**Administrative Outcomes & Methods Results 2015-2016**

**General Information**

**Academic Year: 2015-2016**

**Division: Student Affairs**

**Unit: Dean of Students**

**Department: Dean of Students**

**Outcome Type: Administrative / Educational Support**

**Contact Name: Margarita Arellano or Kathy Weiser**

**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**

Outcome 1:

In FY16, more than 50% of students reported satisfaction with services and also demonstrated academic persistence, as called for in the outcome. In fact, 99% (N=119) of students who obtained assistance from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office and responded to a satisfaction survey reported they were satisfied with services in comparison to 97% (N=85) of students in FY15, which is a 2% increase. In FY16, the 99% (N=119) of students who were satisfied increased by 6% from FY14 when 93% (N=49) of students were satisfied; by 4% from FY13 when 95% (N=16) of students who were satisfied; by 10% from FY12 when 89% (N=38) of students who were satisfied; by 69% from FY11 when 30% (N=3) of students who were satisfied; and by 8% from FY10 when 91% (N=100) of students who were satisfied. Below is a table showing the yearly comparison of response rate and percentage of satisfied respondents.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Satisfaction and Response Rates from Survey | | |
| YEAR | RESPONSE | SATISFIED |
| FY16 | 12% (N=121) | 99% (N=119) |
| FY15 | 15% (N=91) | 97% (N=85) |
| FY14 | 10% (N=53) | 93% (N=49) |
| FY13 | 5% (N=17) | 95% (N=16) |
| FY12 | 16% (N=43) | 89% (N=38) |
| FY11 | 7% (N=11) | 30% (N=3) |
| FY10 | 7% (N=110) | 91% (N=100) |

In FY16, 98% (N=999) of the students who received the absence notification service demonstrated academic persistence by completing the semester in which they received Student Emergency Services in comparison to 95% (N=466) of students who completed the semester after receiving the assistance in FY15, which is a 3% increase. 88% (N=466) of students completed the semester after receiving the assistance in FY14, representing a 7% increase from the previous year. By comparison, the percentage of students who received the absence notification service and completed the semester increased by 9% from 86% (N=305) in FY13 to 95% (N=503) in FY15. While the percentage of students who received the service and completed the semester was the same (95%) in FY12 and in FY15, the number of students who received the service and completed the semester significantly increased by 91% from 263 students in FY12 to 503 students in FY15. Below is a table illustrating the amount of students who received the absence notification service and completed the semester as compared by semester and year.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students Who Received Absence Notification Services  and Completed the Semester | | | |
| YEAR | Fall | Spring | TOTAL |
| FY16 | 97% (N=452) | 98% (N=547) | 98% (N=999) |
| FY15 | 95% (N=220) | 95% (N=283) | 95% (N=503) |
| FY14 | 82% (N=178) | 92% (N=288) | 88% (N=466) |
| FY13 | 80% (N=126) | 91% (N=179) | 86% (N=305) |
| FY12 | 94% (N=117) | 95% (N=146) | 95% (N=263) |

Outcome 1 results demonstrate a large majority of students who receive assistance from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office are satisfied with the services and complete the semester after receiving the service. The satisfaction rate has remained between 89% (in FY13) and 99% (in FY16). The completion rate has been no lower than 86% in FY13 and as high as 98% in FY16. These satisfaction rates and completion rates have remained consistently high (between 86% and 98%) for the past four years.

Implementation of last year’s action plan, calling for Student Emergency Services staff to continue benchmarking comparable universities to enhance and look for more effective ways to inform faculty members about the absence notification service and their role in the process, had a positive impact on this year’s result as demonstrated by an increase in percentage of students satisfied and number of students completing the semester.

Outcome 2:

The target for this method was met, with 100% of survey respondents indicating they are satisfied with advising services for the second year in a row, with an increase in “very satisfied” responses of 16.7% in FY15 to 81.3% in FY16. This method was implemented in FY15, making results comparable for two years. A survey was administered to the officers of the Student Leadership Board at the last general Student Leadership Board meeting in April 2016. The survey was administered to 17 student attendees and there were 16 respondents for a 94.1% response rate.

