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DSA Student Assistant Training/Orientation Purpose

In order to prepare CI students for the professional setting upon graduation and to set expectations for their current employment position, the Division of Student Affairs has created a training initiative. This training provides student assistants with the opportunity to (1) strengthen relationships with their peers and professional staff, (2) develop their professionalism, and (3) attain a deeper understanding of their individual strengths and skill sets.

DSA Student Assistant Training/Orientation Objectives

TRACK ONE – RED Learning Objectives

As a result of training, students will:

- Feel a sense of CI and division-wide team pride;
- Feel a sense of team;
- State the names of five student assistants (they did not know prior to training) and their work areas;
- State the foundational values found within the CI mission statement (multicultural perspectives, international perspectives, integrative approaches, and experiential and service learning);
- Analyze the DSA and AA mission statements and illustrate how their individual area roles assist in accomplishing this Division's mission
- Cite the five DSA core values;
- Summarize how CI’s organizational structure supports CI and DSA/AA missions;
- Articulate the SMILE acronym and identify who should receive excellent customer service;
• Articulate the attributes from the CI Leadership Definition;
• Apply the CI Leadership Definition and its attributes to their student assistant roles within the Division of Student Affairs;
• Define FERPA; and
• Analyze how their actions and decisions, both as individuals and as employees, reflect upon CI.

TRACK TWO – SILVER Learning Objectives

As a result of training, students will:

• Feel a sense of CI and division-wide pride;
• State the names of five student assistants (they did not know prior to training) and their work areas;
• Feel a sense of team;
• Know how to best assist distressed students and patrons;
• Demonstrate a deeper understanding of Title IX;
• Feel an increased level of comfort at a formal dining setting;
• Identify professional dress and correspondence etiquette;
• Distinguish between historical target and agent groups in US society. Identify and discuss their social membership groups with peers;
• Identify at least 3 specific actions they can take to serve as an ally in their student assistant role;
• Identify the basic types of resumes. Determine how to select a format to appropriately market candidate skill and experience level. Outline resources to obtain resume, cover letter, and professional reference sheet examples;
• Identify effective interview strategies and the key components of the interview process;
• Develop and practice “60-second elevator speech” to sharpen interview skills;
• Identify the CI Leadership Definition;
• Apply the leadership definition to their current student assistant position; and
• Cite various opportunities for undergraduate research, internships, study abroad.
Which area in Student Affairs are you employed?
Post-test N=71; Pre-test N=71

- Assessment and Strategic Operations: Pre-test 1, Post-test 2
- Vice President for Student Affairs office: Pre-test 3, Post-test 2
- Wellness and Athletics: Pre-test 4, Post-test 1
- Student Life: Pre-test 8, Post-test 9
- Housing and Residential Education: Pre-test 15, Post-test 16
- Associated Students Inc.: Pre-test 40, Post-test 41

Which track did you participate in today?
(# of participants)

- Silver Track: Pre-test 48, Post-test 55
- Red Track: Pre-test 16, Post-test 23
The numbers for the Silver and Red tracks may appear inconsistent for a couple of reasons. First, it is possible some students accidentally chose the incorrect track on the survey. Secondly, some students realized that they were in the wrong track and switched tracks in between the pre- and post-test.

