**Administrative Outcomes & Methods Results 2014-2015**

**General Information**

**Academic Year:** 2014-2015

**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 FY15, 15% (N=91) of the 604 students who received services from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office responded to the satisfaction survey. In comparison, 10% (N=53) of the 530 students who received services responded in FY14, 5% (N=17) of students responded in FY13, 16% (N=43) of students responded in FY12, 7% (N=11) of students responded in FY11, and 7% (N=110) of students responded in FY10. The low amount of students (N=11) who responded to the survey in FY11 was due to a transition year for the Student Emergency Services area. The response rate increased by 5% from 10% (N=53) of students who responded in FY14 to 15% (N=91) in FY15. The response rate increased by 5% from 5% (N=17) of students who responded in FY13 to 10% (N=53) of students who responded in FY14. In the last two years, the response rate has increased by 10% from 5% (N=17) of students who responded in FY13 to 15% (N=91) in FY15. The increase in response rate demonstrates implementing the FY14 action plan to deliver the satisfaction survey within 10 business days has resulted in more feedback from more respondents than the last two years. In FY15, 97% (N=85) 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 93% (N=49) of students in FY14, which is a 4% increase. The percentage of respondents satisfied with services increased by 2% from 95% (N=16) of students in FY13 to 97% (N=85) of students in FY15. The percentage of respondents satisfied with services increased by 8% from 89% (N=38) of students in FY12 to 97% (N=85) of students in FY15. The percentage of respondents satisfied with services increased by 47% from 30% (N=3) of students in FY11 to 97% (N=85) of students in FY15. The percentage of respondents satisfied with services increased by 6% from 91% (N=100) of students in FY10 to 97% (N=85) of students in FY15. 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** |
| **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 FY15, 95% (N=503) of the students who received the absence notification service completed the semester when they obtained the assistance from Student Emergency Services in comparison to 88% (N=466) of students who completed the semester after receiving the assistance in FY14, which is a 7% increase. In 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 amount 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 Service and Completed the Semester** | | | |
| **YEAR** | **Fall** | **Spring** | **TOTAL** |
| **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 FY12 and 97% in FY15. The completion rate has been no lower than 86% in FY13 and as high as 95% in FY12 and FY15. These satisfaction rates and completion rates have remained consistently high (between 86% and 95%) for the past four years.**

**Outcomes 2:**

**Methods 1 and 2 for Outcomes 2 were new** in FY14 **making their results only comparable to one year of data. In method 1, 100% (N=6) of satisfaction survey respondents rated the semester as either a 5 “Very Satisfied” or 4 “Satisfied” in FY15. In comparison, 100% (N=6) of respondents rated the semester as a 4 “Good” in FY14. For method 2 in FY15, 100% (N=2) of the Student Leadership Board student leaders achieved a 4 “Above Average”rating in all three leadership skills categories. In comparison, none of the students achieved a 4 “Above average” rating in all leadership skills categories in FY14. These results indicate the Student Leadership Board student leaders remain completely satisfied with services and their leadership development is improving.**

**Outcomes 3:**

**Methods 1 and 2 for Outcomes 3 were new** in FY14 **making these FY15 results only comparable to one year of data. In FY15, the target of increasing the average GPA of Greek affiliated students from 2.56 to 2.65 was achieved in FY15 when the average GPA for Greek affiliated students was 2.70. The FY15 average GPA was a 0.03 increase from FY14 when the average GPA of Greek affiliated students was 2.67. In FY15, 77% (N=28) of Greek affiliated chapters achieved an average 2.50 GPA or above in comparison to 67% (N=21) of chapters who achieved the 2.50 GPA or higher in FY14, which is a 10% increase of chapters.**

**The results demonstrate the strategies used to improve academic performance for the Greek affiliated students, and consequently their chapters, are continuing to be effective. One effective strategy was the action plan to compile an academic resource manual, which Greek Affairs staff completed in fall 2014 and distributed to all chapters during spring 2015. Additionally, the results show the effectiveness of the Greek Affairs staff providing appropriate data to chapters in an effort to help identify members who may need more assistance or resources to improve academically.**

