

Vol. 2, Issue 1, 2016

The Scholarship of Student Affairs Assessment Reconsidered

Gavin W. Henning*

Jun 20, 2016

Tags: social sciences

Abstract

In this article, Gavin Henning explores what a scholarship of student affairs assessment could look like - and how a scholarship base would assist in speaking about our unique contribution to higher education. This article offers an account of the development of our field, a history of scholarship within student affairs assessment, and will form a narrative about what scholarship in our growing area could look like moving forward.

When I was invited to write a piece for the second edition of the *Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry*, I was humbled to follow writings by noted scholars such as John Schuh, Marilee Bresciani Ludvik, and Larry Roper. To be honest, I was not sure what I could contribute to the scholarship of student affairs assessment that was being published in this journal. Then it hit me. I could write about the scholarship of student affairs assessment. The idea has always intrigued me when in discussions regarding the professionalism of student affairs; one of the defining characteristics that is consistently noted is a literature base, or scholarship of the field. I had always wondered what this literature base would look like for student affairs assessment.

The first step in exploring what a scholarship of student affairs assessment would look like was to dig deep into the concept of scholarship as pure research, but this did not really seem to meld with student affairs assessment as the focus of the scholarship literature was the responsibilities of faculty members. I remembered reading Boyer's work on scholarship when I was a new graduate student in the early 1990s and so I reviewed Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990). I also re-read *Building a Scholarship of Assessment* (Banta & Associates, 2002) and then ordered *Scholarship Assessed* (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997) and *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* (Hutchings, Taylor-Huber, & Ciccone, 2011) as I felt these books would provide a more complete picture of scholarship. I immersed myself in these texts. What follows are my thoughts regarding what a scholarship of student affairs assessment would look like and what we need to do to build it. But, I had to start at the beginning – the evolution of a sub-field.

Evolution and History of Student Affairs Assessment

Student affairs assessment is still a young and emerging sub-field of student affairs. The seeds for this work were planted almost 50 years ago.

Student affairs assessment began as early as the 1930s with studies of alumni and currently enrolled students (Banta & Associates, 2002). In addition, the 1937 version of the *Student Personnel*

Point of View by the American Council on Education suggested that studies are designed to evaluate programs and services. Assessment is addressed in the 1949 edition of the *Student Personnel Point of View* (American Council on Education) as well (Henning & Roberts, 2016). In this edition, the council suggested that a “continuing program of evaluation of student personnel services and other educational programs to ensure the achievement of students of the objectives for which this program is designed” (American Council on Education, 1949, p. 29). The council also urged staff members to devote time to assessment and planning and suggested focusing on these types of assessment:

- Student satisfaction
- Faculty satisfaction
- Student use of services
- Staff development and training
- Relationships between those who work with students

Through the 1960s, assessment focused on measuring attitudes, interests, and personality characteristics of traditional-aged college students (Banta & Associates, 2002). The emergence of student development theory later in the 1960s marked a turning point in student affairs assessment. The theories revolutionized how staff worked with college students and also ushered in an expectation to measure the individual student growth espoused in these theories. The focus shifted to creating tools for measuring this development such as the the *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* (Rosenberg, 1965) and *Measures of Intellectual Development* (Knefelkamp, 1974).

The founding of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) in 1979 provided standards for higher education. This consortium, which now includes 42 higher education associations, focuses on quality assurance through program review and reflective self-study. The first set of standards for 16 functional areas and graduate professional preparation programs were published in 1986 with self-assessment guides for each set published in 1988 (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2015).

Student affairs assessment began to blossom as a sub-field in the mid-1990s with the publication of the first text regarding the field. *Assessment in Student Affairs: A Guide for Practitioners* (1996) by Lee Upcraft and John Schuh provided a blueprint regarding how to perform assessment in student affairs. Shortly after, in 1999, Gary Malaney performed the first study of student affairs assessment and evaluation offices which brought to light the prevalence of this function and validated it. Malaney (1999) identified 40 institutions that had full-time student affairs assessment professionals. Current estimates indicate about 129 institutions worldwide have an individual(s) dedicated to student affairs assessment (T. W. Elling, personal communication, December 11, 2015). Four years after their first book, Schuh and Upcraft (2000) published the companion *Assessment Practice in Student Affairs: An Application Manual*. Thus, by the beginning of the new millennium student affairs was an established sub-field with professionals solely dedicated to this role and the beginning of a library of scholarship supporting it.

