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Mission Statement  
The Dean of Students Office strives to set standards of excellence in the delivery of student services and to foster a welcoming environment that is inclusive, safe and conducive to learning. The core function of the Dean of Students Office is assisting and developing students through services that include emergency services, leadership development opportunities, legal advice, notary services, ombuds services, and resolutions to student misconduct allegations.  

Evidence of Improvement  
Changes were made to the 2011-2012 Outcome 1’s Method 2 and Outcome 3’s Method 2, so no comparisons between the current and previous year may be made for Outcome 1’s Method 2 and Outcome 3’s Method 2.  

Outcome 1: Student Emergency Services increased volume of service by 101 student requests from 170 student requests in FY11 to 271 student requests in FY12 and increased the overall response rate by 9.6% from the 7% response rate in FY11 to 16.6% in FY12, which is closer to the FY10 response rate of 20%. In FY12, 89% of the respondents indicated either “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the services as compared to 91% in FY10 and 30% in FY11. The target of 50% of the survey respondents being satisfied was achieved in fall 2011 with 95% and spring 2012 with 84% indicating students were satisfied with the services.  

The newly hired graduate assistant was a tremendous asset in improving the response rates for FY12. This response rate increase achieved part of the action plan from FY11. The other part of the FY11 action plan was to add an item to the survey for respondents to provide comments for suggested improvement, which was the fourth item added to the survey for FY12. Last year’s action plan was implemented to receive more student feedback for improvement and the student input received this year included the need for available information about the process, which will be a part of this year’s action plan to create a marketing plan to educate the community about the Student Emergency Services.  

For the first assessment period of 2011-2012 a review of transcripts was conducted for students who had absence notifications sent on their behalf, the results indicate that 95% of the students for whom notifications were sent completed the semester while only 5% of the students did not complete the semester. Although we cannot make a direct connection without further statistical analysis, the results seem to indicate that the services assist students with their academic persistence and the service should continue.  

Outcome 2: The target of 50% of the survey respondents being satisfied with the student organization advising received from the Dean of Students staff was achieved by 100% of respondents from student leaders of Associated Student Government and 87% from Student Foundation rating “agree” or “strongly agree” on all items indicating satisfaction, which is the same as FY11 and a 5% increase from FY10 for ASG while a 2% increase from FY10 for SF. The target of 50% of student leaders to demonstrate development through at least one of the leadership skills proficiency levels was achieved by ASG by 50% more than the target. 75% of ASG leaders were in the two highest levels of leadership skills proficiency by end of spring 2012 in comparison to 50% of the ASG leaders in spring 2011, which is a 25% increase of the ASG leaders from last year. Last year’s action plan was implemented to individually assist ASG leaders with their leadership development goal setting to result in more ASG leaders than last year moving up to higher leadership skills proficiency levels.  

Outcome 3: The amount of students who gave the highest marks (survey average of 1 with 1 being the best and 4 the worst) for FY12 at 27% is still above the FY10’s 23% and FY09’s 20%. The target of 60% of survey respondents being satisfied with services received was achieved by 86% in fall 2011 and 81% in spring 2012, which is 26% more than the target in fall and 20% more than the target in spring. Results indicate that while students report overall satisfaction with the Student Justice process, improvement is still needed in the area of
timelines of first contact from the time of the incident and the time students waited to be seen for their appointment. The action plan from last year was achieved by adding a staff member to help adjudicate cases to improve timeliness of process, but an agreement between the Department of Housing and Student Justice changed the process of the Department of Housing meeting with resident students for alcohol and drug offenses to Student Justice meeting with these students. Although this additional staff member was able to take some additional cases from the regular Student Justice workload and improved the timeliness, the fact remains that the area is understaffed and this needs to be addressed in the future.