**Action Plan**

**The action plan for FY16 to improve the Dean of Students Office services includes the following:**

1. **Student Emergency Services staff will continue conducting benchmarking of comparable universities to enhance and look for more effective ways to inform professors about the absence notification service and their role in it by making contact with the other universities who provide the service to ask what methods are used to inform their professors about the service and how effective are the methods used to inform professors about the service. Results from benchmarking comparable universities will be gathered by May 2016.**
2. **The Student Leadership Board advisor will provide opportunities to organization officers to learn about their roles as student leaders to better understand the process of self-assessment so they can accurately reflect on their experiences by October 1, 2015.**
3. **The Student Leadership Board (SLB) advisors will revise the Method 2 for Outcome 2 to 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 (Member = 1, Volunteer/Contributor = 2, Coordinator = 3, Organization Veteran = 4, and Visionary = 5). This revised method will be completed no later than September 1, 2015.**
4. **The Student Leadership Board advisors will continue to further define the advisor’s role and share this information with the Student Leadership Board members. This information will be provided at the first meeting of the Student Leadership Board on October 1, 2015.**
5. **Greek Affairs staff will continue to provide strategies that proved effective in FY15 to help improve academic performance of Greek affiliated students and their chapters, such as providing resources to chapters, meeting with chapter presidents to discuss academic standards, and identifying students who may need more resources. These strategies will be continuous as student prepare for the start of, midterms and final exams during each long semester.**
6. **Greek Affairs staff will collaborate with 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 in order to present available opportunities will occur before December 1, 2015.**

**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 Student Emergency Services area provided absence notification services for 604 students in FY15. In comparison, the amount of students who received this service in FY14 was 530 students, 344 students in FY13, 271 students in FY12, 170 students in FY11 and 1,577 students in FY10 (the H1N1 crisis). An electronic satisfaction survey was e-mailed to the students who received the service within 10 business days throughout FY15. Paper surveys were not provided to students in FY15 like in FY14, FY13 and FY12 because most students are provided this service without an office visit making it more costly and less effective to provide paper surveys.**

**Overall, 15% (N=91) of the 604 students responded to the electronic satisfaction survey in FY15. In comparison, 10% (N=53) of the 530 students responded in FY14, 5% (N=17) of students responded in FY13, 16% (N=43) of students responded in FY12, 7% (N=11) of students responded in FY11, and 7% (N=110) of students responded in FY10. The low amount of students (N=11) who responded to the survey in FY11 was due to a transition year for the Student Emergency Services area. The response rate increased by 5% from 10% (N=53) of students who responded in FY14 to 15% (N=91) in FY15. The response rate increased by 5% from 5% (N=17) of students who responded in FY13 to 10% (N=53) of students who responded in FY14. In the last two years, the response rate has increased by 10% from 5% (N=17) of students who responded in FY13 to 15% (N=91) in FY15. These results indicate implementing the FY13 action plan to deliver the electronic satisfaction survey within 10 business days (instead of once per month) continues to be effective for the last two years.**

**The survey asked students to respond to the statement, “I was satisfied with the absence notification service provided to me.” using a four point Likert scale with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 4 being “Strongly Disagree.” Overall, 97% (N=85) of the 87 respondents either selected “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” to the statement indicating they were satisfied with the services. The target (50% of the survey respondents will be satisfied with the services received) was achieved with 97% (N=85) in FY15 and exceeded by 47%.**

**The satisfaction rate increased by 4% from 93% (N=49) of satisfied respondents in FY14 to 97% (N=85) of satisfied respondents in FY15. The percentage of respondents satisfied with services increased by 2% from 95% (N=16) in FY13 of satisfied respondents to 97% (N=85) of satisfied respondents in FY15. The percentage of respondents satisfied with services increased by 8% from 89% (N=38) of satisfied respondents in FY12 to 97% (N=85) of satisfied respondents in FY15. The percentage of respondents satisfied with services increased by 47% from 30% (N=3) of satisfied respondents in FY11 to 97% (N=85) of satisfied respondents in FY15. The percentage of respondents satisfied with services increased by 6% from 91% (N=100) of satisfied respondents in FY10 to 97% (N=85) of satisfied respondents in FY15. 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** |
| **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) |