The early 2000s saw a proliferation of resources for student affairs assessment. In 2004, ACPA's Commission for Research for Student Development changed its mission to focus on assessment becoming the Commission for Assessment for Student Development. In 2006, it changed its name to the one currently used, the Commission for Assessment and Evaluation, broadening the scope of assessment beyond student development. NASPA's Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Knowledge Community had its beginnings in 2004 and was formally established in 2005. In 2008, the Student Affairs Assessment Leaders (SAAL) was founded. This organization was initiated because a group of assessment professionals realized that some of them were primarily involved in NASPA and some were primarily involved in ACPA. Thus, there was not one organization where they all could connect. As of January 2016, SAAL is an open and free organization. No member dues are collected and professional development is provided freely by members and operating needs are supported by ACPA, NASPA, and members' own institutions. All three of these organizations provide professional development and networking opportunities for individuals engaging in student affairs assessment.

ACPA held its first Student Affairs Assessment Institute jointly with The Pennsylvania State University in 2003. The two organizations collaborated for two more years when ACPA became the sole sponsor of the institute in 2006. NASPA's Assessment and Retention Conference began in 2004 (D. Roberts, personal communication, December 8, 2015). In 2011, it was renamed the Assessment and Persistence Conference to mark the differentiation between persistence and retention. Persistence is individually focused while retention is institutionally focused. Thus, a conference on persistence would center on how individual students continue towards their own educational goals rather than centering on institutional retention and graduation rates. These events were the first formal professional development events specifically centered on student affairs assessment. The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) had been sponsoring conferences since the mid-1980s (Wall-Smith, n.d.), and The Assessment Institute housed at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis had also been sponsoring conferences for years. Each of these two conferences had sessions on student affairs assessment, but neither were specifically dedicated to that topic.

The years 2006-2008 saw the development of standards in the field for student affairs assessment. In 2006, ACPA's Commission for Assessment and Evaluation published the *Assessment Skill and Knowledge (ASK) Standards* for professionals. Also in this year, CAS published standards for student affairs assessment offices. At this point there were standards for both individual and organizational practice. Then in 2008, NASPA's Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Knowledge Community published the *Assessment Education Framework*. This document outlined a curriculum for developing assessment skills and knowledge for new and continuing professionals.

By 2006, there were standards for assessment practice and a few texts. Excluding the *ASK Standards* and *Assessment Education Framework*, there had been five books published on the topic from 1996 to 2006. In the fall of 2006 came *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education* also known as the Spellings Report. There has been growing prioritization of assessment since the publication of this report. The Spellings

Commission reported a number of findings, which included little support for documented student learning during college and questionable return on financial investment. While there was agreement that improvements could and should be made, there was discontent among educators regarding the recommendations for change. The Commission suggested a consumer-oriented database featuring metrics of quality and the use of standardized tests to measure learning. With educators balking at the use of standardized tests to measure learning, there was a re-emphasis on assessment with a move towards measuring and documenting student learning both in and out of the classroom, as well as demonstrating return on financial investment made by stakeholders.

The number of people doing student affairs assessment has also grown exponentially. In the last 16 years, the number of institutions having someone solely dedicated to student affairs assessment has grown from 40 to 129, which includes individuals from the U.S., Mexico, and Canada. SAAL began with 10 people in December of 2008 and now, seven years later, has nearly 650 – a tremendous increase of 640 individuals. Nearly 220 SAAL members spend at least 50% of their time performing student affairs assessment activities (T. W. Elling, personal communication, December 11, 2015).

The written resources for student affairs assessment has expanded over time. In 2009, the student affairs assessment literature began to grow at an exponential rate. The literature continued to emerge from the mid-2000s on with 2009 being the turning point. Between 2010 and early 2016, there have been 10 books written, four of which were in the four months between November 2015 and February 2016. These publications do not count journal articles, articles in NASPA's *NetResults* (which ran from 2001 to 2011), or other publications. See the appendix for a list of these books as well as a timeline for the evolution of student affairs assessment. The scholarly foundation has been growing dramatically.