The student assistants responded on a five-point Likert scale with five being the most affirmative answer (strongly agree) and one being the least affirmative (strongly disagree). Of the three items, students rated their pride in CI as the highest (4.52) on the post-test. Growth was made by students between the pre- and post-test on all three items. This suggests that the training may have helped foster a deeper sense of being part of a team with their co-workers, pride within their division and overall, pride in CI.
Just over 70% of the students correctly identified the words in the acronym FERPA (Family Education Rights and Privacy Act) in both the pre- and post-test. The students overwhelmingly pointed out that FERPA would assist them in their work when dealing with confidential student information. Just over 83% of them, a net gain of six percentage points, correctly suggested ways in which FERPA would apply to their work. It was common for respondents to indicate that FERPA limits information they would be able to release about students. For example, one student shared that “As a student assistant, I have to keep certain information private due to FERPA laws and know my boundaries of what is legal to share.”
The correct values in the Channel Islands Mission Statement are as follows: 1) Experiential and service learning; 2) Integrative approaches; 3) International perspectives; and, 4) Multicultural perspectives. Correct answers to the four abovementioned yielded the highest percentages from the post-test (Experiential- 90%; Integrative- 87%; Multicultural- 85%; International- 69%). The incorrect answer “Student centeredness” was tied for fourth on the post-test with 69%.
The five core values of the Division of Student Affairs are as follows: 1) collaboration; 2) commitment; 3) diversity; 4) excellence; and, 5) integrity.

The six University divisions are as follows: 1) Academic Affairs; 2) Business and Financial Affairs; 3) Office of the President; 4) Student Affairs; 5) Technology and Communication; and, 6) University Advancement.

Nearly half of the student assistants identified the five core values of the Division of Student Affairs on the post-test which was a net gain of 12.2 percentage points. Just over half (57.1%) were able to correctly name the six University divisions which was a slight dip of 3.5 percentage points from the pre-test.
The six components of the CI Leadership Definition are: 1) act; 2) build community; 3) excellence; 4) flourish; 5) integrity; and, 6) serve. The data in this graph descend in order of percentage of response on the post-test. The student assistants were most likely to select the components of the Definition since those components have the six highest response rates. There were some significant gains on some of the Definitions from the pre-test to the post-test. For instance, “build community” moved from 50% to 100% of students selecting that choice while “act” went from being chosen by 23% to 93%. Student assistants also showed gains by deselecting items more frequently in the post-test that are not components of the definition. The two largest gains came from “diversity” which was originally chosen by 82% yet only by 7% in the post-test and “leadership” which yielded 73% of respondents initially and only 40% on the post-test.
The student assistants responded on a seven-point Likert scale with seven being the most affirmative answer (very satisfied) and one being the least affirmative (very dissatisfied). Since the mean for the logistical element entitled “Lunch” (6.42) was the closest to the highest possible (seven) mean, it was deemed the most satisfying by the student assistants. Most of the logistical elements had a mean score between 5.99 and 6.42 which indicated students were highly satisfied. The two items which scored a bit lower—“End Time” (5.44) and “Length” (5.03) still indicate satisfaction but less emphatically.
The acronym SMILE stands for- Serving others; Making someone's day; Being in it together; Listening; and, Going the Extra Mile. The first letter in the underlined words accord with the letter in the acronym. The student assistants vastly improved from pre-test to post-test by 33 percentage points on this question. In addition, all of them correctly answered the question regarding who should receive customer service which includes: 1) students; 2) staff, administrators and faculty; and, 3) supervisors.
The student assistants responded on a five-point Likert scale with five being the most affirmative answer (very effective) and one being the least affirmative (very ineffective). Since the mean for the program entitled “Confidentiality” (4.6) was the closest to the highest possible (five) mean, it was deemed the most effective by the student assistants. The respondents overwhelmingly found the presenters to be highly effective since all of them scored a mean between 4.33 and 4.6.

![Presenter Effectiveness Chart](chart.png)
The student assistants responded on a five-point Likert scale with five being the most affirmative answer (very helpful) and one being the least affirmative (very unhelpful). Since the mean for the program entitled “Customer Service and Professionalism Etiquette” (4.87) was the closest to the highest possible (five) mean, it was deemed the most helpful by the student assistants. Participants found the sessions to be very helpful as indicated by the mean scores which are all between 4.14 and 4.87.
The correct answer for the first item, which yielded correct answers by 67% of the student assistants on the post-test, is “acts against social injustice out of a belief it is important to be politically correct”. The respondents improved seven percentage points between the pre- and post-test. There were very large gains on the second item, as students gained 56 percentage points with the correct answer “waking up”.
The student assistants responded on a six-point Likert scale with six being the most affirmative answer (strongly agree) and one being the least affirmative (strongly disagree). Overall, participants considerably improved on each of the items, yielding gains between .66 and .86 from the pre-test to the post-test. This suggests the student assistants grew in terms of their comfort level serving as an ally and identifying when they are an agent or target.
The post-test revealed that the overwhelming majority of student assistants participating in the training knew where they could find information related to Study abroad (71%). They made a six percentage point jump between the pre- and post-test for Study Abroad. This data suggests that most student assistants could confidently assist students with accessing information from this office.