The survey asked students to respond to a question regarding the advising of the organization using a five-point Likert scale with 5 being “very good,” 3 being “N/A” and 1 being “very poor.” One hundred percent of FY16 and FY15 respondents indicated advising services were “good.” Eighty-one percent of respondents reported that the advising services of the organization are “very good,” compared to 16.7% of respondents in FY15 being “very good.” (Note: Wording changes in the survey instrument will be changed to align with the method—see action plan).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Satisfaction with Advising Services and Response Rates from Survey | | |
| YEAR | RESPONSE | ADVISING SATISFACTION |
| FY16 | 94.1% (N=16) | 100% (81.3% Very Good) |
| FY15 | 50% (N=6) | 100% (16.7% Very Good) |

We learned that for the second year in a row, student leaders were very satisfied with advising services for the Student Leadership Board, demonstrating that activities, meetings, sessions and other events with advisors are having a positive impact on Leadership Board members and their satisfaction with the organization.

The target of 70% of the Student Leadership Board demonstrating better awareness of their leadership style by mastering all three areas of one level and progressing to the next level within the academic year was met, with both students assessed progressing in their ratings (+1 and +1.5 respectively) and achieving a 4 or greater in all categories. The two students who were observed and assessed achieved an average 1.25-point increase between their fall average assessment score and their spring average assessment score.

The results indicate that students are experiencing growth in their leadership skills, and that discussions about areas for growth and improvement during the fall semester have been fruitful as they prepare for the spring semester.

Implementing last year’s action plan, which called for the Student Leadership Board advisors to provide opportunities to organization officers to learn about their roles as student leaders to better understand the process of self-assessment so they were able to develop more awareness of their own leadership style, had a positive impact on this year’s results as demonstrated by an average 1.25-point increase in leadership skill development. Additionally, student leaders’ satisfaction with advisors increased as a result of implementing last year’s action plan calling for advisors to further define their role and sharing this information with the Student Leadership Board members.

Outcome 3:

Methods 1 and 2 for Outcomes 3 were new in FY14 making the FY16 results only comparable to two years of data. The target of increasing the average GPA of Greek affiliated students from 2.56 to 2.65 was achieved in FY16 and FY15 when the average GPA for Greek affiliated students was 2.72 and a 2.70 respectively. The FY16 average GPA was a 0.02 increase from FY15, which was a 0.03 increase from FY14 for an overall 0.05 increase in the last three fiscal years where the average GPA of Greek affiliated students was 2.67.

A continued increase in the number of chapters who achieved an overall chapter average of 2.50 or higher was evident this fiscal year as well, demonstrating the target for Method 2 was also achieved. For FY16, 81% (N=29) of Greek affiliated chapters achieved an average 2.50 GPA or above. Comparatively, 77% (N=28) of Greek affiliated chapters achieved the target average GPA in FY15 and 67% (N=21) of chapters achieved the target average GPA in FY14. An overall improvement of 14% from FY14 has been achieved, which included a 10% increase in FY15 from FY14 and a 4% increase in FY16 from the results in FY15.

The results demonstrate the strategies used to improve academic performance for the Greek affiliated students, and consequently their chapters, are continuing to be effective. An academic resource manual, which Greek Affairs staff completed in fall 2014 and distributed to all chapters during spring 2015 has continued to be utilized by chapters and provided by Greek Affairs staff as well as council executive officers when meeting with chapter representatives. Additionally, council executive officers have implemented new approaches to working with chapter scholarship representatives to provide support and resources to chapters. Furthermore, the results show the effectiveness of the Greek Affairs staff in providing appropriate data to the governing councils and chapters in an effort to help identify chapters and individual members who may need more assistance or resources to improve academically.