But, do all of these books and resources constitute scholarship? Scholarship begins with inquiry. As Daniel Newhart, editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry*, notes in

the overview of this journal,

the term Inquiry has been chosen intentionally to represent the ongoing reflection upon and implementation of assessment efforts in student affairs. All too often, assessment is seen and approached in segmented chunks rather than ongoing and perpetual processes in which practitioner scholars engage in deep learning. Inquiry involves reflective and reflexive efforts to address universal and local contexts of assessment, evaluation, and research germane to student affairs. (2015, para. 2)

Brian Bourke (2015) notes in his blog post entitled “Inquiry and the Assessment Cycle,” that student affairs assessment should be about questions, not simply tasks that are performed. Through inquiry we can also explore the process of assessment, not just the object of the assessment. As such, assessment is not simply a function to be performed to determine effectiveness or areas for improvement, but also a process that should itself be investigated and critiqued. Perhaps the idea of inquiry into assessment itself – assessment of assessment – paves the way for a scholarship of student affairs assessment.

What is Scholarship?

Before we can begin to discuss a scholarship of assessment we must deconstruct the concept of scholarship itself. In 1990, Ernest Boyer provided a new image of what scholarship could and should be. Previous to the publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Boyer, 1990), scholarship in higher education was considered research and publication. This was the standard to which the productivity and worth of a college professor was compared. Boyer was a former chancellor of the State University of New York and U. S. Commission of Education (precursor to U.S. Secretary of Education) under U.S. President Jimmy Carter. After these stints, during his time as president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Boyer wanted to challenge the assumptions of scholarship and expand the notion of it – creating a more inclusive definition. He stated that a focus only on research and publication too narrowly defined the important work of college faculty. In his pivotal 1990 book, he identified four different types of scholarship: scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of application, and scholarship of teaching. (Learning was added to

scholarship of teaching later). The scholarship of discovery is what people may traditionally think in relationship to about. original research and the discovery of new knowledge shared with the public through various media. The scholarship of integration is synthesis across disciplines, topics within a discipline, and across time. Boyer would likely consider much of the interdisciplinary work being done on college campuses today as examples of this. The scholarship of application is the new intellectual understandings that occur when knowledge is applied in practical settings. Finally, the scholarship of teaching and learning is the systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

Assessment as Scholarship

Where does assessment fit into Boyer's concept of scholarship? In *Building a Scholarship of Assessment* (2002), Pike (2002) suggested that assessment fits most closely with scholarship of application. However, Mentkowski and Loacker (2002) proposed that assessment is a part of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Angelo (2002) extended this conception of scholarship of assessment by arguing for including assessment within the scholarship of teaching and learning to form a scholarship of teaching, assessment, and learning. Assessment certainly must be part of the conversation regarding scholarship of teaching and learning, but not all assessment is related to student learning. In many ways, assessment can also fit into the scholarship of integration. To effectively perform assessment, knowledge must be integrated from across disciplines within higher education (and sometimes outside of it). Assessment of career development program and services may require integration of learning, student development, and career development. Assessment in housing and residence life may require integration of learning, student development, residence life practice, and business. To effectively enact assessment for change there must be an understanding of sociology and organizational change. Assessment is interdisciplinary.

Is it also possible that assessment can fit into the scholarship of discovery? When working on the assessment of intergroup dialogue (a series of structured conversations to explore social identity) a few years ago, I came upon an unintended outcome

in addition to assessing the intended outcomes of the program. Students who participated in intergroup dialogue reported a strong sense of community as a result of the intense conversations they had over the 8-week period with other students. Not only did the students learn from others in the group, they bonded with them; they hung out together, ate meals together, and became friends because of this program. Thus, through assessment, we discovered new knowledge about the intervention. It is feasible that assessment can fit into all forms of Boyer's definitions of scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching and learning. Rather than trying to fit assessment into one form of scholarship, perhaps it should be its own form of scholarship.

It is important to note the difference between scholarly assessment and a scholarship of assessment as not all assessment is scholarship. Banta and associates (2002) discussed the difference between scholarly assessment and scholarship of assessment. Scholarly assessment is "the work underway on hundreds of campuses across the country that is aimed at improving day-to-day conduct of assessment" (loc. 37). On the other hand, scholarship of assessment is the "systematic inquiry designed to deepen and extend the foundation of knowledge underlying assessment" (loc. 40). One definition is about performing effective assessment and the other is about building a knowledge base regarding assessment.