The post-test revealed that the overwhelming majority of student assistants participating in the training knew where they could find information related to the Career Center (87%). While the majority of students (69%) knew where to access this information on the pre-test, the aggregate made an even further 18 percentage point jump on the post-test. This data suggests that nearly all student assistants could confidently assist students with accessing information from the Career Center.
Students rated their interview skills on a five-point Likert scale with 5 representing *Excellent* and 1 *Poor*. The score (2.58) on the post-test, which dipped .09 from the pre-test, indicates that students would assess their skill level as generally fair which is closer to the lower end of the scale than the higher end.
Student assistants rated the degree to which they felt prepared to search for an internship opportunity on a four-point Likert scale with four representing Very prepared and one representing Not at all prepared. The data indicate that they felt more confident after the post-test (2.98 vs. 2.52) by nearly half a point that they were prepared to search for opportunities.
The Silver Track student assistants responded on a five-point Likert scale with five being the most affirmative answer (very helpful) and one being the least affirmative (very unhelpful). Since the mean for the program entitled “Sensitivity Training” (4.71) was the closest to the highest possible (five) mean,
it was deemed the most helpful by the student assistants. Participants found the sessions to be very helpful as indicated by the mean scores which are all between 3.98 and 4.71.

The Silver Track student assistants responded on a five-point Likert scale with five being the most affirmative answer (very helpful) and one being the least affirmative (very unhelpful). Since the mean for each of the three programs entitled “Internships”, “Personal Branding” and “Team Building Activities” (4.50) was the closest to the highest possible (five) mean, they were deemed the most helpful by the student assistants. Participants found the sessions to be very helpful as indicated by the mean scores which are all between 3.76 and 4.5.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The data indicates the following strengths and areas of improvement for future trainings:

**Strengths:**

**Student Assistants**

First, it is worth noting that students made gains and also scored on the very high end of the scale on all seven social identification items where students expressed their own identification. The training appears to have enhanced student assistants’ overall sense of camaraderie with their peer colleagues as well as pride in both their Division-wide team and in CI. Additionally, they made large gains on the four items questioning their comfort level serving as an ally and identifying whether they are an agent or target.

The results of the survey demonstrated that the student assistants often gained knowledge between the pre- and post-test on most knowledge-based items. For example, students showed a gain on four of the six components of the CI Leadership Definition. This suggests that the training program effectively transmitted information needed to help them effectively perform their jobs. Results indicated that the majority of students: a) are knowledge about FERPA; b) are aware of the expressed values in the CI Mission Statement; c) are customer service savvy; d) could confidently assist students in accessing information from the Career Center and Study Abroad; and, e) are knowledgeable about research and how it could be beneficial to them and their peers.

Student assistants found that the sessions they attended were both effective and helpful. Virtually all sessions scored over four out of five on both the Red and Silver Tracks respectively. The only session scoring below a mean of four was the “Study Abroad”, which still received high scores of 3.98 in terms of effectiveness and 3.76 on helpfulness. The highest scoring sessions for the Red Track were “Confidentiality: (4.60) in terms of **Presenter Effectiveness** and “Customer Service and Professionalism Etiquette” (4.87) for **Helpfulness**. The highest scoring sessions for the Silver Track were “Sensitivity Training” (4.71) for **Presenter Effectiveness** and a tie between three sessions, “Internships”, “Personal Branding” and “Team Building Activities” (4.50) for **Helpfulness**.