For this first assessment period of 2011-2012, 27 AEPM/MIP classes were conducted, 501 students successfully completed the course and 496 students completed the Course Evaluation tool (only 5 students chose not to complete the evaluation tool). In the category of “Overall Rating of Course” 447 participants (90%) gave a score of 8 or higher (70 gave an “8”, 119 gave a “9” and 258 gave a “10”). In the category of “Overall Rating of Instructor” 489 (98.5%) gave a score of 8 or higher (13 gave an “8”, 59 gave a “9” and 417 gave a “10”). These results indicate that participants in the AEPM/MIP course, although state mandated to complete the course as a compliance sanction, overall were satisfied with the experience. The target of at least 60% of AEPM participants responding to the evaluations will report an “overall” Course and Instructor rating of 8 or higher on a 1-10 scale, with 10 being the highest was achieved by 90% for the Course and 98.9% for the Instructor, which is 30% more than the target for the Course and 38.9% more than the target for the Instructor.

### Outcome 1  Student Emergency Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1 - Method 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Students who receive assistance from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office will report satisfaction with services and will demonstrate academic persistence as indicated by completion of the semester they received the services.

### Outcome 1 - Method 1 - Result

In FY11 there were 170 students who requested absence notifications, so there were 101 more student absence notifications in FY12 when 271 students requested notification to faculty. An electronic satisfaction survey assessment was emailed to each recipient’s university e-mail address on the Monday following the distribution of their absence notification to their instructors. For students who did not respond within 7 days, a second e-mail was forwarded. Paper surveys were not provide to students who visited the office because the service had not been provided during the time when their office visit occurred; the notification followed their office visit and did not happen immediately, therefore it would be difficult to assess at the point of office visitation.

In the fall of 2011 there were 19 respondents and 26 in the spring of 2012 for an overall FY12 16.6% percent rate of response which represents a 9.6% increase in response rate from FY11.

Students were asked to respond to three statements using a four point Likert scale with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 4 being “Strongly Disagree.” Overall 89% (29) of respondents indicated that they either strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied with the service offered to them; 11% (5), disagreed that the service was helpful; and 0% indicated that the service was not helpful to them.

89% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the absence notification service provided to them. The target of 50% of the survey respondents being satisfied was achieved in both the fall of 2011 and the spring of 2012 with 95% and 84% respectively indicating they were satisfied with the services.

For FY12 the overall response rate was 16.6% (45 responses) which is a 9.6% increase from FY11 where there were a total of only 12 responses for 170 students for a 7% response rate. The newly hired graduate assistant was a tremendous asset in improving the response rates for FY12. This response rate increase achieved part of the action plan from FY11. The other part of the FY11 action plan was to add an item to the survey for respondents to provide comments for suggested improvement, which was the fourth item added to the survey for FY12.

Some comments indicated students would have liked the notifications to have been forwarded earlier, but...
notifications will not be forwarded unless the student provides appropriate documentation. Exceptions are made if there is an emergency and a student has to travel (i.e. home for a sick parent, or emergency which requires immediate departure) and later ascertain documentation upon arrival to their destination or after the completion of funerals; in those circumstances a notification can be sent immediately. Other comments indicated more available, clear information about the process may be helpful. More information to educate students about this service will improve the service so this will be a part of the FY13 action plan. These results indicate that the service is helpful to students when the process is timely because they are aware of how the services work so more information about the service needs to be made available as well as return rates remain low so continued measurement of satisfaction needs to be reviewed to determine the most effective method to receive constructive feedback that will assist in improvement when needed.

Outcome 1 - Method 2
After grades are posted at the end of fall and spring, student transcripts will be reviewed for those students who received services from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office during that semester. Transcripts will show that at least 50% of students completed the semester in which they received services from Student Emergency Services.