**Action Plan**

**The action plan for FY17 to improve the Dean of Students Office services includes the following:**

1. **Student Emergency Services staff will implement an outreach plan to inform professors, students, families, and other student services offices at the University about the Absence Notification services. The focus of the outreach will be to provide information about the roles of: the professors in responding to the notification process; students, families and health providers in submitting the required documentation to allow the notifications; and other student services offices in referring individuals to the Dean of Students Office for the notification services. Results for the outreach plan will be ongoing, but more than 50% of the student services offices identified by the Student Emergency Services staff will be informed by May 2017.**
2. **Student Emergency Services staff will revise the Method 1 of Outcome 1 to at least change the method to using an electronic survey instead of a paper survey, and will consider revising the Method to assess satisfaction or an outcome of another service provided by this area in the Dean of Students Office in order to learn how other improvements may be made. The Method 1 of Outcome 1 revision will occur by September 1, 2016.**
3. **Student Emergency Services staff will revise the electronic satisfaction survey to include a reminder to students to speak with their professors about excusing their absences and to collect data on how often absences are being excused. This revised survey will be done by September 1, 2016.**
4. Student Leadership Board advisors will increase the number of students assessed through the Castens Matrix of Student Employment in Method 2 of Outcome 2 by at least two students beginning September 1, 2016.
5. Student Leadership Board advisors will revise Method 1 of Outcome 2 to change it in two areas: 1) To reflect use of a paper survey instead of an electronic one as a result of a dramatic increase in response rate (50 percent in FY15 with an electronic survey to 94.1 percent with a paper survey in FY16) and 2). The Student Leadership Board survey assessing satisfaction with advising services, will be revised to better rate the student leaders’ satisfaction with the advising services. This revised satisfaction survey will be completed by April 1, 2017.
6. Student Leadership Board advisors will add a component to the Castens Matrix of Student Employment assessment to have participating students provide a brief written statement about why they rated themselves at each particular level for each category (nuts and bolts, people and places, and personal skills) to increase communication and reduce minor inconsistencies between of self-assessment process and the advisor assessment. The revised Castens Matrix of Student Employment assessment to include the brief written statement will be completed by September 1, 2016.
7. The Student Leadership Board advisors will focus on assisting with the completion of the marketing plan for the organization and its events to achieve more exposure. The marking plan will be completed by October 1, 2016.
8. **Greek Affairs staff will continue to provide strategies that proved effective in FY16 and FY15 to help improve academic performance of Greek affiliated students and overall chapter academic performance, which include resources to chapters dispersed by staff and governing councils, meetings with chapter presidents to discuss academic standards, and assessments which identify students who may need more resources provided to chapter executive officers. An academic resource manual will be provided to each of the Greek chapters on September 11, 2016 at an officer training workshop and monthly roundtable meetings with chapter scholarship officers will be held to discuss additional academic success strategies as students prepare for midterms and final exams.**
9. **Greek Affairs staff will collaborate with governing council executive officers and the Office of Retention, Management and Planning to provide Greek affiliated students with opportunities to engage in academic support events and services such as Brilliant Bobcats. The collaboration will occur before December 1, 2016 in order to present available opportunities.**
10. **Greek Affairs will revise the Method 1 for Outcome 3 so the new target is to increase Greek-affiliated students average GPA from 2.65 to 2.75. This revised method will be completed no later than September 1, 2016.**

**Outcome 1 Student Emergency Services**

**At least 50% of students who obtain 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**

**Students who receive assistance from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office during the fall and spring semesters will be given a satisfaction survey within 10 business days after obtaining services. Students will be given paper surveys when they receive services in the office and will be emailed surveys when they do not receive services in the office. The survey will rate the students’ satisfaction of services. At least 50% of the survey respondents will be satisfied with the services received.**

**Outcome 1 - Method 1 Results**

The target of 50% of survey respondents being satisfied with Student Emergency Services was achieved in FY16 with 99% (N=119) of satisfied respondents, which exceeded the target by 49%. The target being achieved and exceeded is consistent with six out of the seven years that this method has been implemented.

The FY16 results compared to a satisfaction rate of 97% (N=85) of students in FY15, representing a 2% increase over FY14; a 6% increase from FY15 when 97% (N=85) of students were satisfied; a 4% increase from FY14 when 93% (N=49) of students were satisfied; by 10% from FY12 when 89% (N=38) of students who were satisfied; by 69% from FY11 when 30% (N=3) of students who were satisfied; and by 8% from FY10 when 91% (N=100) of students who were satisfied. Below is a table showing the yearly comparison of response rate and percentage of satisfied respondents.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Survey Response and Satisfaction Rates | | |
| YEAR | RESPONSE | SATISFIED |
| FY16 | 12% (N=121) | 99% (N=119) |
| FY15 | 15% (N=91) | 97% (N=85) |
| FY14 | 10% (N=53) | 93% (N=49) |
| FY13 | 5% (N=17) | 95% (N=16) |
| FY12 | 16% (N=43) | 89% (N=38) |
| FY11 | 7% (N=11) | 30% (N=3) |
| FY10 | 7% (N=110) | 91% (N=100) |

