support critical thinking. While the use of professional standards developed by professional associations is voluntary, they provide practitioners with a needed instruction manual to review goals and functional areas which help determine the extent to which departments are meeting the established objectives (Mable, 1991).

The Arrows

As you move beyond the foundation of the model, the three philosophies, service, development, and learning—as designated by arrows—point upward, signifying the importance of their connection to the building blocks of assessment, as well as pointing upward towards a seamless and continuous process. Student affairs practitioners understand that service, development, and learning do not just occur one time, but are a continuous and evolving part of each student's college experience (American College Personnel Association, 1996; American Association of Higher Education, 1991; National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association, 2004). Subsequently, in order for assessment to be accurate and effective, it should be a continuous process (Bresciani et. al., 2004; Winston & Miller, 1994).

Step One: Select a Philosophical Area to Assess

In the service paradigm, assessment is often characterized as customer satisfaction; however, for the purpose of this model, the term service is one that incorporates multiple facets. Assessing service may translate into asking clients their opinion (Upcraft and Schuh, 1996). It may also involve tracking the characteristics of users (Palomba & Banta, 1999), the patterns of office use, and the way in which students use a facility. Practitioners may also find it helpful to

examine the service needs and wants of students (Palomba & Banta, 1999). Examples of service outcomes could include shortening wait times at the Health Center, increasing the number of Caucasian students who visit the African American Cultural Center, or decreasing the amount of vandalism that occurs to the student center during home football games.

Development, on the other hand, involves multiple dimensions of student growth. Areas such as moral, ethical, psychosocial, cognitive, racial identity, and spiritual are only a few of the many concepts that can be considered within this paradigm. Assessing development may involve measuring a student's emotional growth, interdependence, or identity development, all components of Chickering and Reiser's (1993) theory of psychosocial development. Assessing development may also lead practitioners to examine other areas such as ethical reasoning or racial awareness to determine if their specific program enhanced students' growth in these areas. Such information gives confidence and credibility. "We cannot only speak with confidence about 'what we do,' but we can also discuss 'how well we do it'" (Bresciani et. al., 2004).

While assessing development utilizes the concepts of student development theory, learning assessments examine "educationally purposeful activities" (American College Personnel Association, 1996, p.1). Such activities may be rooted in the philosophies of the Student Learning Imperative (American College Personnel Association, 1996) or Learning Reconsidered (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association, 2004), or in theories such as Bloom's Taxonomy, or Baxter-Magolda and King's Learning Partnerships (2004). Regardless of the guiding framework, the overarching purpose of assessing learning is to demonstrate the contribution student affairs makes to the overall educational experience (Bresciani et. al., 2004).

With all three paradigms, the intentionality of the process is paramount. The practitioner

must first identify the specific area they wish to target (service, development, or learning), have an understanding of the specific area within that paradigm they wish to target, and then align outcomes, objectives and curriculum that will facilitate the desired change. As stated by Bresciani, Zelna, and Anderson, “Decades of cumulative research indicate that students respond to intentional activities that are linked to positive outcomes” (2004, p. 1).

Step Two: Accountable Objectives

The arrows or paradigms in student affairs connect to the second step of assessment within the comprehensive model, which is the establishment of objectives. According to North Carolina State University’s Committee on Undergraduate Program Review, objectives are “broad, general statements of [1] what the program wants students to be able to do and to know, or [2] what the program will do to ensure what students will be able to do and to know” (Committee on Undergraduate Program Review, 2001). Thus, objectives describe what the program hopes to accomplish and bring to life the mission of the department and division. When creating objectives, it is important to step back and reflectively examine if the objectives are truly connected to the department’s mission. Are the objectives broad enough to encompass the desired experience? Are they important and meaningful not only to students, but to other student affairs and higher education stakeholders (Bresciani et. al., 2004)? The objectives step, like all other subsequent steps in the model, acts as the first check-point to ensure that the program being created is truly connected and accountable to the institution, the division and the individual department.

