# Evidence of Improvement

# Outcome 1:

# Method 1 of Outcome 1 was new in fall 2016 and this was the second year of results. In fall 2017, the Method 1 target of at least 50% of survey respondents will report that the emergency funding helped them complete the semester was achieved. The target was achieved with 96% (N=25) of respondents who indicated they either “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed.” In comparison, 92% (N=11) of survey respondents reported they either “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” that the funds helped them to complete the semester in fall 2016. This represents a 4% increase of students who reported the funding helped them complete the semester from 92% (N=11) of students in fall 2016 to 96% (N=25) of students in fall 2017.

Method 2 of Outcome 1 was new in fall 2016 and this was the second year of results. The target of Method 2 is that at least 50% of students will complete the semester they received emergency funding. In fall 2017, the target was achieved and exceeded with 91% (N=92) of students. The fall 2017 results are comparable to the fall 2016 results. In fall 2016, 96% (N=27) of students completed the semester. The results indicate a 5% decrease of students who completed the semester from fall 2016 to fall 2017. The decrease may be attributed to the students who may have discontinued the fall 2017 semester to return to their homes in the Houston metropolitan area in order to help their families recover from severe damage caused by Hurricane Harvey.

# Outcome 2:

In FY18, the Method 1 target of at least 70% of survey respondents being satisfied with the advising services was achieved and exceeded with 95% (N=18) of respondents indicating satisfaction with advising. The results are comparable to the previous three years when satisfaction was 100% (N=7) in FY17, 100% (N=16­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­­) in FY16 and 100% (N=6) in FY15. This outcome has been consistently met and achieved so it will be removed in a future assessment cycle.

In FY18, the Method 2 target of at least 70% of student leaders observed will achieve growth of their leadership skills by mastering all three areas of one level and progressing to the next level from the fall semester to the spring semester was achieved. The one officer who remained to be observed for the 2017-2018 academic year progressed from the Coordinator leadership skill level to the higher leadership skill level of Organization Veteran. In comparison, the target has been achieved in the previous two years with the student leaders who are observing progressing to the next leadership skill level by observing only one to two officers due to staffing shortages and officer departures during the assessment cycle.

# Outcome 3:

In FY18, the Method 1 target average GPA of 2.75 for the students who are members of Greek-affiliated chapters advised by Greek Affairs staff was met and exceeded with a 2.87 average GPA. The 2.87 average GPA in FY18 was a significant increase from the 2.64 average GPA in FY17 and from the 2.69 average GPA in FY16. Revised in FY16, the Method 1 target was raised from 2.65 to 2.75 following several years of improved average GPAs among Greek members.

The Method 2 target of ­­­­65% of chapters achieving an average chapter GPA of 2.50 or higher for the fall semester was achieved in FY18 with 87% (N=27) of chapters. The results show an increase from the FY17 result of 63% (N=22) of chapters achieving an overall chapter average GPA of 2.50 or above. This is compared to 73% (N=27) of chapters in FY16, 64% (N=23) of chapters in FY15 and 56% (N=19) of chapters in FY14.

**Action Plan**

# The action plan for FY19 to improve the Dean of Students Office services includes the following:

# Outcome 1:

# Student Emergency Services staff will review records of students who did not complete the semester to confirm if the suspected cause of non-completion in fall 2017 was due to Hurricane Harvey or due to other factors. This will be completed by September 1, 2018.

# Student Emergency Services staff will determine methods to increase survey response rates by September 1, 2018.

# Outcome 2:

1. Leadership Institute staff members will create officer position specific training tools by September 1, 2018.
2. Leadership Institute staff members will work with Student Leadership Board members to create a marketing plan by October 1, 2018 for the Student Leadership Board organization.
3. Leadership Institute staff members will create a mid-year orientation training agenda for students who join the Student Leadership Board in the spring semester. This training agenda will be created by November 1, 2018.

