The satisfaction of services received increased from fall 2009 to spring 2010 despite the return rate decreasing by one percent (1%) from twenty-and, therefore, exceeded the target by forty-two percent (42%) during spring 2010.

The target of fifty percent (50%) of the survey respondents being satisfied with the services received was achieved with ninety-two percent (92%) were satisfied with the helpfulness of the services they received. Eighty-four percent (84%) indicated the assistance helped them academically.

Responded to the electronic survey resulting in a twenty percent (20%) return rate. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the respondents indicated they were satisfied with the helpfulness of the services received and will be able to demonstrate knowledge of the appropriate resources that may assist their success at the university in the future. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the respondents indicated the assistance helped them academically.

Evidence of Improvement

Overall, this year was the baseline year for most assessments. The only assessment that was the same from last year to this year was the Student Justice satisfaction survey. The Student Justice satisfaction survey indicated improvement by gaining more student feedback from a larger amount of returned surveys this year, which provided results that indicated students are more satisfied with the Student Justice and discipline process based on the percentage increase of higher ratings used since last year and the percentage decrease of lower ratings used since last year. While this year’s results are similar to last year’s results, the results this year indicate three improvements. The amount of completed surveys returned increased from 20 last year to 120 this year. The percentage of students who rated all questions at the lowest level decreased from five percent (5%) in 2009 to less than one percent (1%) in 2010. Finally, the percentage of students who rated all questions at the highest marks increased from twenty percent (20%) in 2009 to twenty-three percent (23%) in 2010.

The satisfaction of Emergency Services increased by two percent (2%) from fall 2009 to spring 2010 despite the satisfaction survey return rate decreasing by one percent (1%). Satisfaction was ninety percent (90%) in fall 2010 and ninety-two percent (92%) in spring 2010. In fall 2009 the return rate was twenty-one percent (21%) and the return rate in spring 2010 was twenty percent (20%).

The amount of the Emergency Services survey respondents who identified a resource to assist them during future emergency situations increased by eighteen percent (18%) from fall 2009 to spring 2010. Twenty-four percent (24%) of respondents indicated a resource in fall 2009 while forty-two percent (42%) indicated a resource in spring 2010.

The ASG student leader observations results from fall 2009 to spring 2010 indicated that one of the two student leaders, which is fifty percent (50%), at the ORGANIZATIONAL VETERAN level developed to the VISIONARY level (i.e. the highest level). The SF student leader observations results from fall 2009 to spring 2010 indicated that one of the two student leaders, which is fifty percent (50%), at the ORGANIZATIONAL VETERAN level developed to the VISIONARY level (i.e. the highest level).

Outcome 1

Students who utilize the Dean of Students Office Emergency Services are satisfied with services received and will be able to demonstrate knowledge of the appropriate resources that may assist their success at the university in the future.

Outcome 1 - Method 1

Students who received the Dean of Students Office Emergency Services during the fall and spring semesters will be sent an electronic satisfaction survey within 45 days after receiving services. The satisfaction survey will rate how helpful the services were and whether the services impacted their academic progress at the university. Fifty percent (50%) of the survey respondents will be satisfied with the services received.

Outcome 1 - Method 1 - Result

During fall 2009 Emergency Services was utilized by 1,449 students for approximately 7,000 absence notifications to faculty and 306 students responded to the electronic survey resulting in a twenty-one percent (21%) return rate. Ninety percent (90%) of the respondents indicated they were satisfied with the helpfulness of the services received. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the respondents indicated the assistance helped them academically. The target of fifty percent (50%) of the survey respondents being satisfied with the services received was achieved by ninety percent (90%) and, therefore, exceeded the target by forty percent (40%) during fall 2009. The number of students who requested services in fall 2009 was unusually high due to the H1N1 pandemic.

During spring 2010 Emergency Services was utilized by 128 students for approximately 500 absence notification to faculty and 25 students responded to the electronic survey resulting in a twenty percent (20%) return rate. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the respondents indicated they were satisfied with the helpfulness of the services they received. Eighty-four percent (84%) indicated the assistance helped them academically. The target of fifty percent (50%) of the survey respondents being satisfied with the services received was achieved with ninety-two percent (92%) and, therefore, exceeded the target by forty-two percent (42%) during spring 2010.

The satisfaction of services received increased from fall 2009 to spring 2010 despite the return rate decreasing by one percent (1%) from twenty-
one percent (21%) in fall 2009 to twenty percent (20%) in spring 2010. Satisfaction increased by two percent (2%) from ninety percent (90%) to ninety-two percent (92%). Also, the respondents who rated the services helped them academically decreased by four percent (4%) from eighty-eight percent (88%) in fall 2009 to eighty-four percent (84%) in spring 2010. Due to technological challenges, the electronic survey was sent at the end of fall 2009 and spring 2010 instead of within 45 days after students received, which may have attributed to receiving a low return rate. These results do not include indicators for possible further improvements in the service, so more assessment is needed to indicate areas where improvements in the service may be made. The assessment of this service needs to be improved by conducting the assessment in a timelier manner to gain more feedback from students and by gathering more qualitative data from students to determine areas where other improvements may be made.

