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

Evidence of Improvement

2009-2010 was the baseline year for these outcomes and methods, so only comparisons may be made between 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

Outcome 1: Student Emergency Services increased satisfaction by 10% from 90% in fall 2009 to 100% in fall 2010. Students who used Student Emergency Services were able to recall at least one resource by a level of 24% in fall 2009 and 42% in spring 2010 to 100% in fall 2010 and 100% in spring 2011 indicating an overall increase of 76% from fall 2009 to fall 2010 and 58% from spring 2010 to spring 2011.

Last year’s action plan included integrating an update to the database that would automatically send electronic satisfaction surveys to increase student feedback was not able to be implemented because the technology did not allow for the update so the same electronic methods were used to survey the students.

Outcome 2: Satisfaction levels of student organization advising by the Dean of Student Office staff in 2009-2010 were at 95% for Associated Student Government (ASG) and 85% for Student Foundation (SF) while levels in 2010-2011 were 100% for both ASG and SF indicating an overall increase of 5% for ASG and 15% for SF. Levels of students developing their leadership skills proficiency for both ASG and SF was 50% in 2009-2010 while levels in 2010-2011 were 100% for ASG and 50% for SF indicating an overall increase of 50% for ASG. Last year’s action plan included assisting student leaders implement officer training in summer 2010, which helped us to further improve services by providing student leaders with specific guidance and resources to develop leadership skills.

Outcome 3: The Student Justice satisfaction survey scores reflect most satisfaction at “1” and least satisfaction at “4.” Student Justice showed continuous improvement from 2009-2010 when the average survey score was 1.48 to fall 2010 when the average survey score was 1.40 and to spring 2011 when the average survey score was 1.36. Results demonstrate continued improvement because the scores decreased each semester closer to “1” (i.e. closer to “1” is better). Last year’s action plan involved adapting email communication to notify students which helped us to further improve timeliness of the process.

Outcome 1 - Method 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 - Result

In fall 2010, an electronic satisfaction survey was e-mailed to 79 students requesting notification to faculty about the students experiencing an emergency or crisis that prevented them from attending class. The survey was attached to an e-mail which was sent on November 1, 2010 to all students who requested the notifications to faculty. Six (6) of the total 79 students responded to the satisfaction survey for a response rate of 8%, which is a 13% response rate decrease from the 21% in fall 2009. Students were asked to respond to three statements using a four point Likert scale with 1 being “Strongly Agree” and 4 being “Strongly Disagree.”

Overall, fall 2010 respondents were mostly very satisfied with this service. On item 2 one-hundred (100%) of respondents indicated the service they received was helpful to them. On item 3 eighty-three percent (83%) of respondents indicated the service received assisted them continuing their education. With 100% of respondents either indicating “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” on item 2, the target of 50% of the survey respondents being satisfied was achieved in fall 2010, which is a 10% increase from the 90% of survey respondents indicating satisfaction in fall 2009.

In spring 2011, an electronic satisfaction survey was sent to 91 students requesting notification to faculty about the students...
experiencing an emergency or crisis that prevented them from attending class. The electronic survey was sent via the TRACS system on April 12, 2011 and a reminder on April 18, 2011. Six (6) of the total 91 students who requested the notifications to faculty responded to the satisfaction survey for a response rate of 7%, which was a 1% decrease in response rate from fall 2010. Like in fall 2010, students were asked to respond to the three statements using a Likert scale. The Likert scale was a five point scale with 1 being “Strongly Agree,” 3 being “Undecided” and 5 being “Strongly Disagree” instead of the four point scale used in fall 2010 that did not include the “Undecided.” Overall, spring 2011 more respondents were more satisfied than dissatisfied with this resource as the fall 2010 respondents had been. On item 2 thirty-three percent (33%) of the respondents indicated the service was helpful to them. With 33% of respondents indicating “Strongly Agree” on item 2, the target of 50% of the survey respondents being satisfied was not achieved in spring 2011. This is a decrease of 59% of the survey respondents indicating satisfaction from spring 2010 when 92% indicated satisfaction. These results indicate that students are less satisfied with services than last year, however, these results were skewed due to the small sample of respondents as well as the change of survey measurement midyear from a four point Likert scale in fall 2010 to a five point Likert scale in spring 2011.