Outcome 1 - Method 2 - Results
This method was new for 2011-2012 making these results for this method baseline information; therefore comparative data is not available. A review of transcripts was conducted for students who had absence notifications sent on their behalf, the results indicate that 95% of the students for whom notifications were sent completed the semester while only 5% of the students did not complete the semester. These results indicate that the services assist students with their academic persistence and the service should continue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Completed Semester</th>
<th>Did Not Complete Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>(117) 94%</td>
<td>(7) 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>(146) 96%</td>
<td>(6) 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(263) 95%</td>
<td>(13) 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 1 – Action Plan
There continues to be an increase in the number of students using or requesting the service electronically and providing documentation via faxes from the appropriate medical agency’s facilities, therefore the necessity to visit the Dean of Students Office has become less and less necessary creating lack of opportunity to provide paper surveying and receive feedback. The following is the action plan to achieve improved service:

1. The Assistant Dean for Emergency Services will create a marketing plan to educate the campus community about Student Emergency Services provided through the Dean of Students Office during 2012-2013.
2. The Assistant Dean for Emergency Services will review the current method of measuring satisfaction and other types of methods to determine the most effective method of receiving information to achieve continuous improvement and, if necessary, change the method of measurement during 2012-2013.

Outcome 2  Student Leaders
At least 50% of student leaders, such as executive officers and committee chairs, in organizations advised by Dean of Students Office staff will report satisfaction with advising services received and will demonstrate effective leadership skills.

Outcome 2 - Method 1
All officers in student organizations advised by the Dean of Students Office will be sent an electronic satisfaction survey 10 class days before the end of the spring semester. The satisfaction survey will rate how helpful the services were and whether the services impacted their effectiveness of leading their student organization. Fifty percent (50%) of the survey respondents will be satisfied with the services received.

Outcome 2 - Method 1 - Results
An email with the satisfaction survey was sent to eight (8) Associated Student Government (ASG) leaders and ten (10) Student Foundation (SF) Executive Officers at the end of the spring semester and a reminder was sent two weeks later. The ASG and SF Executive Officers were asked to complete the survey and return it to the Dean of Students Office to maintain anonymity. This survey included five items for respondents to rate on a four point Likert-type scale of agreement and three open ended questions. Three surveys from ASG and three surveys
from SF were returned to the Dean of Students Office, therefore, ASG had a 38% return rate and SF had a 30% return rate. ASG had a 12% decrease in the return rate from FY11 and a 2% decrease from FY10 while SF had a 70% decrease in return rate from both FY11 and FY10.

All ASG respondents reported to “strongly agree” with all five items that Dean of Students staff were available, accessible, knowledgeable, supportive and respectful of student leaders’ decisions. All SF respondents reported to “strongly agree” or “agree” with three of the five items. Two of the three SF respondents reported they “strongly agree” or “agree” that Dean of Students staff supported their leadership development with the third SF respondent reporting “neutral” to the question. The remaining question regarding the Dean of Students staff being respectful of student leaders’ decisions resulted in one SF respondent reporting “agree,” one SF respondent reporting “neutral” and one SF respondent reporting “disagree.”

The target of 50% of the survey respondents being satisfied with the student organization advising received from the Dean of Students staff was achieved by 100% of respondents from ASG and 87% from SF rating “agree” or “strongly agree” on all items indicating satisfaction, which is the same as FY11 and a 5% increase from FY10 for ASG while it is 13% decrease from FY11 and a 2% increase from FY10 for SF. These results indicate that students’ satisfaction with the advising received from the Dean of Students staff remains between 100% and 85% for three years as well as return rates remain low so continued measurement of satisfaction needs to be reviewed to determine the most effective method to receive constructive feedback that will assist in improvement when needed. Due to the consistent high levels of satisfaction from year to year, no items in the 2011-2012 action plan included items about the satisfaction survey.

In order to improve the return rate of the survey, we will enhance the anonymity of the respondents by eliminating the need to return the survey in person to the Dean of Students Office. The process will be changed to a completely electronic process by changing the survey instrument from a Word document to an online GATO form. The link to the on-line survey instrument will be emailed to the student leaders to enable them to complete and submit the survey online, which will be easier and quicker for respondents than the current method of completing, printing, and delivering the survey. Also, the on-line form will provide all completed and submitted survey results to be typed making result reporting quicker and easier.