### Outcome 1 - Method 2

Students who received the Dean of Students Office Emergency Services during the fall and spring semesters will be sent an electronic satisfaction survey within 45 days after receiving services. The satisfaction survey will include an open ended question asking students to record at least 1 resource that may assist during emergency situations in the future. Twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents will recall one (1) resource.

### Outcome 1 - Method 2 - Result

Twenty-four percent (24%) of the 306 students who responded to the electronic survey in fall 2009 identified a resource to assist them during emergency situations in the future. The target of twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents who recall one resource was not achieved by only one percent (1%). This may be attributed to two factors including a technical problem and the clarity of the question. Several comments about the open-ended question indicated an error occurred and students either were not allowed to see the question or to respond to the question. The students who were able to see the question and respond provided answers indicating the question was not stated in a manner that students understood what was being asked.

Forty-two percent (42%) of the 19 students who responded to the electronic survey in spring 2010 identified a resource to assist them during emergency situations in the future. The target of twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents who recall one resource was achieved by forty-two percent (42%) and, therefore, exceeded the target by seventeen percent (17%).

The amount of respondents who identified a resource to assist them during emergency situations in the future increased by eighteen percent (18%) from fall 2009 to spring 2010. Twenty-four percent (24%) of respondents indicated a resource in fall 2009 while forty-two percent (42%) indicated a resource in spring 2010. This increase may be partly attributed to fixing the technical problems for this open-ended question on the electronic survey as well as revising the open-ended question to better clarify between fall 2009 and spring 2010. These results indicate improvements may be made in educating students about the resources that could assist them during emergency situations.

### Outcome 1 - Action Plan

In order to increase the return rate and receive more feedback about services, an update to the current electronic database system will be integrated for fall 2010 satisfaction surveys to be sent electronically no later than 15 class days after a student receives services. In order to gain more detailed student feedback, focus group assessment will be conducted between February 15-28, 2011. The Student Affairs Assessment Team is a resource that may be used to help facilitate the focus group assessment.

### Outcome 2

Student leaders, such as executive officers and committee chairs, in organizations advised by Dean of Students Office staff are satisfied with advising services received and are able to 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 - Result

Ten electronic satisfaction surveys were sent to Associated Student Government (ASG) on April 26, 2010 and four completed surveys were returned, which is a 40% return rate. Four paper satisfaction surveys were distributed to Student Foundation (SF) during the week of May 6, 2010 and four completed surveys were returned, which is a 100% return rate. The difference in return rates between ASG and SF may be attributed to that paper surveys distributed in person to SF instead of the electronic surveys distributed by e-mail to ASG.

The ASG satisfaction target of fifty percent (50%) was achieved with an overall ninety-five (95%) satisfaction and, therefore, exceeded the target by forty-five percent (45%). No ASG respondent indicated dissatisfaction with any item on the survey. The ASG respondents agreed that Dean of Students staff were available and accessible to provide knowledgeable advice. Three of the four ASG respondents agreed that they were provided satisfactory administrative support. The fourth ASG respondent was neutral about receiving satisfactory administrative support. Comments reflected that ASG respondents believe Dean of Students staff supports student leaders’ decisions, ideas, and development. However, one comment indicated that more support is needed in the forms of allowing twenty-four hour access to the ASG Office and red restricted or reserved parking. ASG respondents commented that they liked the ASG Officer training provided by the Dean of Students staff. The ASG responses indicated overall student leader satisfaction of advising by Dean of Students staff.

The SF satisfaction target of fifty percent (50%) was achieved with an overall eight-five percent (85%) satisfaction and, therefore, exceeded the
The SF action plan includes the following.

· Feedback, 10 class days before the end of the semester, which will be two weeks before final exams, in order to achieve a better return rate for more student

· Dean of Students staff will distribute the ASG electronic satisfaction survey using the same existing resources during the earlier time frame of 10 class days before the end of the semester resulting in a low return rate for ASG and lack of thorough comments for SF.

These results indicate possible improvement in conducting the assessment at a better time to gain more qualitative data. The results also indicated possible improvements in student leadership training and development.

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 at least three areas of leadership (communication skills, mentoring, negotiating, instructing, supervising, persuading, taking instructions, organizational management, emotional/spiritual development, human awareness, serving, intellectual skills, vocational skills, and personal life management) 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.