Student Affairs Assessment as Scholarship

If there can be a scholarship of assessment as Banta and associates (2002) argued, then there certainly can be a scholarship of student affairs assessment. But, how would it be recognized? What would it look like? How would it be built?

There are a number of criteria that could be used to identify assessment that is part of a scholarship of assessment, not just scholarly assessment. In 1995, Boyer began to outline standards by which work could be measured and determined if it was scholarship. He and his colleagues reviewed a number of documents including hiring guidelines, promotion and tenure practices, and standards for publication in journals and university presses. Based on that document analysis, his criteria were:

1. Did the scholar have clear goals?
2. Did the scholar use appropriate methods?
3. Did the scholar adequately use resources?
4. Did the scholar communicate effectively with others?
5. Did the scholarly effort lead to significant results?
6. Did the scholar engage in reflective self-critique? (p. 135)

The sixth standard is critical to defining scholarship as this reflection is what yields improved practice. There needs to be contemplation regarding the process itself. This type of reflection can help determine what worked well, what did not, and what improvements need to be made in the future.

Two years later, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) clarified Boyer's standards for scholarly performance with the following six:

1. Clear goals—Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?
2. Adequate preparation—Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?
3. Appropriate methods—Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply the methods selected effectively? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?
4. Significant results—Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?
5. Effective presentation—Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her

message with clarity and integrity?

6. Reflective critique—Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work? (pp. 25-34).

All of these standards relate to Boyer's (1990) four forms of scholarship, but the criteria could also be applied to the concept of a scholarship of student affairs assessment. For student affairs assessment to count as scholarship it must have clear goals. The assessor must have appropriate knowledge and skills to implement the assessment. The most appropriate methods must be utilized and the results must have an impact and lead to change. Results of scholarship cannot have impact unless they are effectively presented. Finally, there must be self-critique of the product.

Mentkowski and Loacker (2002) identified another set of six criteria for scholarship:

1. The activity requires a high level of discipline specific expertise.
2. The activity breaks new ground, is innovative.
3. The activity can be replicated or elaborated.
4. The work and its results can be documented.
5. The work and its results can be peer-reviewed.
6. The activity has significance and impact. (loc. 1002)

As criteria for evaluating assessment scholarship, these six could also be used for evaluating student affairs assessment scholarship. There are important criteria in each set of standards. Scholarship of student affairs assessment requires expertise in both assessment skills and knowledge as well as understanding of the field of student affairs. To count as scholarship, the product must be innovative and novel in approach, methods, or results that add to the field. as products that are not novel in approach, methods, or results do not add to the field. Similar to research, to be considered scholarship, assessment must be able to be documented, replicated, and peer reviewed.

Integrating Glassick et al. (1997) and Mentkowski and Loacker's (2002) criteria for scholarship, the following standards for student affairs assessment scholarship could be specified:

1. The activity requires a high level of discipline-related expertise: The assessment activity should take into account literature related to the program or service being assessed as well as literature of the field including student development theory, leadership theory, organizational development theory, change theory, and communication. In addition, the activity must also require competence in assessment methods.
2. The activity is innovative: An activity that is similar to activities done on other campuses may not be notable in the larger student affairs assessment arena. The activity should employ a novel approach to assessment either in design, implementation, results, documentation of results, or using the data to effect change.
3. The activity has significant impact: Similar to the activity being novel, the impact must be significant. This impact can come from the results themselves or the approach that is used that could affect how other assessment is done.
4. The activity is effectively presented: The assessment and subsequent results are effectively shared with key stakeholder groups in form and content appropriate for each target audience.
5. The results of the activity results effect change: One of the biggest challenges with assessment is the use of findings for improvement. To be scholarship, the assessment must have some clear impact that is documented in such a way to catalogue improvement.
6. The activity includes reflective critique: The assessor reflects on the assessment process to identify what went well and what could be improved. In other words, there was "assessment of assessment." This is the systematic inquiry that can extend the knowledge underlying assessment.
7. The activity can be peer-reviewed: Boyer (1995) describes four types of evidence that can be used to evaluate

scholarship: self-assessment, peer evaluation, student evaluation, and client evaluation. While self-assessment is important, review by peers with knowledge of the activity provides external, expert feedback and validation.

