Fall 2012 LLRC Work Study, Lab Aide and CalWorks Student Employee SLO Assessment Process Overview

Learning Outcome

Proposed DRAFT institutional level outcome:
IV. Personal Responsibility and Professional Development. Students will demonstrate self-awareness, social and physical wellness, and workplace skills.

PSLOs:
2. Students build understanding of, appreciation for, and sensitivity to diverse peoples and cultures through the practice of using LLRC resources, services and facilities.

Assessment method

Student Employee Evaluation Form (“eval form” attachment A)
The eval form was created under the direction of Dean Rita Jones by members of the Supervisors’ Council, a committee consisting of classified and certificated staff responsible for departments within the LLRC. The original and current intent is to provide an instrument to evaluate student staff job performance so feedback can lead to improved job performance and provide a record for staff to give informed job references for students who leave our employment to transfer or other destinations. The eval form is used in conjunction with the LLRC “Guidelines for professional conduct for student workers” (“guidelines” attachment B). Many of the guidelines, which are given to new student workers to initial, are basic rules for professional conduct in a modern workplace. If a student worker does not comply with the guidelines this will be reflected in the eval each semester. A meeting is scheduled every semester around finals and the evaluation process is conversational and constructive in nature.
Throughout the semester during training and regular work, the student and staff should be using the “Student Training Checklist” to ensure that no aspect of training for the job is skipped over. All staff are responsible for ensuring the training of student assistants is complete and accurate, not just the hiring and approving manager. There is a simplified (attachment C) and full (attachment D) version of this training checklist and all students should have both and have checked off all the steps by the end of their first semester. The evaluation meeting is a great time to make sure that this is true for all the student staff.
The other main assessment tool, a student employee survey or feedback form, is being developed, reviewed and will be put into place by the end of this semester cycle so that we can address training issues and workplace skills and other personal development within our group of student staff.
### Describe the tool or strategy

We can modify and improve our training and support methods using our assessments to inspire and promote accurate time reporting, responsibility, self initiative, self confidence, collegiality between diverse student demographic groups, and many other workplace skills.

### When will you assess and how often?

First assessment conducted by Rosenberg Circulation department late Fall 2012. Second assessment will be late Spring 2013 by all LLRC departments using student staff.

### Resources needed (staff, equipment, materials)

Survey instrument(s) which should be modified each semester to account for returning students’ continuing growth in experience and learning. Staff time to complete an evaluation form for every student worker at the LLRC.

### What is the criteria for success?

80% of returning student workers feel and are judged via supervisor evaluation to be ready to seek and gain employment outside of City College; 80% of newly hired student workers feel and are judged via supervisor evaluation to be not yet ready but actively attaining required skills and confidence to be ready to seek and gain employment outside of City College. See rubric for supervisor evaluation – readiness is indicated by an overall rating of 4 or above on the evaluation form. Scores on the evaluation will help determine the improvement and forward progress of newer students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Elements</th>
<th>5 Excellent</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>3 Satisfactory</th>
<th>2 Fair</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Knowledge</td>
<td>Displays superior knowledge of procedures and policies; asks for minimal repetition of instructions</td>
<td>Displays good knowledge of procedures; may be less knowledgeable about policies; asks questions when appropriate</td>
<td>Displays adequate knowledge of procedures; superficial knowledge of policies; asks questions when appropriate</td>
<td>Displays sometimes inadequate knowledge of procedures and is uncomfortable explaining policies; asks many questions</td>
<td>Displays poor knowledge of procedures and little knowledge of policies; asks repetitive questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>Work is consistently completed correctly</td>
<td>Work is done correctly most of the time</td>
<td>Work may need monitoring to ensure correctness</td>
<td>Work usually needs monitoring to ensure correctness</td>
<td>Work is usually incorrect and must be monitored closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of Work</td>
<td>Work is done on time on a consistent basis</td>
<td>Work is usually completed within time constraints</td>
<td>May need monitoring to ensure work is completed on time</td>
<td>Usually needs monitoring to ensure work is completed on time</td>
<td>Must be monitored to ensure work is finished at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Student is on time for shifts and has no unexcused absences</td>
<td>Student is usually on time, calls when running late, and has no unexcused absences</td>
<td>Student is usually on time, may occasionally be late with no notice and has no unexcused absences</td>
<td>Student may be late several times during the semester with no notice and has no unexcused absences</td>
<td>Student is usually late and has at least one unexcused absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Willing to accept all job assignments; works effectively with others at all levels (student, staff, faculty)</td>
<td>Willing to accept all job assignments; usually works effectively with others at all levels (student, staff, faculty)</td>
<td>Sometimes does not feel confident with accepting certain jobs; may have difficulty interacting with other levels</td>
<td>Sometimes may ask for a different assignment; may have difficulty taking direction from staff or faculty</td>
<td>May refuse an assignment; has difficulty interacting and taking direction from all levels (student, staff, faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Results:

1. Improvement of interactions and training to support proposed ILO IV (Personal Responsibility and Professional Development. Students will demonstrate self-awareness, social and physical wellness, and workplace skills.):

By the above Criteria for Success, students’ self assessment indicated we did not meet the stated goal of 80% of returning students feeling confident and ready to apply their job experiences to seeking outside employment (non-student worker jobs or careers), but may have reached the goal of 80% of newly hired workers feeling that they are actively attaining transferable skills and are “almost there.” 50% answered Ready; 50% answered Almost There. The format of the survey did not allow for direct linkage of this question to newly hired or returning students. This will be corrected in future surveys.

By the above Criteria for Success, supervisor evaluation forms indicated that we did meet the stated goals. In fact, by this measure, all (100%) of the students evaluated are ready to seek outside employment using the skills they’ve learned or demonstrated here at the Rosenberg Circulation Department.

2. Improvement of training to support PSLO 2 (Students build understanding of, appreciation for, and sensitivity to diverse peoples and cultures…)

Question #7 on the student self assessment survey: While working at the LLRC, do you feel comfortable with and respected by your co-workers and supervisors? If not, why not? Received one response that indicated a student worker felt another student worker was disrespectful in a somewhat oblivious way due to specifically characterizing actions of individuals as reflective of a specific ethnicity as a whole. To put it simply, stereotyping by one student worker had made another student worker very uncomfortable.

Next Steps to be taken within the Department:

Regarding proposed ILO IV:

Self Assessment differing from supervisory observation may be attributed to self esteem or self confidence levels of the student workers, or a reluctance to leave the nest or the perceived security of a student staff position. This can be addressed by sharing positive feedback as often as “constructive criticism” type feedback. Another helpful way to improve confidence may be to use staff experience in the modern workforce in other industries or enterprises to demonstrate that the skills they learn and use here are in fact, very transferable and explain why during conversations with the students.

Regarding PSLO 2:

9 out of 10 survey responses indicated that respondents felt comfortable and respected by co-workers. The one negative response doesn’t indicate a trend, but it is a clear and important opportunity to raise sensitivity levels overall amongst the student workers. I think adding a component to our general orientation about the benefits of a culturally diverse student body and by extension a culturally diverse student workforce would be very helpful. The question will be restated on the self assessment, and other questions created to find out how or if their sensitivity to other cultures had been affected by their time as a student worker at the library by contact and relationships with student patrons and staff.
Implementation plans and timeline:

All LLRC departments with student workers are invited to begin full participation in this process as of Spring 2013. All departments should use the same evaluation form and share in developing the new questions for the students’ self evaluation survey. Training materials and methods will vary by department given that work processes are different, but interaction and training with student workers is similar in that full time faculty or classified staff all participate in one on one training and have direct contact with student workers in their departments. As an example, Circulation in Rosenberg will re-write its student training manual Fall 2013 in order to reflect the results of Fall 12 and Spring 13 assessments.

Continuous evaluation and editing of survey questions to yield more specific data on how to improve training, training materials and work place conditions will be ongoing.