**Outcome 2 - Method 2**

A rubric with identified skills and proficiency levels will be used in ongoing observation and analysis of student organization leaders’ performance in evaluating three areas of leadership (Nuts & Bolts, People & Places and Personal Skills) throughout their term in office. The evaluation of the three areas of leadership will occur at the end of the fall and spring semesters. Fifty percent (50%) of student leaders evaluated will demonstrate development through at least one of the growth stages moving from MEMBER toward VISIONARY on the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2 - Method 2 - Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Advisors in the Dean of Students Office observed daily interactions with student leaders throughout the year and used a rubric to determine the students’ leadership skills proficiency. The rubric advisors used reflects students’ progressive levels of leadership skills proficiency from Member (lowest level) through the three middle levels Volunteer/Contributor, Coordinator, and Organization Veteran to Visionary (highest level). Students develop through these levels by mastering leadership skills in all three areas of “Nuts & Bolts,” “People & Places, “and “Personal Skills.”

During fall 2011 and spring 2012, advisors observed eight (8) student leaders from the Associated Student Government (ASG) and ten (10) student leaders from Student Foundation (SF). Not all of the SF leaders evaluated during the academic year were in the same leadership position from fall 2011 to spring 2012. Between the fall 2011 and the spring 2012, there were changes in SF leadership for the positions of President, Executive Vice President, Director of Communications and Marketing, and Director of Leadership Development. The levels of leadership skills proficiency and the following results are illustrated in Table 1 (below).

In fall 2011 both ASG and SF leaders demonstrated their leadership skills proficiency between the Organizational Veteran (second to highest) level and Volunteer/Contributor (second to lowest) level. The Organizational Veteran level included 37.5% of the ASG leaders and 30% of the SF leaders. The Coordinator level included 37.5% of the ASG leaders and 50% of the SF leaders. The Volunteer/Contributor level included 25% of the ASG leaders and 20% of the SF leaders.

In spring 2012 ASG leaders demonstrated their leadership skills proficiency between the Visionary (highest) level and Coordinator (middle) level while SF leaders demonstrated their leadership skills proficiency between the
Organizational Veteran (second to highest) level and Volunteer/Contributor (second to lowest) level. The Visionary level included 37.5% of the ASG leaders. The Organizational Veteran level included 37.5% of the ASG leaders and 50% of the SF leaders. The Coordinator level included 25% of the ASG leaders and 40% of the SF leaders. The Volunteer/Contributor level included 25% of the ASG leaders and 10% of the SF leaders.

Table 2: 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Skill Levels</th>
<th>ASG Fall 2011</th>
<th>ASG Spring 2012</th>
<th>SF Fall 2011</th>
<th>SF Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member (lowest level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/Contributor</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Veteran</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary (highest level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between fall 2011 and spring 2012 semesters 100% of ASG leaders and 20% of SF leaders increased their leadership skills proficiency and moved up to a higher skill level. 25% of the ASG leaders and 10% of SF leaders moved up from the Volunteer/Contributor level. 37.5% of the ASG leaders and 10% of SF leaders moved up from the Coordinator level. Additionally, another 37.5% of ASG leaders moved up from the Organizational Veteran level between fall 2011 and spring 2012. The target of 50% of student leaders to demonstrate development through at least one of the leadership skills proficiency levels was achieved by ASG by 50% more than the target and was not achieved by SF leaders with 30% less than the target.

75% of ASG leaders and 50% of SF leaders were in the two highest levels of leadership skills proficiency by end of spring 2012 in comparison to 50% of the ASG leaders and 75% of SF leaders in spring 2011, which is a 25% increase of the ASG leaders from last year. The levels of leadership skills proficiency for 2010-2011 is below in Table 2

Table 2: 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Skill Levels</th>
<th>ASG Fall 2010</th>
<th>ASG Spring 2011</th>
<th>SF Fall 2010</th>
<th>SF Spring 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member (lowest level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/Contributor</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Veteran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary (highest level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate for the SF leaders that leadership opportunities, a retreat for transition in May and planning for the academic year should continue to be offered, which was achieved this year from last year’s action plan. Also, the results indicate that in order to improve the Dean of Students staff advising services for the SF leaders, leadership opportunities should have curriculum guided by the advisors and include team building, budgeting, event planning, assessment, communication, recordkeeping and university policies and procedures. The results indicate for the ASG leaders that last year’s action plan that was achieved to include individual meetings with ASG leaders to discuss their leadership development goals and action plans were effective and should be continued this year with the new ASG leaders.