By meeting these standards, student affairs assessment practice can be considered scholarship and thus contribute to the scholarship of student affairs assessment. The scholarship of assessment is the body of work of “systematic inquiry that deepens and extends the foundation of knowledge underlying assessment” (Banta & Associates, 2002, loc. 40). Student affairs assessment that is determined to be scholarship are the building blocks for a scholarship of assessment.

Building a Scholarship of Student Affairs Assessment

Scholarship is a knowledge base for a field. A scholarship of student affairs assessment would be a knowledge base of systematic inquiry that informs the design, implementation, and assessment of assessment practice. As mentioned earlier, the number of texts regarding student affairs assessment are burgeoning, with four published between November 2015 and February of 2016. More texts are not sufficient. Other work needs to be done to build a scholarship of student affairs assessment.

One of the first steps in building a scholarship of student affairs assessment is to develop a tested model or theory of assessment. Gray (2002) outlines three responsibilities of a scholarship of assessment: (a) describe the phenomena associated with it, (b2) create a model or theory of assessment, and (c3) must have questions that questions that can be used to test the utility of the model or theory. Current student affairs assessment literature describes the phenomena. There are also numerous, but similar iterations of the assessment cycle. However, this cycle is not a tested model. Systematic studies must be performed to confirm and/or revise accepted models of student affairs assessment.

Assessment scholars and practitioners need to continue to build the literature base. While there has been a dramatic increase in the number of student affairs assessment monographs and books

in recent years, there are still only 21 of them for the 21 years the field has been recognized. With student affairs assessment courses being required in many student affairs and higher education graduate programs, included in a component outlined in the CAS Standards for Master's Preparation Programs, and an overall increased importance placed on the practice in student affairs, a larger literature base is crucial for student affairs assessment education and skill development.

The third action needed in building a scholarship of student affairs assessment is to develop evidence-based practices, processes, and tools for along with criteria to evaluate them. Still, many assessment practices are based on past practice or that of others, but their effectiveness has not been evaluated. The creation of tested assessment tools aiding in the reflective critique would be useful. In addition, a process and tools for the peer-review of assessment practices may also be helpful.

A scholarship of student affairs assessment would benefit from a curriculum and formal training model. This was started with the *ASK Standards* (ACPA - College Student Educators International, 2006) and the *Assessment Education Framework* (NASPA - Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2008) back in the mid-late 2000s and skill and knowledge standards have been updated in the most recent revision of the *ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies* (ACPA - College Student Educators International & NASPA - Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2015). The latest edition of the competencies should be reviewed to determine how comprehensive they are. Once that review has taken place, a curriculum similar to the *Assessment Education Framework* that was developed by NASPA's Assessment, Evaluation, and Research knowledge community back in 2008 should be developed and implemented.

A Call to Action

Now is a critical time for student affairs practice in higher education. With dramatic cuts to institutional budgets, with no relief in sight, and increased accountability from all stakeholders focusing on the return on investment of a college education, but more specifically, the return on investment of student affairs

units, building a scholarship of student affairs assessment is critical to the very survival of the field. SAAL can be a catalyst in building this scholarship of student affairs assessment. The members of this organization are doing that work daily and now need to begin evaluating that work against the standards for assessment scholarship. Upon the completion of that evaluation, assessment scholarship needs to be shared publically. The *Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry* is a vital tool providing a platform for this scholarship to be shared.

The value of student affairs is being called in to question on many campuses. At some institutions, student affairs is devolving into student services with a focus on service provision rather than student development. Organizational charts are changing at some colleges and universities with student affairs divisions being dismantled and/or units being reorganized to report to business affairs or academic affairs. Without assessment to demonstrate the impact of student affairs educators on student development, learning, and retention, the future of the field is in jeopardy. A scholarship of assessment can help validate student affairs practice and also provide vital guidance for assessing that practice. The need is great for a scholarship of student affairs assessment and the time to build it is now.

