

Office of Intercultural Programs and Services

CAS Self Assessment Report Summary

The Office of Intercultural Programs and Services approached the CAS evaluation from several directions. First, full-time staff members were assembled. The instrument was shared with all full-time staff members and a history of CAS was provided during this introduction. It was then decided that full-time staff members during the 00-01 and 01-02 academic years would complete the assessment along with one graduate assistant and one practicum student.

Following the completion of this first step, all the data and comments were gathered into one document. The group individually assigned number values to each criterion. The collected information was shared amongst the group and reviewing the comments, documentation, and discussing their own personal experiences began. The data collection was led by Jeremy Schenk, practicum student. Takisha Stokes, practicum student facilitated the comments and discussion for the group.

The Office of Intercultural Programs and Services successfully recruited two practicum students with strong interest in assessment to help coordinate all CAS efforts. During the Spring and Summer of 2001, full-time staff discussed CAS and how the standards related to the Office of Intercultural Programs and Services. Jeremy Schenk led effort to collect reference data necessary for appropriate assessment criterion. Full-time staff members as well as the practicum student assigned numbers to the criterion after viewing appropriate data. During the end of Summer and early Fall 2001, new staff were added to the Office of Intercultural Programs and Services and some staff members left. This allowed for new views on the CAS assessment and new views on the Office of Intercultural Programs and Services without impressions of a veteran staff member. A new practicum student was also added for the Fall of 2001. With a new group formed, the Office of Intercultural Programs and Services regrouped and revisited how the CAS assessment was going to be completed. The new group also defined shared terms for the CAS assessment, a shared understanding of the rating scale, and a commitment to understanding the standards and guidelines as a whole.

CAS Results Summary by Section

Section	Rating Ratio	Compliance Percentage
1- Mission	91/130	70%
2- Program	107/170	63%
3- Leadership	81/125	65%
4- Organization & Management	40/70	57%
5- Human Resources	87/140	62%
6- Financial Resources	9/15	60%
7- Facilities, Technology, & Equipment	14/45	31%
8- Legal Responsibility	19/25	76%
9- Equal Opportunity, Access, & A.A.	26/35	74%
10- Campus & Community Relations	18/25	72%
11- Diversity	27/35	77%
12- Ethics	60/95	63%
13- Assessment & Evaluation	15/30	50%