# Outcome 3:

1. Greek Affairs staff will continue to provide new strategies to help improve academic performance of Greek-affiliated students and overall chapter academic performance. Strategies will include staff providing resources to chapters and governing councils; meeting with chapter presidents to discuss academic standards; increasing incentives for chapters that improve academic performance; providing assessments or tools to chapter executive officers that identify students who may need more academic resources; and collaborating with university departments to provide Greek-affiliated students with opportunities to engage in existing academic support services. Initial strategies from collaborations with governing councils and departments will be developed by November 1, 2018, but collaborations will continue throughout the year.
2. Greek Affairs staff will collaborate with other university departments to develop new strategies to identify Greek members who may need additional academic support earlier in the academic year. Greek staff will also track academic progress of Greek-affiliated students more frequently. Initial strategies from collaborations with governing councils and departments will be developed by November 1, 2018, but collaborations will continue throughout the year.

**Outcome 1 Student Emergency Services**

**At least 50% of students who obtain assistance from Student Emergency Services in the Dean of Students Office will achieve academic persistence as indicated by the completion of the semester they received the services.**

#  Outcome 1 - Method 1

**Students who receive funding assistance from Student Emergency Services (SES) in the Dean of Students Office during the fall semester each year will be sent an electronic survey at the end of the semester. in which they receive SES assistance. At least 50% of the students who respond to the survey will report that emergency funding helped them to complete the semester that they received the services.**

#  Outcome 1 - Method 1 - Result

# Method 1 of Outcome 1 was new in fall 2016 and this was the second year of results. At the end of the fall 2017 semester 101 students were sent an electronic satisfaction survey. The electronic survey was completed by 20% (N=26) of students who received it. In fall 2017, the target of at least 50% of survey respondents will report that the emergency funding helped them complete the semester was achieved with 96% (N=25) of respondents who indicated this. The target was exceeded by 46% more survey respondents who reported that the funding helped them complete the semester.

# In comparison, 92% (N=11) of survey respondents reported they either “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” that the funds helped them to complete the semester in fall 2016. This represents a 4% increase of students who reported the funding helped them complete the semester from 92% (N=11) of students in fall 2016 to 96% (N=25) of students in fall 2017.

 **Outcome 1 - Method 2**

**Within 15 business days after grades are posted at the end of the fall semester each year, student transcripts will be reviewed for students who received emergency funding 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 emergency funding.**

#  Outcome 1 - Method 2 - Result

# A total of 101 students received funding assistance in the fall 2017 semester. Transcripts showed the target of at least 50% of students will complete the semester in which they receive emergency funding was achieved in fall 2017 with 91% (N=92) of students who completed the semester they received funding. The target was exceeded by 41% more students completing the semester. Transcripts showed that 96% (N=27) of students who obtained the service completed the fall 2016, which exceeded the target by 46% of students.

# In comparison, the percentage of students who completed the semester they received emergency funding decreased by 5% of students from the fall 2016 semester when 96% (N=27) of students completed the semester to the fall 2017 semester when 91% (N=92) of students completed the semester. The reason for this decrease might be attributable to the fact that there was massive flooding within the Houston metropolitan area and students who were from the affected areas may have made the decision to discontinue the semester to return home with the intention of returning to the university again in the spring 2018 semester.

# The Student Emergency Services staff learned that the emergency funding service is helpful for students in achieving academic persistence.

**Outcome 2 Leadership Institute**

**The Dean of Students Office advising services provided to the Student Leadership Board will be effective, as indicated by at least 70% of student leaders, such as executive officers and committee chairs, reporting satisfaction with advising services received.**

#  Outcome 2 - Method 1

**All student leaders of the Student Leadership Board will be given surveys 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 - Result

This method was implemented in FY15, making these results comparable for four years. While according to the method, a survey was to be administered to the officers of the Student Leadership Board during the first week of April, but it was not distributed at that time. Instead, the office has been transitioning to utilizing Qualtrics for all evaluations for its ease of collection and analysis of data. After a Qualtrics survey was created, it was provided to all attendees at the last meeting in late April and the membership was allotted time in the meeting to complete the survey. This manner of survey distribution resulted in a 100% (N=19) response rate. We would like to continue this process in the next academic year and will provide time during a meeting to complete an electronic survey via Qualtrics.