**The action plan was partially achieved during FY15. By May 2015 Student Emergency Services staff revised other university web sites to find those institutions who provided the absence notifications service. The benchmarking to look for more effective ways to inform Texas State University professors about this service will continue into FY16 by making contact with the other universities who provide the service to ask what methods are used to inform their professors about the service and how effective are the methods used to inform professors about the service.**

**Student Emergency Services staff learned from respondents’ comments on the survey that most students felt the service was efficient and still more information about the absence notification service needs to be provided to the community, especially professors. Most comments were about to the service being efficient but a few students indicated the service did not help because their professors did not provide assistance when the absence notification was sent to them. In FY15, Student Emergency Services staff will continue to conduct benchmarking of comparable universities to find effective ways to inform professors about the absence notification service and their role in it.**

**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 three years. A review of transcripts was conducted after grades posted each semester during FY15 for students who received the absence notification service from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office. This transcript reviews from each semester were averaged to show 95% (N=503) of the students completed the semester during FY15. In comparison, 88% (N=466) of students completed the semester in FY14, 86% (N=305) of the students completed the semester in in FY13 and 95% (N=263) of the students completed the semester 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** |
| **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 95% (N=503) in FY15 and exceeded by 45%. 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 action plan was partially achieved during FY15. By May 2015 Student Emergency Services staff revised other university web sites to find those institutions who provided the absence notifications service. The benchmarking to look for more effective ways to inform Texas State University professors about this service will continue into FY15 by making contact with the other universities who provide the service to ask what methods are used to inform their professors about the service and how effective are the methods used to inform professors about the service. This means that it will be important in FY16 to determine the most effective method(s) to inform the university community about this service.**

**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**

**This method was new in FY14 making these results comparable for only one year. A paper survey was administered to the officers of the Student Leadership Board (SLB). The survey was created in February 2014 and administered during the first week in April 2015. The survey was administered to 12 students and there were 6 respondents (50% response rate). In comparison, 12 students were given the survey with a 50% (N=6) response rate in FY14.**

**The survey asked students to respond to questions using a five point Likert scale with 5 being “Very Satisfied,” 3 being “N/A” and 1 being “Not satisfied.” 100% (N=6) of respondents rated the semester as either a 5 “Very Satisfied” or 4 “Satisfied.” In comparison, 100% (N=6) of respondents rated the semester as a 4 “Good” in FY14. The target (70% of the survey respondents will be satisfied with the services) was achieved by the 100% (N=6) of respondents reporting satisfaction and exceeded by 30%.**

**Student Leadership Board advisors learned from respondents’ comments that the organization needs more oversight to ensure goals are met and better communication with the Leadership Institute in order to empower the SLB to plan for their events. The responses also revealed that students would like to see additional partnerships with other organizations and more notice for events.**

**The action plan to revise the Student Leadership Board satisfaction survey in order to collect comprehensive results was completed and the survey was distributed in early April 2015.**

**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 and will report the observations of each on a rubric at the end of each semester. The rubric will rate six leadership skill categories including Ethics/Integrity, Excellence, Social Responsibility, Inclusivity, Civic Engagement and Empowerment on a scale of 1 to 4 with 4 being the best. At least 70% of the SLB student leaders will achieve a 4 in all six categories to demonstrate a better understanding of their own leadership style from the fall semester to the spring semester.**

**Outcome 2 - Method 2 Results**

**This method was implemented in FY14 so results are only comparable for one year. A leadership rubric was developed and administered to the Student Leadership Board (SLB) executive officers in April 2014. The rubric assessed the leadership development of the students by observing and measuring their growth in the areas of the Leadership Institute’s six core values: Ethics/Integrity, Excellence, Social Responsibility, Inclusivity, Civic Engagement, and Empowerment. The rubric used ratings from 1 to 4 with 1 being “Emerging,” 2 being “Development,” 3 being “Average” and 4 being “Above Average.” The assessment was not administered during fall 2013 because SLB was being restructured. When the new SLB officers were selected in January 2014, they were notified of the leadership rubric and were scheduled to meet with the advisor at the end of April. Two students were assessed using the rubric.**