Step Three: Accountable Outcomes

Creating outcomes which measure the end result of objectives is the third step in the model. Outcomes are more specific statements derived from objectives. When creating

outcomes, it is important to think with the end in mind. What do you hope students learn or gain from your program or service? The use of active verbs such as identify, solve, or demonstrate, give the specificity needed for outcomes to be measurable. Careful attention should be given to avoid vague words that are open for interpretation (Palomba & Banta, 1999). Though outcomes are specific by nature, they cover a broad scope of territory, from program or service outcomes, to student learning and development outcomes, to faculty and staff outcomes (Bresciani, 2003).

Step Four: Assessment

The fourth step of the model involves testing and measuring the intended outcomes of your program or service. Assessment is commonly understood within student affairs as, “any effort to gather, analyze, and interpret evidence which describes institutional, divisional or agency effectiveness” (Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Indicative of its definition, assessment can employ several techniques. The trick is choosing a technique or combination of techniques which can truly measure your intended outcomes. It is important that practitioners choose wisely which assessment technique to utilize. There are many resources that can guide practitioners in this intricate process (Upcraft and Schuh, 1996; Schuh and Upcraft, 2001; Bresciani, 2003; Bresciani et. al., 2004; Palomba & Banta, 1999).

Step Five: Evaluation

The fifth step of the model is the evaluation of intended outcomes. Evaluation is defined as “any effort to use assessment evidence to improve institutional, divisional, or agency effectiveness” (Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). This step is often the most difficult part of assessment because it requires a critical look at program effectiveness. The purpose of evaluation is for program improvement, as well as recognition of meaningful work. Evaluation is situated at the pinnacle of the model because it is at this point that the model loops back and the process begins

again. The hope is that the information gained through the evaluation will be put to use in improving future program outcomes as well as confirming that the programs and services in place are meeting the stated outcomes. Doing assessment is not enough; we have to “close the loop” and use data to improve all that we do (Palomba & Banta, 1999). The evaluation step should provide a time to consider improvements as well as to celebrate how your intended outcomes contribute to student success and to the mission of your department and division.

Conclusion

Assessment is not a new concept for the field of student affairs. As previously discussed, assessment language is found in some of the earliest professional documents (American Council on Education, 1937; American Council on Education, 1949) and point toward an intentional connection between understanding and improving practice. Because this model is comprehensive, it will give practitioners a point of commonality and direction to pursue assessment together. In the past, assessment practice has often been viewed as sporadic, endemic to particular departments, or practiced through student satisfaction only. In order to infuse a culture of assessment and implement a user-friendly practice, a comprehensive assessment model is needed.

Upcraft and Schuh (1996) also pointed towards the comprehensive nature of assessment as they outlined several reasons for its importance to student affairs. They contend that assessment is important to survival and demonstration of worth, to the quality of programs, to cost effectiveness, to strategic planning and policy development, and to accreditation. The model will help student affairs position itself to respond to questions from stakeholders and administrators such as: How does student affairs contribute to learning? Is student affairs competitive with industry standards? What are students gaining from programs and services? By

taking a comprehensive approach to assessment and ensuring that all paradigms, service, development, and learning are represented, this model will lead to greater accountability and organizational effectiveness. Additionally, because this model systematically connects the mission of the Division with individual departments' objectives and outcomes, practitioners should be able to integrate this model in a relevant, pragmatic manner. Though comprehensive, the model provides a simple, sequential step process to measurable outcomes and opportunities to "close the loop," whether they are outcomes related to student service, development, or learning.

This article was intended to be both a history of assessment practices and an introduction to a new comprehensive assessment practice within student affairs. We believe this model can act as a compass to help student affairs divisions navigate their own unique assessment culture. We also believe this model is inclusive enough to provide a framework for implementing training with practitioners from diverse specializations.