When looking at the whole training program, student assistants were very satisfied with the logistical elements with six of the nine items scoring over a mean of six on a seven-point Likert scale. They were most satisfied with “Lunch” (6.42) and with the “Overall Training Experience” (6.20).

**Staff**

In conjunction with the students’ feedback from the survey, staff noticed the sessions were interactive and engaging. They observed that the pre-training “Voice Thread” engaged students and primed them for learning.

Logistically, the staff revealed it was helpful utilize meal tickets for lunch at Islands Café. Additionally, students enjoyed having the break, the lunch options provided at Islands Café and having water provided throughout the training.
**Improvement Opportunities:**

**Student Assistants**

While student assistants gained on many areas of the survey, there were some areas with room for improvement. For instance, knowledge of the five values of the Division of Student Affairs yielded only 47.9% correct answers from the participants. Also, only 57.1% of them could name the six University Divisions. In comparison to other knowledge-based questions, these two returned a lower number of correct responses. This data may help staff members conducting future trainings to consider how this key information is communicated to training participants.

The student assistants were not very confident in their interview skills (2.49 on a five-point scale). In fact, their confidence slightly dipped (.09) from the pre-test. In addition, while students felt more prepared to search for internships after the training (2.98 vs. 2.52 on a four-point scale), there is still additional growth for students in this area.

When looking at the whole training program, students found two areas where slight improvement might be considered. The lowest scoring item was the “Length” of the program with a mean of 5.03 and the “End Time” at 5.44. Both of these items may be closely related which may offer those who plan future trainings meaningful insight regarding how student assistants experienced the 2014-2015 training.

**Staff**

In terms of the programming, staff observed that the Silver Track tended to be repetitious for many of those partaking in this portion of the programming (Either due to receiving the content in a different venue or registration confusion). Also, staff participation might be fostered by having them separate themselves throughout the training and thereby, participate in discussions with students.

Logistically, it is important to have someone dedicated to and the transition of students from one session to the next. For example, there was an issue transitioning between the Silver Track group leaving the room and setting up for General Assembly. Additional areas for focus include: a) ensuring there is more than one bathroom available for participants; b) checking AV equipment to minimize challenges for when it is needed; and, c) monitoring rooms for comfort (there was an issue with the Silver Track room being too hot).

**Ideas for 2015-2016 Training:**

**Administrative Logistics**

- Bigger name tags in lanyards (Name, Area, Track, Table) with information on both sides and with the name being the most prominent feature
- Meal cards in nametag lanyards
- Get a more accurate idea of who needs HR paperwork completion time before making such arrangements
- Two check-in stations with photos of table images posted and signage (i.e. A-L, M-Z)
- Leadership academic certificate for participants
Staff Logistics
- Discussion of “shifts” to best utilize staff time and clarification of roles when staff are present with the students to encourage engagement
- Assigning greeters to welcome presenters
- Discussion of reformatting the team to include a large group of planners that informs a smaller logistical team (on a rotating basis)
- Continuation of a Chair responsible for logistics (one from each area on a rotating basis) to be the central contact point for meal orders, room reservations, all equipment needed for the events, registration, and name tags. Chair would work with a small logistics team to assist with planning and implementation of training logistics
- Hiring AV support for the day or being clear on roles when AV hiccups happen

Repeat Attendee Logistics
- Discussing the appropriate roles/participation level for students who have attended the Red and Silver Tracks
- Keep a comprehensive list of students who have completed training tracks to avoid asking them to attend training in which they have already participated

Training Logistics
- Redesign the assessment tools to measure the learning outcomes in a manner that is easier to interpret and utilize
- Exploring continuing education options verses one day “absolutely needed” trainings (Question to ponder- What do students need right away and what might be offered at a later time)