Unfortunately, with the transition to the new system, the language for satisfaction with advising services was not maintained in the new survey, and instead utilized a seven-point Likert scale. Instead of a scale of satisfaction, the evaluation used the following scale rating advising services: 1 – Extremely helpful, 2 – Moderately helpful, 3 – Slightly helpful, 4 – Neither helpful nor unhelpful, 5 – Slightly unhelpful, 6 – Moderately unhelpful, and 7 – Extremely unhelpful. The change in survey language over the last four years with the corresponding survey results are indicated in the table below.

|  |
| --- |
| Satisfaction and Response Rates from Survey |
| Year | Response | Satisfaction |
| 2017-2018 FY18 | 100% (N=19) | 95% (N=18) (74% Extremely Helpful) |
| 2016-2017 FY17 | 58% (N=7) | 100% (N=7)(57% Very Satisfied) |
| 2015-2016 FY16 | 94% (N=16) | 100% (N=16)(81% Very Good) |
| 2014-2015 FY15 | 50% (N=6) | 100% (N=6)(17% Very Good) |

In FY18, the target of at least 70% of respondents being satisfied with advising was achieved and exceeded with 95% (N=18) of respondents finding advising helpful or extremely helpful. Out of the 95% (N=18) of respondents who indicated satisfaction with advising, 74% (N=14) of respondents reported advising was extremely helpful. The FY18 results are significantly up from last year’s data that indicated 51% (N=4) of respondents reported being very satisfied with advising. This is the first year that the survey was distributed to the entire membership at a meeting and the reason we had a 100% (N=19) of students who completed the survey.

Staff intends to be more intentional in providing advising to the members of the Student Leadership Board, orientating them to their positions, and will be sure to include an orientation for those who join the team mid-year as several officers did in spring 2018. Other areas of focus include marketing of the organization and developing the brand of the Student Leadership Board.

 **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 Carsten’s 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 being Member = 1, Volunteer/Contributor = 2, Coordinator = 3, Organization Veteran = 4, and the highest-level Visionary = 5. At least70% of student leaders observed will achieve growth of their leadership skills by mastering all three areas of one level and progressing to the next level from the fall semester to the spring semester.**

# Outcome 2 - Method 2 - Result

Beginning in Fall 2014, the Student Leadership Board (SLB) 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 three academic years providing two years of comparable data.

The SLB advisors assess 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. As with the previous academic year, the Student Leadership Board experienced a change in leadership that impacted the 2017-2018 academic year. While the Executive Director remained in their position for the entirety of the two semesters, the Co-Executive Director had to resign her position in January 2017, and a new Co-Executive Director was installed in February 2018. Unfortunately, this did not allow us to track growth for more than one individual, as the new officer was not observed during the fall 2017 semester.

The executive officer who remained both semesters averaged at 3.17 for fall 2017, which would fall at the *Coordinator* level. During this assessment, the advisors and officers discussed goals and areas of improvement for the following semester. In Spring 2018, the executive officer averaged at 4.33, falling in the *Organization Veteran* level, and showing improvement by 1.16 levels and meeting the target.

Leadership development of the Student Leadership Board met the target in FY18 with the observed student leader mastering all three areas of one level and progressing to the next level within the academic year on the Carstens Matrix of Student Employment assessment.

The SLB officers were given the rubric for a personal assessment at least 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. The student was required to provide examples of how they met the levels for each area. Once all three areas of the rubric were reviewed, areas for further growth and development were discussed with the student. At the end of the meeting, an average rating based on the responses from the student and advisors were recorded.

The results indicate that the student experienced 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 this assessment 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. We found it helpful to have the student and the advisors to provide specific examples of instances that place them in each particular level to maintain consistency between the student and advisor’s assessment. We also anticipate better results with students who will be able to fulfill their officer duties throughout both the fall and spring semesters.