Outcome 2 - Method 2 - Result

The rubric used illustrate students move through levels of leadership proficiency from the beginning stage called MEMBER through the stages called VOLUNTEER COORDINATOR, COORDINATOR, and ORGANIZATION VETERAN to the most effective level of leadership called VISIONARY. Students move through these levels of leadership proficiency by mastering leadership skills in all three areas of leadership called “Nuts & Bolts,” “People & Places,” and “Personal Skills.” During fall 2009 four student leaders from Associated Student Government (ASG) and four student leaders from Student Foundation (SF) were observed. During spring 2010 the same four from ASG and from SF were observed to determine development of leadership skills in those observed.

The fall 2009 ASG student leader observations resulted in the demonstration of leadership skills at the ORGANIZATIONAL VETERAN level for two of the four and at the VISIONARY level (i.e. the highest level) for the other two of the four. The spring 2010 ASG student leader observations resulted in the demonstration of leadership skills at the ORGANIZATIONAL VETERAN level for one of the four and at the VISIONARY level (i.e. the highest level) for three of the four. Results for ASG from fall 2009 to spring 2010 indicated that one of the two, which is fifty percent (50%), at the ORGANIZATIONAL VETERAN level developed to the VISIONARY level (i.e. the highest level).

The fall 2009 SF student leader observations resulted in the demonstration of leadership skills at the ORGANIZATIONAL VETERAN level for two of the four and at the VISIONARY level (i.e. the highest level) for the other two of the four. The spring 2010 SF student leader observations resulted in the demonstration of leadership skills at the ORGANIZATIONAL VETERAN level for one of the four and at the VISIONARY level (i.e. the highest level) for three of the four. Results for SF from fall 2009 to spring 2010 indicated that one of the two, which is fifty percent (50%), at the ORGANIZATIONAL VETERAN level developed to the VISIONARY level (i.e. the highest level).

Both ASG and SF student leader observations achieved the target of fifty percent (50%) of student leaders evaluated will demonstrate development through at least one of the growth stages with exactly the fifty percent (50%).

These results indicate that students in both ASG and SF begin in these student organizations with the leadership skills at the higher levels of leadership proficiency so training must begin with developing the skills in these higher levels of leadership proficiency in order for all students to master all leadership skills that will move them to the highest level of leadership proficiency.

Outcome 2 - Action Plan

The ASG action plan includes the following:

· The Dean of Students, ASG President and Vice-President will work together in summer 2010 to create an agenda for an early fall 2010 ASG Officer Orientation.

· The ASG Advisors will discuss the administrative support feedback (e.g. 24-hour access to the ASG Office, red restricted parking permits) in summer 2010 to determine feasibility of implementation in the future.

· One ASG student leader will attend the Washington Center’s Inside Washington academic seminar for one week between January 2, 2011 and January 15, 2011.

· ASG members will attend the Texas State Leadership Institute Conference during the spring 2011 semester.

· Dean of Students staff will distribute the ASG electronic satisfaction survey using the same existing resources during the earlier time frame of 10 class days before the end of the semester, which will be two weeks before final exams, in order to achieve a better return rate for more student feedback.

The SF action plan includes the following:

· Dean of Students staff will host a SF officer transition meeting in May 2010.

· Dean of Students staff will host a SF officer and co-chair leadership training retreat in summer 2010.

· SF will implement a Leadership Team, consisting of executive board members and committee chairs in summer 2010.

· SF will implement the Texas State Leadership Institute Conference during the spring 2011 semester.

· SF will implement a monthly leadership development program in fall 2010 and spring 2011.

· SF will implement all committees have co-chairs instead of one chair in fall 2010 and spring 2011.

· Dean of Students staff will distribute the SF electronic satisfaction survey using the same existing resources during the earlier time frame of 10
class days before the end of the semester, which will be two weeks before final exams, in order to achieve a better return rate for more student feedback.

In order to achieve comparable return rates and student feedback, both ASG and SF surveys will be distributed consistently by each of them sent electronically during the same time frame.

The resources available to complete the action plan are the ASG and SF student organization leaders, Dean of Students staff and other campus resources such as meeting rooms, speakers, etc.

Outcome 3

Students who utilize the services offered through the Student Justice process are satisfied with services received and demonstrate their knowledge of behaviors the university considers inappropriate and the consequences of engaging in unacceptable conduct.

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.Fifty percent (50%) of survey respondents will be satisfied with services received.