The action plan from 2009-2010 was not achieved. Technology did not allow updating the electronic database system anticipated to be integrated for fall 2010 to increase the return rate and receive more feedback by electronically sending satisfaction surveys no later than 15 class days after a student receives services. Other methods were used to distribute the satisfaction survey and collect the results. Email was used to distribute the survey and collect the results in fall 2010 resulting in a low response rate while using email to distribute a link to the electronic survey on TRACS and using TRACSS to collect the results in spring 2011 resulting in a lower return rate than fall 2010. A focus group assessment to gain more detailed student feedback was attempted but lack of student participation did not allow this part of the action plan to be achieved. These results indicate that satisfaction with services could be improved because results reflected that 33% or respondents were satisfied with services in spring 2011. The instrument does not measure how to improve services further because it only measures the level of respondent satisfaction. The instrument will be changed to request feedback about how to improve services. Additionally, we will increase the response rate by soliciting feedback immediately after services are received.

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

In fall 2010, four of the six survey respondents answered the open ended question on the survey resulting in a 66% response rate. In fall 2010, the target of 25% of respondents recalling one resource was achieved because 100% of the respondents recalled at least one resource to assist students in their own personal emergencies. This is an increase of 42% from fall 2009. In spring 2011, two of the six survey respondents answered the open ended question on the survey resulting in a 33% response rate to the question. In spring 2011, the target of 25% of respondents recalling one resource was achieved because 100% of the respondents recalled at least one resource to assist students in their own personal emergencies. This is a 8% increase from spring 2010.

Outcome 1 - Action Plan

A three step approach will be implemented in fall 2011 to receive a larger sample of respondents:
1. Continue emailing surveys to students who received services.
2. Provide up to two calls to the students who did not respond to the emailed survey to allow the students to complete the survey over the phone.
3. Provide the survey by paper to the students who seek service in person at the Dean of Students Office. The resource that will be used to complete this action plan is volunteers completing community service hours. A script written by the Associate Dean of Students will be used to train the volunteers about what to say during the phone calls when surveying the students.

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
An email with the satisfaction survey was sent to four Associated Student Government (ASG) Executive Officers and four Student Foundation (SF) Executive Officers at the end of the spring semester and a reminder was sent two weeks later. The ASG and SF Executive Officers were asked to complete the survey and return it to the Dean of Students Office to maintain anonymity. This survey included five items for respondents to rate on a four point Likert-type scale of agreement and three open ended questions. Two surveys from ASG and four from SF were returned to the Dean of Students Office, therefore, ASG had a 50% return rate and SF had a 100% return rate. ASG had a 10% increase in the return rate from last year while SF had the same return rate as last year.

All AGG respondents reported they “strongly agree” that Dean of Students staff were available, accessible, knowledgeable and supportive. Only item 3, “DOS staff members respected our decisions as student leaders,” was rated “agree” by one of the two ASG respondents, which was the only item less than a “strongly agree.” All SF respondents reported they “strongly agree” with all five items of the instrument including that Dean of Students staff was available, accessible, knowledgeable, supportive, and respectful of student leaders’ decisions. AGG and SF respondents’ comments supported their ratings indicating they were overall highly satisfied with advising by the Dean of Students staff.

The target of 50% of the survey respondents being satisfied with the student organization advising received from the Dean of Students staff was achieved by 100% of both ASG and SF respondents rating “agree” or “strongly agree” on all items indicating satisfaction. This is a five percent increase for AGG and fifteen percent increase for SF from last year’s satisfaction rate at ninety-five percent for AGG and eighty-five percent for SF. These results indicate that students are more satisfied than last year with the advising received from the Dean of Students staff.

The action plan from 2009-2010 related to student satisfaction of student organization advising from Dean of Students staff was achieved. One item of the action plan related to the satisfaction survey results about support from the Dean of Students Office advisors was “the AGG Advisors will discuss the administrative support feedback (e.g. 24-hour access to the AGG Office, red restricted parking permits) in summer 2010 to determine feasibility of implementation in the future,” which was achieved and resulted in the decision that this type of support was not feasible. Also, the Dean of Students Office advisors, AGG President and Vice-President regularly met in summer 2010 and achieved the action plan item to create an agenda for the AGG Advisor Orientation that was implemented on August 23, 2010. The advisors’ support of helping the AGG leaders plan and implement the Advisor Orientation assisted the AGG leaders to plan and implement an intensive oversight retreat training for the AGG organizations members. Additionally, the action plan item to distribute the satisfaction surveys for both AGG and SF during the same and earlier time frame was achieved despite the low return rate for AGG. These results indicate that satisfaction has improved since last year and 100% satisfaction was achieved. We will maintain the high quality service while measuring the satisfaction for one more year and change the method if the satisfaction level is at least 90%.