Outcome 2 - Action Plan

The action plan for Associated Student Government (ASG) is to:
1. Continue providing ASG leader training between May and September each year.
2. Continue introducing the leadership skills proficiency rubric at ASG leader training.
3. Continue asking ASG leaders to self-evaluate their leadership skill proficiency at start of year and mid-year.
4. Continue meeting with ASG leaders at start of year and mid-year to set goals and evaluate.
5. Enhance the anonymity of the respondents by eliminating the need to return the survey in person to the Dean of Students Office by changing the survey from a Word document to an on-line GATO form.

The action plan for Student Foundation (SF) is to:
1. Continue providing SF leader training between May and September each year.
2. Continue providing SF Fall Leadership Team Retreat in August.
3. Continue asking SF leaders to self-evaluate their leadership skill proficiency at start of year and mid-year.

4. Continue meeting with SF leaders at start of year and mid-year to set goals and evaluate.

5. Enhance the anonymity of the respondents by eliminating the need to return the survey in person to the Dean of Students Office by changing the survey from a Word document to an on-line GATO form.

6. Play a more direct role by advisors in articulating the purpose of the organization and expectations of members during the 2012 summer and fall trainings as well as during 2012-2013.

7. Revise the charter articulation agreement under SA/PPS 05.02, organization governing documents, organization structure, and member expectations by advisors and help from Dean of Students staff to better aligned with current department mission and goals in summer 2012.

8. Offering leadership opportunities with curriculum guided by the advisors and that includes team building, budgeting, event planning, assessment, communication, recordkeeping and university policies and procedures during 2012-2013.

### Outcome 3 - Student Justice

At least 60% of students who utilize the services offered through the Student Justice process will report satisfaction with services received during the adjudication process and while taking the AEPM course at Texas State.

#### Outcome 3 - Method 1

Students will be provided a paper satisfaction survey before leaving the office after adjudication during the fall and spring semesters. The satisfaction survey will rate how helpful the Dean of Students Office staff were during the Student Justice process and whether the student’s experience in the process will positively influence future choices concerning behavior as a student. At least 60% of survey respondents will be satisfied with services received.

#### Outcome 3 - Method 1 - Results

This assessment involved providing a satisfaction survey to students adjudicated during the long semesters of FY12 for Code of Student Conduct violations. An approximate total of 450 surveys were handed out. 58 were completed and returned in fall 2011; 37 of them in spring 2012 for an overall response rate of 21%. Students rank 12 statements in the survey from 1-4, with 1 being the most positive response and 4 the least positive response, specifically, 1=Very true, 2=Somewhat true, 3=Not so true and 4=Not true at all.

Overall, satisfaction with the Student Justice process remains positive. However, the findings show a slight decrease in the overall satisfaction (total survey average was 1.49 in fall and 1.56 compared to the previous year in which the average was 1.36 in fall and 1.40 in spring. The new averages take satisfaction closer to the 2009-2010 overall satisfaction rating of 1.48. The percentage of students who gave the lowest marks (survey average of 4) increased slightly, from 5% to 6%. The amount of students who gave the highest marks (survey average of 1), compared to FY11, decreased from 41% to 27%, however, this year’s average is still above the FY10’s 23% and FY09's 20%.

By question, the negative responses (scores of 3 or 4) ranged from 9-22% in both fall and spring, and therefore, in each question the positive responses (scores of 1 or 2) ranged from 78-92%. The question averages were consistent from fall to spring, ranging from 1.36 to 1.79 in fall and 1.41 to 1.81 in spring. These numbers do show a slide back to FY10 figures which showed question averages ranging up to 1.74 (that year’s question showing the least satisfaction). As with past assessments, the question with the least satisfaction was regarding the timeliness of the adjudication process. After timeliness, the question that stands out as having the least satisfaction refers to their experience having a positive impact on their values and attitudes. The questions with the highest satisfaction were regarding their agreement that they were treated with courtesy, respect, and professionalism and that they were given the opportunity to explain their behavior and informed of their options.