About the author:

Gavin W. Henning is an Associate Professor of Higher Education and the Director of the Master of Higher Education Administration and Doctorate of Education Programs at New England College in Henniker, New Hampshire. He is also the 2015-2016 President, ACPA – College Student Educators International and will be the 2017-2019 President, Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education

References

ACPA - College Student Educators International. (2006). Assessment skills and knowledge for student affairs. ACPA - College Student Educators International.

ACPA - College Student Educators International, & NASPA -

Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2015). Professional competency areas for student affairs practitioners (2nd ed.). ACPA - College Student Educators International & NASPA - Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.

American Council on Education. (1949). *Student personnel point of view (revised edition)*. Washington, D.C.

Angelo, T. (2002). Engaging and supporting faculty in the scholarship of assessment. In T. Banta (Ed.), *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banta, T., & Associates. (2002). *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bourke, B. (2015, November 15). Inquiry and the assessment cycle. Retrieved from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/inquiry-assessment-cycle-brian-bourke>

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. (1995). From scholarship reconsidered to scholarship assessed. *Quest*, (48), 129–139.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2015). History. Retrieved from <http://www.cas.edu/history>

Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Maeroff, G. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gray, P. (2002). Roots of assessment. In T. Banta (Ed.), *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Henning, G., & Roberts, D. (2016). *Student affairs assessment: Theory to practice*. Sterling, Va: Stylus.

Hutchings, P., Taylor-Huber, M., & Ciccone, A. (2011). *Scholarship of teaching and learning reconsidered: Institutional integration and impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knefelkamp, L. (1974). *Measures of intellectual development*. Olympia, WA: The Perry Network.

Malaney, G. (1999). Student affairs research, evaluation, and assessment: Structure and practice in an era of change. *New Directions for Student Services*, (85).

Mentkowski, M., & Loaker, G. (2002). Enacting a collaborative scholarship of assessment. In T. Banta (Ed.), *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

NASPA - Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2008). *Assessment Education Framework*. Washington, D.C.

Newhart, D. (2015). Home. Retrieved from <https://submissions.scholasticahq.com/sites/the-journal-of-student-affairs-inquiry>

Pike, G. (2002). Measurement issues in outcome assessment. In T. Banta (Ed.), *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*. College Park Maryland: Morris Rosenberg Foundation.

Schuh, J. H., & Upcraft, M. L. (2000). *Assessment Practice in Student Affairs: An Applications Manual* (1 edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Upcraft, M. L., & Schuh, J. H. (1996). *Assessment in Student Affairs: A Guide for Practitioners* (1st edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wall-Smith, S. (n.d.). A history of higher education assessment. Retrieved from <http://www.fitchburgstate.edu/offices/academic-offices/office-of-assessment/assessment-tools/office-of-assessment-a-history-of-higher-education-assessment/>

Appendix I

Student Affairs Assessment Monographs and Books (in chronological order)

1. Upcraft, L., & Schuh, J. (1996). *Assessment in student affairs*.

San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

2. Malaney, G. (Ed.) (1999). Student affairs research, evaluation, and assessment: Structure and practice in an era of change. *New Directions for Student Services, number 85*.
3. Schuh, J., & Upcraft, M. (2001). Assessment practices in student affairs. An applications manual. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
4. Bresciani, M., Zelna, C., & Anderson, J. (2004): *Assessing student development and learning*. Washington, D.C.: NASPA.
5. ACPA - College Student Educators International. (2006). Assessment skills and knowledge for student affairs. ACPA - College Student Educators International.
6. Bresciani, M. (2006). *Outcomes-based academic and co-curricular program review: A compilation of institutional good practices*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
7. NASPA Assessment Education Framework 2008
8. Keeling, R., Wall, A., Underhile, R., & Dungy, G. (2008). *Assessment reconsidered: Institutional effectiveness for student success*. Washington, D.C.: International Center for Student Success and Institutional Accountability.
9. Bresciani, M., Moore Gardner, M., & Hickmott, J. (2009). *Demonstrating student success: A practical guide to outcomes-based assessment of learning and development in student affairs*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
10. Schuh, J., & Associates. (2009). *Assessment methods for student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
11. Bresciani, M., Moore Gardner, M., & Hickmott, J. (2009). Case studies for implementing assessment in student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services, number 127*.
12. Culp, M., & Dungy, G. (2012). Building a culture of evidence in student affairs: A guide for leaders and practitioners. Washington, D.C.: NASPA.
13. Collins, K., & Roberts, D. (Ed.). (2012) Learning is not a sprint: Assessing and documenting student learning learning in cocurricular involvement. Washington, D.C.: NASPA.