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

Advisors observed four (4) student leaders from the Associated Student Government (ASG) during fall 2010 and spring 2011, and five (5) student leaders and four (4) student leaders from Student Foundation (SF) during fall 2010 and spring 2011 respectively because one student leader resigned his position at the beginning of the spring semester. The levels of leadership skills proficiency and the following results are illustrated in Table 1 (below).

In fall 2010 the AGG leaders demonstrated their skills proficiency between the Volunteer/Contributor and Coordinator levels while SF leaders demonstrated their skills proficiency between the COORDINATOR and ORGANIZATION VETERAN levels. Fifty percent of AGG leaders were at the Volunteer/Contributor level. Forty percent of the SF leaders were at the ORGANIZATION VETERAN level. Fifty percent of AGG leaders and sixty percent of SF leaders were at the Coordinator level, which allowed for the majority of student leaders to demonstrate the following leadership skills:

- delegate
- network intentionally
- manage priorities
In spring 2011 both ASG and SF leaders demonstrated their skills proficiency between coordinator and VISIONARY levels, which range from the middle to the highest level of leadership proficiency. Fifty percent of ASG leaders and twenty-five percent of SF leaders were at the coordinator level. Twenty-five percent of ASG leaders and fifty percent of SF leaders were at the Organizational Veteran level. ASG and SF each had twenty-five percent of leaders at the Visionary level. A total of fifty percent of ASG leaders and seventy-five percent of SF leaders were within the top two levels, which allowed leaders to demonstrate at least the following skills in spring 2011:

- coach and be resource to others
- distinguish doing things right from doing the right thing
- good public speaking, writing, and presenting skills,

Table 1 below shows the target of 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 was achieved by ASG with one hundred percent of leaders and by SF with fifty percent of leaders demonstrating development during 2010-2011, which is an increase of fifty percent by ASG leaders from last year while SF remained the same as last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Skill Level</th>
<th>ASG Fall 2010</th>
<th>ASG Spring 2011</th>
<th>SF Fall 2010</th>
<th>SF Spring 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member (lowest level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/Contributor</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Veteran</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary (highest level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicated at least 50% of all student leaders developed their leadership skills this year and less students developed their leadership skills last year as compared to this year because last year 50% of all student leaders began in Fall 2009 at the Visionary level and had no higher level to move.

The action plan from 2009-2010 was partially achieved. The action plan item to assist in the leadership development of ASG and SF leaders by having these students attend the Texas State Leadership Institute Conference during the spring 2011 semester was achieved. Additionally, another action plan item was achieved when SF implemented a monthly leadership development program in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. The Dean of Students Office advisors hosted an officer transition for SF in May 2010 and, from this point SF implemented the SF Leadership Team consisting of executive board members and committee chairs, which achieved two of the SF action plan items from 2009-2010. ASG did not achieve the action plan item to send one ASG student leader to attend the Washington Center’s Inside Washington academic seminar for one week between January 2, 2011 and January 15, 2011 because of financial constraints. SF did not achieve the action plan item to implement all committees having co-chairs instead of one chair in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 because changes in student leadership and staffing did not facilitate the implementation of this. These results indicate that 50% more students have developed their leadership skills this year than last year, but the services could be improved further by more individual advising to develop their leadership skills.

Outcome 2 - Action Plan

The action plan for Associated Student Government (ASG) is to:

1. Continue providing ASG Officer Orientation between May and September each year.
2. Introduce the leadership skills proficiency rubric at ASG Officer Orientation.
3. Ask ASG Executive Officers self evaluate at start of year, mid-year, and end of year.
4. Meet with ASG Executive Officers at start of year, mid-year and end of year to set goals and evaluate.

The action plan for Student Foundation (SF) is to:

1. Continue providing SF Officer Orientation between May and September each year.
2. Continue providing SF Fall Leadership Team Retreat in August.
3. Consider expanding the evaluation process to include committee directors who are responsible for major SF programs and now interact regularly with the Dean of Students Office staff.
4. Ask SF Executive Officers self evaluate at start of year, mid-year, and end of year.
5. Meet with SF Executive Officers at start of year, mid-year and end of year to set goals and evaluate.

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**

Students adjudicated in fall 2010 and spring 2011 for Code of Student Conduct violations were given a satisfaction survey with a four point Likert scale that reflects “1” as the most satisfied and “4” as the least satisfied. Approximately 209 surveys were handed out in fall 2010; 148 of them were completed and returned for a response rate of 71%. In spring 2011, approximately 187 surveys were handed out; 95 of those were completed and returned for a response rate of 51%. Collectively for the academic year, the response rate was 61%. Overall satisfaction with the Student Justice process remains positive. The findings show that the total survey average improved, rating 1.36 in fall and 1.40 in spring compared to 1.48 in the previous period assessed.