Outcome 3 - Method 1 - Result

The Student Justice paper satisfaction surveys were distributed to students adjudicated in spring 2010 for Code of Student Conduct violations, excluding students who were suspended or expelled. Approximately 141 surveys were distributed and 120 were returned, which is an eight-five percent (85%) return rate. The paper satisfaction surveys were distributed in spring 2010 instead of during both fall 2009 and spring 2010. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of respondents indicated an overall average survey rating of satisfaction as compared to thirteen percent (13%) of respondents who indicated an overall average survey rating of dissatisfaction. While thirteen percent (13%) of respondents indicated an overall average survey rating of dissatisfaction, the overall average question rating equaled a rating of satisfaction for each question. The target of fifty percent (50%) of survey respondents being satisfied with services received was achieved by eighty-seven percent (87%) and, therefore, exceeded by thirty-seven percent (37%). Also, the satisfaction survey indicates that some respondents believe they are learning during the discipline process. One question indicated that the discipline process and Student Justice experience will positively influence future choices concerning student behavior for eleven percent (11%) of respondents. Another question indicated that the discipline process and Student Justice experience has had a positive impact on the values and attitudes for sixteen percent (16%) of respondents.

While this year’s results are similar to last year’s results, the results this year indicate three improvements. The amount of completed surveys returned increased from 20 last year to 120 this year. The percentage of students who rated all questions at the lowest level decreased from five percent (5%) in 2009 to less than one percent (1%) in 2010. Finally, the percentage of students who rated all questions at the highest marks increased from twenty percent (20%) in 2009 to twenty-three percent (23%) in 2010.

The survey items ranked lowest were about the timeliness of the Student Justice discipline process, so possible improvement may be made in quicker contact with students requesting they make appointments.

Outcome 3 - Method 2

As a part of the Student Justice process adjudication phase during the fall and spring semesters, students found responsible for violating university drug policy will be required to write a reflective essay. The reflective essay will be based on a rubric that will evaluate the students’ understanding of inappropriate behavior, personal responsibility, and campus safety. Twenty-five percent (25%) of students returning their essay will demonstrate understanding through one of the growth stages moving from AWARENESS toward APPLICATION on the rubric.

Outcome 3 - Method 2 - Result

The rubric used illustrates students may be at one of three levels of understanding, which are the lowest level of understanding called AWARENESS, the middle level of understanding called APPRECIATION, and the highest level of understanding called APPLICATION. Students’ understanding of each area of inappropriate behavior, personal responsibility and campus safety are measured by what information is provided in the students’ written essay. Therefore, students may be at different levels of understanding for each area being measured.

Sixty (60) students who were found responsible for violating university drug policy in 2009-2010 were offered to complete the essay in lieu of community service on April 1, 2010. Nineteen (19) of the 60 students completed the essay, which is a thirty-one percent (31%) return rate. Some students were given the opportunity in spring 2010 to write the essay as an option to completing part of their community service sanction instead of requiring it as a sanction in fall 2009 and spring 2010.

Eighty-four percent (84%) of the essays submitted indicated students demonstrated an overall minimum understanding of AWARENESS based on receiving the score of six points out of nine possible points. Only one of the eighty-four percent (84%) of essays scored a minimal six points while the other essays scored seven to nine points, which indicates 93% of the students who demonstrated an overall minimum understanding of AWARENESS also demonstrated a higher level of understanding between APPRECIATION and APPLICATION. Two of the three essays that did not score the minimum six points scored a four points out of nine points and the other essay scored no points. The essay that did not score any points may be attributed to the student not reading the instructions for writing the essay. The target of twenty-five percent (25%) of students returning their essay will demonstrate understanding through one of the growth stages moving from AWARENESS toward APPLICATION was
achieved by eighty-four percent (84%) and, therefore, exceeded the target by thirty-four percent (34%). The results indicated that a better grading system may be a possible improvement because no detailed results were provided illustrating the understanding levels for each area. More detailed results could provide areas where more education may be needed for students.

### Outcome 3 - Action Plan

In order to have more student feedback about the Student Justice and discipline process, the Student Justice satisfaction survey will be distributed during both fall 2010 and spring 2011 as well as be considered for distribution to all students adjudicated for Code of Student Conduct violations, including students who were suspended or expelled, during 2010-2011. The items ranked lowest continue to revolve around the timeliness of the judicial process, therefore, that will be the targeted improvement. Adoption of e-mail communication as an official mode of notification to students is being proposed as a modification to the Code of Student Conduct. If changes are approved over summer 2010, use of e-mail as a primary mode of communication will be adopted in fall 2010.

In order to better gain insight on students learning demonstrated in the essay, a more specific scoring by item will be used to analyze results in 2010-2011. Student Justice will implement utilizing the reflective essay as an alternative sanction for students found responsible for violating university policies in addition to the drug policy, as stated in the original outcome, starting summer 2010.

The resources that are available to complete the action plan include e-mail to increase timeliness in the Student Justice discipline process as well as the current instructions for the essay to distribute to more students and the current rubric to expand more specifics of scoring the essays.
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