**In June 2014, the leadership rubric was replaced with a new model based on Carstens Matrix of Student Employment, which completed the action plan to revise the rubric in order to provide immediate feedback to the students. The new rubric included three areas: nuts and bolts, people and places, and personal skills. These areas were rated using the following five level scale: Member = 1, Volunteer/Contributor = 2, Coordinator = 3, Organization Veteran = 4, and Visionary = 5.**

**The two SLB officers were given the rubric one week prior to their meeting with the advisor. 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. Specifically they are able to share their leadership responsibilities, hold themselves accountable, and encourage ownership and participation in the organizations. The SLB only had two officers at the time of conducting this assessment. By the end of the spring semester both students had achieved a 4 in all three categories (100%). The two students assessed averaged a 2 point increase between their fall average assessment score and their spring average assessment score. The target of 70% of the SLB student leaders will achieve a 4 in all three categories was met by 100% (N=2) and exceeded by 30% because both of the students achieved a 4 in all categories. In comparison, none of the students achieved a 4 in all categories in FY14.**

**Furthermore, they can make connections to the vision and mission of the Leadership Institute, move ideas to action, and can set aside personal agendas for the betterment of the group. We learned that we need to work earlier to instill confidence in our students so that they begin the year comfortable with their roles. We also learned that we need to work with students to better understand the process of self-assessment so they can accurately reflect on their experiences.**

**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 FY15. Data for each student was utilized to calculate averages for each of the 36 organizations advised by staff in both long semesters. In FY15, the assessment averaged data from a total of 2,498 students (934 male and 1,564 female) in 36 organizations for Fall 2014. In Spring of 2015, a total of 2,388 students (900 male and 1,488 female) in 36 organizations were assessed. In comparison, in FY14 2,279 students (849 males and 1,430 female) from 34 organizations for Fall 2013 and 2,299 students (891 male and 1408 female) from 36 organizations for Spring 2014 were assessed.**

**This method was new in FY14 making these FY15 results only comparable to one year of data. In FY15, the target to increase the average GPA of Greek affiliated students from 2.56 to 2.65 was exceeded each semester. For Fall 2014 the average GPA of Greek affiliated students was 2.66, exceeding the target by 0.01. In Spring 2015 the average GPA was 2.73, which was a 0.08 increase above the target. For FY15, the average GPA for Greek affiliated students was 2.70, which exceeded the target by 0.05 and a 0.03 increase from FY14. In comparison, for 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 at 2.60 in Fall 2013 and at 2.75 in Spring 2014.**

**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. Further, staff met with chapter presidents providing guidance on assisting members who are not meeting organizational academic standards.**

**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 FY15. Data for each student was utilized to calculate averages for each of the 36 organizations advised by staff in both long semesters. In FY15, the assessment averaged data from a total of 2,498 students (934 male and 1,564 female) in 36 organizations for Fall 2014. In Spring of 2015, a total of 2,388 students (900 male and 1,488 female) in 36 organizations were assessed. In comparison, in FY14 2,279 students (849 males and 1,430 female) from 34 organizations for Fall 2013 and 2,299 students (891 male and 1408 female) from 36 organizations for Spring 2014 were assessed.**

**This method was new in FY14 making these FY15 results only comparable to one year of data. In FY15, 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 FY15, 77% (N=28) of chapters achieved an average 2.50 GPA or above in comparison to 67% (N=21) of chapters who achieved the 2.50 GPA or higher in FY14, which is a 10% increase of chapters. 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) 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 amount 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** | **Spring** | **Total** |
| **FY15** | **64% (N=23)** | **89% (N=32)** | **77% (N=28)** |
| **FY14** | **56% (N=19)** | **67% (N=24)** | **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. 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 staff compiled an academic resource manual, fully completing their action plan for FY15. The manual was distributed to all chapters during the second long semester.**