**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 semester each year, Greek Affairs staff will review the 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 the current average GPA of 2.65 to 2.75.**

#  Outcome 3 - Method 1 - Result

In FY18, the target to increase the average GPA of Greek affiliated students from 2.65 to 2.75 was achieved with a 2.87 average GPA. Results revealed that the all-Greek member average for the fall semester was 0.22 above the target level.

In comparison, the 2.65 target for the all-Greek member GPA was not reached in FY17 but was reached and exceeded in FY16, FY15 and FY14. FY17 results were 0.11 below the target while FY16 results demonstrated an increase of 0.04 in the fall above the target average GPA. FY15 results exceeded the target by 0.01 in the fall.

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 the fall semester in FY18. Data for each student was utilized to calculate averages for each of the organizations advised by staff in both long semesters.

Method 1 was established in FY14 and revised in FY17. Although the target of all Greek member GPA was revised in FY16, the results are comparable from year to year. Below is a table illustrating the average of the Greek affiliated students’ GPA and the number of students who are Greek affiliated for the fall semester each year since the implementation of this method.

|  |
| --- |
| Average Greek Affiliated Undergraduate Student GPA |
| YEAR | Fall | Number of Students |
| 2017-2018 (FY18) | 2.87 | 2,463 |
| 2016-2017 (FY17) | 2.64 | 2,880 |
| 2015-2016 (FY16) | 2.69 | 2,674 |
| 2014-2015 (FY15) | 2.66 | 2,498 |
| 2013-2014 (FY14) | 2.60 | 2,279 |

The results indicate the strategies used to improve academic performance are still effective. However, chapter officers may need additional guidance in utilizing the resources and assessment data provided. Greek Affairs staff provides appropriate data to chapters 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, the governing councils provide resources, support, and incentive to chapter officers in charge of each organization’s scholarship program through semester roundtable meetings and individual chapter meetings. 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. For FY19, Greek Affairs staff will continue to work with other university departments to develop strategies for gaining additional data and to assist chapter officers in utilizing assessment data to revise chapter scholarship programs.

 **Outcome 3 - Method 2**

**After grades are posted at the end of the fall semester each year, 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 the current chapter average of 2.50 GPA will increase from 56% of chapters to 65% of chapters.**

#  Outcome 3 - Method 2 - Result

In FY18, the target to increase the percentage of chapters who achieved an overall chapter average GPA of 2.50 or higher from 56% of chapters to 65% of chapters was met. In FY18, the fall semester percentage of chapters that achieved an overall chapter average GPA of 2.50 or higher was 87% (N=27).

Method 2 was established in FY14 making the FY18 results comparable to three years of data. In comparison, in FY17 63% (N=22) and in FY16 73% (N=27) of chapters achieved the target GPA with 64% (N=23) in FY15 and 56% (N=19) in FY14. Below is a table illustrating the percentage of chapters who reached the target overall chapter average GPA for each fall semester since the implementation of this method.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| YEAR | Fall | Number of Organizations |
| 2017-2018 (FY18) | 87% (N=27) | 31 |
| 2016-2017 (FY17) | 63% (N=22) | 35 |
| 2015-2016 (FY16) | 73% (N=27) | 37 |
| 2014-2015 (FY15) | 64% (N=23) | 36 |
| 2013-2014 (FY14) | 56% (N=19) | 34 |

The results indicate the strategies used to improve academic performance are effective. However, chapter officers may need additional guidance in utilizing the resources and assessment data provided to achieve more consistent academic achievement from semester to semester. 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 FY18, work with the governing councils continued to focus 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. For FY19, Greek Affairs staff will continue to work with other University departments to develop strategies for gaining additional data and to assist chapter officers in utilizing assessment data to revise chapter scholarship programs.

Grade information was obtained from the Student Affairs MAKO database for all students who were members of Greek affiliated chapters advised by the Greek Affairs staff in the Dean of Students Office at the end of each fall semester in FY18. Data for each student was utilized to calculate averages for each of the organizations advised by staff in each fall semester.