An electronic satisfaction survey was e-mailed to the students who received the Student Emergency services within 10 business days throughout FY16. Paper surveys were not provided to students in FY16 as in years past because most students are provided this service without an office visit. The FY16 response rate (12%) is among the average response rates of all seven years implementing this method. Changing from a paper survey to an electronic survey and distributing the survey on Tuesdays, as assessment data has shown that response rates are the highest when surveys are distributed on Tuesdays than any other day of the week, will be a part of the FY17 action plan.

The 2015 action plan item calling for benchmarking comparable universities to enhance and look for more effective ways to inform faculty members about the absence notification service and their role in the process, had a positive impact on this year’s results as demonstrated by an increase in percentage of students satisfied and number of students completing the semester.

Student Emergency Services staff learned from respondents’ comments that while they are satisfied with how services are provided, the absence notifications are not resulting in the professors excusing the absences. The FY17 action plan will also include updating the electronic survey to remind students to speak with their professors about excusing the absences and to collect data about how often absences are being excused by professors.

**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 in FY12, making these results comparable for four years. A review of transcripts was conducted after grades posted each semester during FY16 for students who received the absence notification service from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office. These transcript review from each semester were averaged to show 98% (N=999) of the students completed the semester during FY16. By comparison, 95% (N=503) of the students completed in FY15; 88% (N=466) of students completed in FY14; 86% (N=305) of the students completed in FY13; and 95% (N=263) of the students completed in FY12. Below is a table illustrating the amount of students who received the absence notification service and completed the semester as compared by semester and year.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students Who Received Absence Notification Service and Completed the Semester | | | |
| YEAR | Fall | Spring | TOTAL |
| FY16 | 98% (N=452) | 98% (N=547) | 98% (N=999) |
| FY15 | 95% (N=220) | 95% (N=283) | 95% (N=503) |
| FY14 | 82% (N=178) | 92% (N=288) | 88% (N=466) |
| FY13 | 80% (N=126) | 91% (N=179) | 86% (N=305) |
| FY12 | 94% (N=117) | 95% (N=146) | 95% (N=263) |

The target of 50% of students completing the semester in which they received the absence notification service from Student Emergency Services was achieved with 98% (N=999) in FY16 and exceeded by 48%. The amount of students who received the services and completed the semester increased by 7% from 88% (N=466) in FY14 to 95% (N=503) in FY15. In comparison, the amount of students who received the services and completed the semester increased by 9% from 86% (N=305) in FY13. These results indicate the service assisted a large majority of students with their academic persistence and the service should continue.

The 2015 action plan item calling for benchmarking was partially completed during FY16, with no findings to determine effective ways to inform faculty members about the absence notification service and their role in it. In lieu of finding best practices through benchmarking, Student Emergency Services staff informed faculty when opportunities allowed staff to educate the faculty about the service. Despite the need to supplement the action plan, the results indicated the action that was taken had a positive impact as demonstrated with the increases from last year in both student satisfaction of services and students academic persistence.

**Outcome 2 Leadership Institute**

**At least 70% of student leaders, such as executive officers and committee chairs, of the Student Leadership Board advised by Dean of Students Office staff will report satisfaction with advising services received and will demonstrate more awareness of their own leadership style.**

Outcome 2 - Method 1

All student leaders of the Student Leadership Board will be given an electronic survey the first week of April each year. The survey will rate the student leaders’ satisfaction with the advising services. At least 70% of the survey respondents will be satisfied with the services.

Outcome 2 - Method 1 Results

The target of at least 70% of the survey respondents will be satisfied with the advising services was achieved by the 100% satisfaction rate (exceeded by 30%).

This method was new in FY15 making these results comparable for two years. A paper survey was administered to the officers of the Student Leadership Board (SLB) at the last general Student Leadership Board meeting in April 2016. The survey was administered to 17 student attendees and there were 16 respondents (94.1% response rate).

The survey asked students to respond to questions regarding the advising and rating of the organization using a five-point Likert scale with 5 being “very good,” 3 being “N/A,” and 1 being “very poor.”