Of all surveys completed, 86% in fall 2011 and 81% in spring 2012 averaged a positive response (1.00-2.00), which was a 5% decrease from 91% in fall 2010 and 8% from 89% in spring 2011. All question averages were positive. The question showing the least satisfactory responses in fall was 1a regarding the timeliness of the initial contact (1.79); in the spring it was question 1b regarding the timeliness of being seen upon arrival for appointment (1.81). Questions/statements gauging learning included, “My experience with the discipline process and Student Justice will positively influence future choices I make concerning my behavior as a student” and “has had a positive impact on my values and attitudes.” The average for these two questions over the two semesters ranged from 1.45 to 1.75, both in the positive range. From the time this survey was first administered, the questions with the least satisfactory responses consistently related to the timeliness of the adjudication.
process (first contact from the time of the incident and the time students waited to be seen for their appointment).

At times, delays occur from the time incidents occur and when Student Justice initiates contact. This may be due to the time it takes for the San Marcos Police Department to relay to University Police arrest summaries of students who engage in behavior that may have a negative impact on the university or university community. With the addition of a new full-time Conduct Officer, the time “out” for a person to be able to be scheduled was greatly reduced. It was not uncommon for students to have to wait 1-2 weeks in the past and up to three weeks during peak periods. Now, it is rare that a student cannot be seen within a week of when they call to schedule an appointment. In addition, Student Justice is engaged with the Department of Housing in implementing the use of software that will help record and track conduct violations. Once fully implemented, it is expected that the time from the occurrence of an incident to the time a student is summoned to Student Justice will be decreased since the Department of Housing and Student Justice will use the same system. This system will also automate electronic contact with students.

Regarding the time a student waits to be seen for their appointment, at times, particularly during peak times when several students may be scheduled back-to-back, if a student appointment runs late, it can delay with a domino effect subsequent appointments. In an effort to alleviate this and see if the rating for question 1b improves, FY13 Student Justice appointments will be scheduled for 45 minutes (increased from 30 minutes).

The target of 60% of survey respondents being satisfied with services received was achieved by 86% in fall 2011 and 81% in spring 2012, which is 26% more than the target in fall and 20% more than the target in spring. Results indicate that while students report overall satisfaction with the Student Justice process, improvement is still needed in the area of timelines of first contact from the time of the incident and the time students waited to be seen for their appointment. The action plan from last year was achieved by adding a staff member to help adjudicate cases to improve timeliness of process, but an agreement between the Department of Housing and Student Justice changed the process of the Department of Housing meeting with resident students for alcohol and drug offenses to Student Justice meeting with these students to add more cases than in past years, therefore, the added staff member absorbed the additional case load so the timeliness problem remained the same instead of being improved.

**Outcome 3 - Method 2**

Students who are found responsible for violating alcohol policies will be assigned a sanction of completing the Alcohol Education Program for Minors course (AEPM). Students assigned this sanction may choose to complete it at Texas State. Participants in AEPM during the fall, spring, and summer semesters will complete evaluations to rate the course and instructor after they complete the program. At least 60% of AEPM participants responding to the evaluations will report an “overall” course and Instructor rating of 8 or higher on a 1-10 scale, with 10 being the highest.

**Outcome 3 - Method 2 - Results**

This method was new for 2011-2012 making these results for this method baseline information; therefore comparative data is not available. Alcohol and Drug Compliance Services (ADCS) utilizes the state mandated Course Evaluation tool, provided by the Alcohol Education Program for Minors (AEPM) curriculum, as a method of identifying student satisfaction with the course, program and instructor strengths as well as areas needing improvement within the realm of flexibility allowed by the Texas Department of State Health Services (DHS) and course curriculum creators. The Course Evaluation tool utilizes a combination of Likert Scale and qualitative measurements through participant written response as methods of gathering evaluative data. The Course Evaluation is completed, voluntarily, by participants at the conclusion of each course. All evaluations are reviewed and data calculated by AEPM program administrator.