14. Allen, K. R., Elkins, B., Henning, G. W., Bayless, L. A., & Gordon, T. W. (2013). *Accreditation and the role of the student affairs professional*. Washington, DC: ACPA-College Student Educators International.
15. Moore Gardner, M., Kline, K., & Bresciani, M. (2013). *Assessing student learning in the community and two-year college: Successful strategies and tools developed by practitioners in student and academic affairs*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
16. Timm, D., Davis Barham, J., McKinney, K., & Knerr, A. (Ed.). (2013). *Assessment in practice: A companion guide to the ASK Standards*. Washington, D.C.: ACPA
17. Schuh, J. (Ed.). (2013). Selected contemporary assessment issues. *New Directions for Student Services, number 142*.
18. Phillips Bingham, R., Bureau, D., & Garrison Duncan, A. (Ed.). (2015). *Leading assessment for student success: Ten tenets that change culture and practice in student affairs*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
19. Yousey-Elsener, K., Bentrin, E., & Henning, G. W. (Ed). *Coordinating student affairs divisional assessment: A practical guide*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
20. Schuh, J., Biddix, J., Dean, L., & Kinzie, J. (2016). *Assessment in student affairs* (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
21. Henning, G. W., & Roberts, D. (2016). *Student affairs assessment: Theory to practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Appendix II

Student Affairs Assessment Evolution Timeline

1930s Studies of students and alumni

1937 *Student Personnel Point of View* encouraged evaluation of programs and services

1949 2nd edition of *Student Personnel Point of View* urged evaluation of student and faculty satisfaction, student use of services, and staff training

1960s (early) Focus on measuring attitudes, interests, and personality characteristics

1960s (late) With rise of student development theories, focus shifted to assessment student growth

1979 Founding of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS)

1986 First set of CAS Standards for 16 functional areas and graduate professional programs published

1996 *Assessment in Student Affairs: A Guide for Practitioners* by Upcraft and Schuh was published

1999 Gary Malaney published study finding that 40 colleges and universities had full-time student affairs assessment professionals

2000 *Assessment Practice in Student Affairs: An Application Manual* by Schuh and Upcraft was published

2003 ACPA and The Pennsylvania State University co-sponsored first Student Affairs Assessment Institute

2004 NASPA sponsored first Assessment and Retention Conference

2004 ACPA's Commission for Research for Student Development changed name to Commission for Assessment for Student Development

2005 NASPA's Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Knowledge Community officially founded

2006 ACPA's Commission for Assessment for Student Development changed its name to Commission for Assessment and Evaluation

2006 ACPA's Commission for Assessment and Evaluation published *Assessment Skills and Knowledge (ASK) Standards*

2006 CAS published first set of standards for student affairs

assessment programs/offices

2006 ACPA became sole host of the Student Affairs Assessment Institute and the Commission for Assessment and Evaluation served as planning team and faculty

2008 NASPA's Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Knowledge Community published the *Assessment Education Framework*

2010 Development of the ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies which includes a competency regarding assessment, evaluation, and research

2010 The ACPA/NASPA Professional Competencies were revised including minor revisions to the competency regarding assessment, evaluation, and research

2011 NASPA's Assessment and Retention Conference renamed Assessment and Persistence Conference

2015 Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry founded

2016 (Feb) Twenty-one books and monographs specifically focused on student affairs assessment

Evolution and History of Student Affairs Assessment Student affairs assessment is still a young and emerging sub-field of student affairs. The seeds for this work were planted almost 50 years ago. Student affairs assessment began as early as the 1930s with studies of alumni and currently enrolled students (Banta & Associates, 2002). In addition, the 1937 version of the Student Personnel Point of View by the American Council on Education suggested that studies are designed to evaluate programs and services.Â Previous to the publication of Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (Boyer, 1990), scholarship in higher education was considered research and publication. This was the standard to which the. 8.