Not only did 100 percent of the FY16 respondents rank their satisfaction with advising services as “good,” the number of students reporting services were “very” good dramatically increased over last year. The number of respondents who ranked advising services as “very good” was 81.3% (N=13) in FY16, compared to 16.7% ranking services as “very good” in the previous year.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Satisfaction and Response Rates from Survey | | |
| YEAR | RESPONSE | SATISFIED |
| FY16 | 94.1% (N=16) | 100% (81.3% Very Good) |
| FY15 | 50% (N=6) | 100% (16.7% Very Good) |

Respondents’ comments illustrate that the organization needs more experience with marketing its events/workshops, and within the organization for more exposure. Respondents would like to see the organization grow and expand. The responses also revealed a great deal of satisfaction with their programming, particularly the bi-weekly workshops and the Wiley Middle School Leadership Conference. Based on these responses, assisting with the branding and marketing the organization and its events will be an area of focus for the advisors to establish plans and strategies to achieve their goals of greater awareness and exposure for the organization.

Implementation of last year’s action plan, calling for the Student Leadership Board advisors to further define their roles and share the updates with the members, had a positive impact on this year’s results. Advisors shared the updates with the Student Leadership Board members at its their first meeting on October 1, 2015. This clarification contributed to the increase in advising satisfaction rates because of better defined roles and responsibilities of advisors.

**Outcome 2 - Method 2**

**Advisors of the Student Leadership Board (SLB) will observe the leadership development of the SLB student leaders throughout the academic year based on a rubric from Castens Matrix of Student Employment, which includes three areas (nuts and bolts, people and places, and personal skills) and a five level scale with the lowest level Member = 1, Volunteer/Contributor = 2, Coordinator = 3, Organization Veteran = 4, and the highest level Visionary = 5. At least 70% of student leaders observed will demonstrate better awareness of their leadership style by mastering all three areas of one level and progressing to the next level within the academic year.**

**Outcome 2 - Method 2 Results**

Leadership development of the Student Leadership Board increased beyond the target in FY16, with 100 percent of student leaders observed mastering all three areas of one level and progressing to the next level within the academic year on the Carsten’s Matrix of Student Employment assessment.

Beginning in Fall 2014, the Student Leadership Board Executive Director and Co-Executive Director were assessed using Carsten’s Matrix of Student Employment. The executive officers are notified of the assessment at the beginning of the academic year, and they are required to meet with advisors at the end of their first semester (late November/early December) and again at the close of the full calendar year (April). This rubric includes three areas: nuts and bolts, people and places, and personal skills. These areas are rated using the following scale: *Member* (1), *Volunteer/Contributor* (2), *Coordinator* (3), *Organization Veteran* (4), and *Visionary* (5). This rubric has been utilized for two academic years, for one year of comparable data.

The SLB assesses the two executive officers who have the greatest connection (and hold the only two paid positions with required office hours) to the office to conduct this assessment. In Fall 2015, one executive officer averaged at 3.75, which would fall at the *Coordinator* level, while the other averaged a 2.91, falling within the *Volunteer/Contributor* level. During this assessment, the advisors and officers discussed goals and areas of improvement for the following semester. In Spring 2016, one executive officer averaged at 4.75, falling in the *Organization Veteran* level, while the other averaged 4.41, falling in the same level.

By the end of the spring semester both students had achieved at least a 4 in all three categories (100%). The two students assessed averaged a 1.25 point increase between their fall average assessment score and their spring average assessment score. The target of 70% of the SLB student leaders demonstrating better awareness of their leadership style by mastering all three areas of one level and progressing to the next level within the academic year was met because both of the students progressed in their ratings (+1 and +1.5 respectively) achieved a 4 or greater in all categories.

The SLB officers were given the rubric for a personal assessment one week prior to their meeting with the advisors. The students used the rubric to assess their development as a result of their involvement with the SLB and the advisor also used the rubric to assess the students’ development. The students met individually with the advisors to share their own ratings and to hear the advisor’s ratings. All three areas of the rubric and areas for further development were discussed. At the end of the meeting, an average rating based on the responses from the student and advisor were recorded.