For this assessment period of 2011-2012, 27 AEPM/MIP classes were conducted, 501 students successfully completed the course and 496 students completed the Course Evaluation tool (only 5 students chose not to complete the evaluation tool). In the category of “Overall Rating of Course” 447 participants (90%) gave a score of 8 or higher (70 gave an “8”, 119 gave a “9” and 258 gave a “10”). In the category of “Overall Rating of Instructor” 489 (98.5%) gave a score of 8 or higher (13 gave an “8”, 59 gave a “9” and 417 gave a “10”). These results indicate that participants in the AEPM/MIP course, although state mandated to complete the course as a compliance sanction, overall were satisfied with the experience. The target of at least 60% of AEPM participants responding to the evaluations will report an “overall” Course and Instructor rating of 8 or higher on a 1-10 scale, with 10 being the highest was achieved by 90% for the Course and 98.9% for the Instructor, which is 30% more than the target for the Course and 38.9% more than the target for the Instructor.
Some of the written feedback from participants on the evaluations regarding each category confirmed these results:

“It was not as bad as I thought it would be and it provided me with new information”,

“The course included valuable information college students need to know”,

“It was educational, could be more entertaining but it was pretty good and served its purpose”,

“The instructor was very sweet, she did a great job at making me feel comfortable”,

“Instructor had great experience and knowledge of alcohol’s consequences and addiction”,

“The teacher made this course entertaining, the content was factual but incredibly boring”.

Not all of the written feedback was positive or appropriate, and most of the suggestions for the course related to issues structured by the course format and implementation guidelines mandated by DSHS and the course curriculum developers. Issues such as length of class “mandated two 3 hour sessions on back to back days” were addressed in the suggestions, mostly requesting shorter classes or have it all in one day. Other issues included wanting snacks (not part of program requirement, vending machines are available in the building and class is only 3 hours at a time), updating curriculum information (DSHS provided curriculum and video update in January 2012 for the first time since 2010) and hours classes are offered (schedule of classes provides flexibility and choice for participants either on weekday afternoons or weekend hours, scheduling is also determinant on room availability in the LBJ Student Center). Written feedback on the Course Evaluation provides documentation that the course encourages healthy decision making and personal responsibility regarding decisions about alcohol use/abuse.

### Outcome 3 - Action Plan

In order to improve timeliness of the Student Justice process for 2012-2013, the following is the action plan:

1. Schedule Student Justice appointments for 45 minutes instead of the current meeting time allotment of 30 minutes to reduce the domino effect of students waiting for their appointment because one appointment ran over its allotted time.
2. Implement the use of software by both the Department of Housing and Student Justice that will help record and track conduct violations to more efficiently streamline the process shared by these two offices.
3. Establish dates and times for hearings in conjunction with training of the Student Judicial Hearing Board.
4. Modify the current Student Justice assessment tool or create a new one that better assesses student learning and areas for improvement.

The AEPM course and curriculum are state mandated to facilitate exactly as taught in the instructor certification training, therefore there are minimum areas of change regarding facilitation and program implementation that can be made. However, review of the written suggestions and feedback resulted in a trend towards participants requesting snacks being offered during the class, therefore, the following is the action plan to improve the AEPM course for 2012-2013

1. Beginning this next assessment period (June 2012 to May 2013) the registration documentation for the course will have additional information regarding location and availability of vending machines in the building, information about breaks in the course to which snacks can be acquired and will enhance the documentation currently in place on the registration packet that says “drinks and snacks are welcome in the classroom as long as they are not alcoholic or substance related.”
2. Instructors will also enhance their attention to review building amenities during the mandated “housekeeping” protocols at the beginning of each class.