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Mission Statement

Undergraduate Admissions serves applicants, students, parents, high school, college and other academic counselors, the Campus, the CSU Chancellor’s Office and external community stakeholders by making final decisions regarding admission, awarding of transfer credit, graduation, and residency for tuition purposes. Undergraduate Admissions strives to maintain the highest possible decision-making integrity while providing complete, accurate, timely and user-friendly information and customer service. Undergraduate Admissions also provides information technology development and support and strives to maintain uninterrupted services and timely user support while continuing to analyze, recommend and implement new technology solutions.

Rationale

Undergraduate Admissions assists the university’s mission of attracting, retaining and graduating a diverse student body, while serving communities with which students and faculty are engaged. Acting as the first official point-of-contact, Undergraduate Admissions provides a positive environment for the introduction to the University, allowing students to begin the process of learning.

Planning Goals

Goal 1: 
Assure an evaluations decision-making process that is complete and efficient for application review, degree verification, transfer course articulation and residency determination.

Goal 2: 
Improve office organization, resource allocation and management practices to support the office mission and values and provide a positive environment for managers, staff and student workers.

Goal 3: 
Improve quality and timeliness of network, hardware and software support to the admissions office and to all Enrollment Management offices.

Student Learning Outcomes and Program Objectives

Program Objective #1: Impacted Major Recommendations Recorded Electronically

For the Fall 2010 admissions cycle, 100% of department decisions for designated impacted majors will be entered electronically in SIMS and integrated with the official Admissions Office eligibility evaluation.

Rationale:
Applicants to impacted majors must be reviewed by departments using additional criteria. Department decisions must match the official University Eligibility Decisions. Currently a paper and e-mail process is used to communicate back-and-forth with departments. This process is inefficient and unreliable, requiring additional quality control and time to complete the decision-making process.

Measures:
Analysis of the timing and processing of impacted major decisions will determine how many decisions were made through the automated process and how much the process improved both the timeliness and accuracy of the process.
Satisfaction/feedback surveys of departments will be conducted at the end of the Fall 2010 (September 2010) and Fall 2011 cycle (September 2011.)

Results:
Other than a few special cases resolved via e-mail communication, all impacted major decisions were recorded in the Department Recommendation field in SIMS. This data was used to by staff to prioritize evaluations and was used to automatically communication application status to impacted major applicants. Additionally, this field was used to manage and communicate with applicants placed on department wait lists. Departments which conducted supplemental application review successfully entered their decisions via a screen on the SIMS database.

The Psychology Department used a ranking system to both admit applicants and place them on a wait list. After ranking was complete and approved by the department, the department recommend fields were updated by the admissions office.

No paper decision forms were used to communicate department decisions. A few late and changed decisions were handled via e-mail.

Conclusion:
The process of recording department decisions electronically improved the efficiency and accuracy of the process. New Impacted Majors for the Fall 2011 application cycle will be trained in the process. A few minor changes to the way data is entered will be proposed for the next admissions cycle. Also, since the screen will be available at the beginning of the Fall 2011 application cycle, departments will be able to record receipt of supplemental department applications. The department and the admissions office can better used this to track completeness of applications and communicate with applicants earlier in the cycle.

Student Learning Outcome #1: Technical Student Assistant Training (Supports Goal #3.)

All Admissions Office Information Technology student assistants will demonstrate knowledge of:
- PC Setup, maintenance, troubleshooting and repair
- Section Customer Service Principles
- Workplace Values

Timeline:
Initial trial assessments tested with a Technical Student Assistant hired for the Summer 2009 semester. Assessments will begin for all Technical Student Assistants hired beginning with the Fall 2009 semester.

Rationale:
The training provided to the Technical Student Assistants while employed in the System Support Group/Office of Undergraduate Admission will be the fundamental building block of their professional development. The skill set they acquire; the methodology to problem solving; the enforcement of process adherence such as developing and maintaining standard operating procedures, tracking help support problems and solutions and ownership of their task through documentation will help them in future employment and education.

Measures:
1. A short answer assessment test will be given at the time of hire and at the end of each quarterly maintenance cycle. This will help to gauge improvement and learning expectations.
2. Direct supervisor observation
3. Comparison of customer satisfaction surveys over time:
   a. Short paper surveys will be given to customers after each support task is completed
   b. Longer online surveys will be given to all users supported each semester.
Measures are taken as a gauge of overall development and not used as a means of selection or promotion. We want to offer to our Technical Student Assistants the tools they need to succeed and the measurement assesses the fundamental utility of those tools, to determine how well we are training them.

We set up a plan and are giving all Technical Student Assistants an assessment when they start. We are also planning to give them semi-annual assessments at the end of each semester.

**Results:**
Assessment Tests were given in interval at the end of each semesters where the answers were quantified into a raw aggregated score with a maximum of 100. The breakdown is as follows:

**Assessment Survey of Self (Knowledge & Understanding):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Summer 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSA #1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA #2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA #3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA #4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55 / 58 (21 days later)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Survey of Student (Performance & Interaction):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How courteous was the TSA?</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of file restoration</td>
<td>83.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of bookmark restoration</td>
<td>75.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Outlook Setup</td>
<td>91.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions:**
We tracked a significant improvement of the TSA’s general knowledge over the course of one year. Their expertise grew in the area of Knowledge, Understanding, Performance and Interaction with staff. The TSA are an integral part of the support operations and their skill set is constantly being tested and improved upon. We will continue to give more advanced versions of the Assessment Survey to both the TSA and the Staff in order to derive some measure of their experience they are gaining working as part of a technical unit.