The results indicate that students are experiencing growth in their leadership skills, and that discussions about areas for growth and improvement during the fall semester have been fruitful as they prepare for the spring semester. Based on the success of these assessments and conversations about goals and strategies to improve, we learned that we should connect with our executive officers earlier in each semester to discuss expectations and provide support for their individual roles within the organization. Due to some minor inconsistencies between the process of self-assessment compared to that of the advisors, we also plan to have executive officers provide a brief written statement about why they rated themselves at each particular level for each category (nuts & bolts, people & places, and personal skills).

**Outcome 3 Greek Affairs**

**Students who are members of Greek affiliated chapters advised by the Greek Affairs staff in the Dean of Students Office will improve academic performance.**

**Outcome 3 - Method 1**

**After grades are posted at the end of the fall and spring semesters, Greek Affairs staff will review GPA report from IT. The average GPA of the students who are members of Greek affiliated chapters advised by the Greek Affairs staff in the Dean of Students Office will increase from an average GPA of 2.56 to 2.65.**

**Outcome 3 - Method 1 Results**

**Grade information was obtained from the Student Affairs MAKO database for all students who participated in Greek affiliated chapters advised by the Greek Affairs staff in the Dean of Students Office for each long semester in FY16. Data for each student was utilized to calculate averages for each of the organizations advised by staff in both long semesters.**

**In FY16, the assessment averaged data from a total of 2,674 students (973 male and 1,701 female) in 37 organizations during the fall semester and averaged data in the spring semester from a total of 2,542 students (1,034 male and 1,508 female) in 35 organizations. In comparison, during FY15 2,498 students (934 males and 1,564 females) in the fall and 2,388 students (900 male and 1,488 female) in the spring comprising the membership of 36 organizations were assessed. For FY14 2,279 students (849 males and 1,430 female) from 34 organizations for the fall semester and 2,299 students (891 male and 1408 female) from 36 organizations for the spring semester were assessed.**

**Method 1 was new in FY14 making the FY16 results only comparable to two years of data. In FY16, the target to increase the average GPA of Greek affiliated students from 2.56 to 2.65 was achieved and exceeded each semester. The fall semester average GPA was 2.69 and the spring semester average was 2.74. FY16 results demonstrated an increase of 0.04 and 0.09 respectively above the target average GPA. The overall average GPA for Greek affiliated students for FY16 was a 2.72, a 0.02 increase from FY15. In addition to the overall increase, during each long semester an increase from the corresponding semester in the previous year was seen, a 0.03 increase from fall 2014 semester and a 0.01 increase from spring 2015 semester.**

**In comparison, the results seen in FY15 were a fall average GPA of 2.66, and a spring average GPA of 2.73, which was an overall average GPA for Greek affiliated students of 2.70. This exceeded the target by 0.05 and was a 0.03 increase from FY14. In FY14 the target was met and exceeded in the Spring semester only. FY14 yearly average GPA of 2.67 was comprised of an average GPA of 2.60 in Fall 2013 and a 2.75 in Spring 2014. Below is a table illustrating the average of the Greek affiliated students’ GPA and the number of students who are Greek affiliated for each semester and fiscal year since the implementation of this method.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Greek Affiliated Undergraduate Student GPA** | | | | | | |
| **YEAR** | **Fall** | **Number of Students** | **Spring** | **Total Number of Students** | **FY GPA Average** |
| **2015-2016**  **(FY16)** | **2.69** | **2,674** | **2.74** | **2,542** | **2.72** |
| **2014-2015**  **(FY15)** | **2.66** | **2,498** | **2.73** | **2,388** | **2.70** |
| **2013-2014**  **(FY14)** | **2.60** | **2,279** | **2.75** | **2,299** | **2.67** |

**The results indicate the strategies used to improve academic performance are continuing to be effective. Greek Affairs staff provided appropriate data to chapters in an effort to help identify members who may need additional assistance or resources to improve academically. Staff met with chapter presidents providing guidance on assisting members who are not meeting organizational academic standards. In addition to the strategies already being utilized in previous years, staff worked with the governing councils on providing resources and support to chapter officers in charge of the organizations’ scholarship programs through semester roundtable meetings and individual chapter meetings, to further develop academic plans for students and whole chapters who may need additional assistance. Councils and staff also worked to collaborate with other University departments to provide resources and assistance to chapters and individual Greek affiliated students throughout the year such as the PACE center, Brilliant Bobcat sessions, and utilizing SLAC services.**