References

- American Association of Higher Education, American College Personnel Association, & National Association of College Personnel Administrators (1998). Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility for learning. [On-line]. Available: http://www.aahe.org/teaching/tsk_frce.htm
- American College Personnel Association (1996). Student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37.
- American Council on Education, (1937). *The Student Personnel Point of View*. American Council on Education Studies, ser. 1, vol. 1, no.3. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- American Council on Education (1949). *The Student Personnel Point of View, (Rev. ed.)*. American Council on Education Studies, ser. 6, vol. 1, no.3. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- American Association of Higher Education (1991). 9 principles of good practice for assessing student learning. Retrieved February 28, 2006, from <http://www.iuk.edu/%7Ekoctla/assessment/9principles.shtml>.
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The practice of social research*, (10th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomas Learning.
- Baxter Magolda, M., King, P. M. (2004). *Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship*. Herndon, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Blimling, G. S., Whitt, E. J., & Associates (1998). Principles of good practice for student affairs. Retrieved December 10th, 2005, from <http://www.myacpa.org/pgp/principle.htm>
- Blimling, G. S., Whitt, E. J. (1999). *Good practices in student affairs: Principles to foster student learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Bloom B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook I: The cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay Co Inc.
- Bresciani, M. (2003). An updated outline for assessment plans. Net Results. Retrieved February 28, 2006, from <http://www.naspa.org/>
- Bresciani, M. J., Zelna, C. L., & Anderson, J. A. (2004). *Assessing student learning and development*. Washington, D.C.: NASPA.
- Brown, R. D. (1972). Student development in tomorrow's higher education: A return to the academy. *Student Personnel Monograph*, no. 16. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services (CAS), (1999). *The book of professional standards for higher education*. Hagerstown, MD: HBP Printing, graphics & Information Services.
- Council of Student Personnel Associations (1994). Student development services in postsecondary education. In A. L. Rentz (ed.), *Student affairs: a profession's heritage* (American College Personnel Association Media Publication No. 40, 2nd ed., pp. 428-437). Lanham, MD: University Press of America. (Original work published 1975).
- Committee on Undergraduate Program Review (2001). *Common language for assessment* [On-line]. Retrieved February 28, 2006, from <http://www.ncsu.edu/provost/academicprograms/uapr/process/language.html>

- Folger, J. K. (1977). Increasing the public accountability of higher education. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no. 16. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hearn, J. C. (1988). Strategy and resources: economic issues in strategic planning and management in Higher Education. In John C. Smart (Ed) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Volume IV*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). Stages of moral development as a basis for moral education. In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, and E. V. Sullivan (Eds.), *Moral education: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 23-92). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mable, P. (1991). Professional standards: an introduction and historical perspective. In W. Bryan, R. B. Winston, and T. K. Miller (Eds) *Using Professional Standards in Student Affairs, New Directions for Student Services*, no. 53. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Miller, Z. (2000). *A cautionary critique: the winter of despair or the spring of hope*. University of Georgia's Conference on Accountability and Financial Support of Public Higher Education Conference Presentation, May 31, 2000, Athens, Georgia.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Retrieved December 1, 2005, from http://www.naspa.org/membership/leader_ex_pdf/lr_long.pdf
- Nuss, E. M. (1996). The development of student affairs. In S. R. Komives & D. B. Woodward, (Eds.) *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 22-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Palomba, C. A., & Banta, T. W. (1999). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing and improving assessment in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in college*. New York: Hold, Rinehart & Winston.
- Rhatigan, J. J. (2000). The history and philosophy of student affairs. In M. J. Barr, M. K. Desler & Associates, *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed., pp. 3-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rogers, J. T. (2000). *Quality and public accountability: accreditations appropriate role*. University of Georgia's Conference on Accountability and Financial Support of Public Higher Education Conference Presentation, May 31, 2000, Athens, Georgia.
- Rowley, D. J., Lujan, H. D., Dolence, M. G. (1997). *Strategic change in colleges and universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schuh, J. H., Upcraft, M. L., & Associates (2001). *Assessment practice in student affairs: An application manual*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Simpsons, E.G. Jr. (2000). Engaging the public policy agenda: University of Georgia's Conference on Accountability and Financial Support of Public Higher Education Conference Presentation, May 31, 2000, Athens, Georgia.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan.
- Upcraft, L. M., & Schuh, J. H. (1996). *Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R.B. Jr, & Miller, T. K. (1994). Model for assessing developmental outcomes related to student affairs programs and services. *NASPA Journal*, 32 (1).

Figure I

Comprehensive Model for Student Affairs Assessment