**Outcome 3 - Method 2**

**After grades are posted at the end of the fall and spring semesters, Greek Affairs staff will review GPA reports from IT. The percentage of the Greek affiliated chapters advised by the Greek Affairs staff in the Dean of Students Office that achieve an average 2.50 GPA will increase from 56% of chapters to 65% of chapters.**

**Outcome 3 - Method 2 Results**

**Grade information was obtained from the Student Affairs MAKO database for all students who participated in Greek affiliated chapters advised by the Greek Affairs staff in the Dean of Students Office for each long semester in FY16. Data for each student was utilized to calculate averages for each of the organizations advised by staff in both long semesters.**

**In FY16, the assessment averaged data from a total of 2,674 students (973 male and 1,701 female) in 37 organizations during the fall semester and averaged data in the spring semester from a total of 2,542 students (1,034 male and 1,508 female) in 35 organizations. In comparison, during FY15 2,498 students (934 male and 1,564 female) in the fall and 2,388 students (900 male and 1,488 female) in the spring comprising the membership of 36 organizations were assessed. For FY14 2,279 students (849 males and 1,430 female) from 34 organizations for the fall semester and 2,299 students (891 male and 1408 female) from 36 organizations for the spring semester were assessed.**

**Method 2 was new as well in FY14 making the FY16 results only comparable to two years of data. In FY16, the target to increase the percentage of chapters who achieve an average 2.50 or higher GPA from 56% of chapters to 65% of chapters was met. In FY16, 81% (N=29) of chapters achieved an overall chapter average GPA of 2.50 or above. This is compared to 77% (N=28) in FY15 and 67% (N=21) in FY14, which is a 14% increase of chapters. For FY16, 27 Greek affiliated organizations out of 37 in the fall semester and 30 out of 35 organizations in the spring semester achieved an overall chapter GPA of a 2.50 or higher, this is 73% and 86% respectively, of the Greek community who reached the target average GPA. Comparatively, in Fall 2014, 64% (N=23) of the chapters advised by the Greek Affairs staff in the Dean of Students office reached an average GPA of 2.50 or higher. This is 1% below the target percentage but an 8% increase from Fall 2013 which had 56% (N=19) of chapters above the target GPA. In Spring 2015, 89% (N=32) of the 36 chapters averaged a 2.50 GPA or higher, exceeding the target by 24% and a 22% increase from Spring 2014 in which 67% (N=24) of chapters were at or above the established average GPA. Below is a table illustrating the percentage and number of Greek affiliated chapters that achieve an average 2.50 or higher GPA by semester and by year.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Greek Affiliated Chapters Achieving Average 2.50 or Higher GPA** | | | | | | |
| **YEAR** | **Fall** | **Number of Organizations** | **Spring** | **Number of Organizations** | **Total** |
| **2015-2016**  **(FY16)** | **73% (N=27)** | **37** | **86% (N=30)** | **35** | **81% (N=29)** |
| **2014-2015**  **(FY15)** | **64% (N=23)** | **36** | **89% (N=33)** | **36** | **77% (N=28)** |
| **2013-2014**  **(FY14)** | **56% (N=19)** | **34** | **67% (N=24)** | **36** | **67% (N=21)** |

**The results indicate the strategies used to improve academic performance are continuing to be effective. Staff met with presidents from each chapter throughout the semester, which included assistance in developing strategies to improve academic achievement. Staff continued providing the resource manual distributed in FY15. In addition, Staff continued to work with the four governing Councils in establishing strategies to expand resources and assistance for chapters throughout the academic year in addition to enhancing accountability for chapters who are not meeting academic standards. In FY16, work with the governing councils focused on providing resources and support to chapter officers in charge of organizations’ scholarship programs through semester roundtable meetings and individual chapter meetings, to further develop academic plans for students and whole chapters who may need additional assistance. Councils and staff also worked to collaborate with other University departments to provide resources and assistance to chapters and individual Greek affiliated students throughout the year such as the PACE center, Brilliant Bobcat sessions, and utilizing SLAC services, fully completing their action plan for FY16.**