While the percentage of students who gave the lowest marks (survey average of 4) increased to 3% (n=8 in fall 2010 & spring 2011 combined) compared to less than 1% (n = 1) in 2009-2010, the number of students who gave the highest marks (survey average of 1) increased significantly to 41% (n=61) in fall 2010 from 23% in 2009-2010, which in turn was an improvement from 20% in 2008-2009. Though in spring 2011 the number of surveys with the highest possible marks declined from the fall 2010, the percent, 28% (n = 27), was still an improvement from 2009-2010.

By question, the negative responses (scores of 3 or 4) ranged from 6-12% in fall and 6-17% in spring, and therefore, in each question the positive responses (scores of 1 or 2) ranged from 88-94% in fall and 83-94% in spring. The question averages ranged from 1.28 to 1.55 in fall and 1.27 to 1.67 in spring, also an improvement from the last period’s range of 1.29-1.74. As with past assessments, the question with the least satisfaction was regarding the timeliness of the adjudication process. The questions with the highest satisfaction were regarding their agreement that they were treated with courtesy, respect, and professionalism and that they were given the opportunity to explain their behavior and informed of their options.

Of all surveys completed, 91% in fall 2010 and 89% in spring 2011 averaged a positive response (1-2) compared to the remainder with negative assessment averages of 2.1-4. All question averages were positive with the least satisfactory responded question (1a) averaging 1.55 in fall and 1.67 in spring. Questions/statements gauging learning included, “My experience with the discipline process and Student Justice will positively influence future choices I make concerning my behavior as a student” and “has had a positive impact on my values and attitudes.” The average for these two questions over the two semesters ranged from 1.36 to 1.57.

The target of fifty percent (50%) of survey respondents being satisfied with services received was achieved by 91% in fall 2010 and 89% in spring 2011, which is between a 4% and 2% increase from the total 87% of respondents indicating satisfaction during 2009-2010. The action plan from 2009-2010 was achieved. The action plan item to gain more student feedback about Student Justice and the discipline process was achieved by distributing the Student Justice satisfaction survey during both fall 2010 and spring 2011 to all students adjudicated for Code of Student Conduct violations, including students who were suspended or expelled, during 2010-2011.

Those adjudicating cases gave students the paper survey after each initial meeting so the number of returned surveys went from 122 in 2009-2010 to 243 in 2010-2011. The action plan item to utilize email for quicker notification was implemented and timeliness of the process increased by at least 0.07 from 2009-2010. These results indicate that satisfaction has improved since last year by 4% in fall 2010 and 2% in spring 2011. Services could improve further by better timeliness of the process.

**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**

His assessment involved voluntary completion of a reflective essay (in lieu of 10 hours of community service hours) by students who had 20 hours or more of community service due as part of their sanctions. These students were adjudicated for a Code of Student Conduct Violation in 2010-2011. The offer to complete the essay in lieu of community service was presented at the time of adjudication, typically to students who actually had 40 hours of community service to complete for a drug violation. Most of these students expressed an interest in completing the essay though some later opted to complete the entirety of their originally recommended hours of community service. Because completion was optional, a baseline of “number sent” was not established. In addition, the spring semester just ended and more essays are expected to be submitted over the summer and are not included in this review.

The assessment is intended to evaluate the student’s understanding of inappropriate behavior, personal responsibility, and campus safety. An assessment rubric ranked each area by level of understanding including awareness, appreciation, and application; the level reflected corresponded with a score of 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Prior to scoring, it was established that an essay total score of 6 out of the possible 9 would be the standard for considering the essay successfully completed and demonstrative of understanding of the areas being measured.

Table 2 below shows eighty-four percent (84%) of the essays submitted indicated students demonstrated an overall minimum
understanding of AWARENEESS based on receiving the score of at least six points out of nine possible points. Cumulatively, the essay score average was 7.0. 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 of eighty-four percent (84%) of the essays submitted indicated students demonstrated an overall minimum understanding of AWARENEESS in 2010-2011 was the same results from 2009-2010.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay Score</th>
<th># of Essays</th>
<th>% of Essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Essays:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The action plan from 2009-2010 to gain better insight into student learning through the reflective essay was achieved. The essay was utilized as a sanction for students found responsible for any policy violations when the staff member adjudicating the student decided it was appropriate instead of limiting it as an optional sanction for only drug policy violations as was done in 2009-2010. A more detailed rubric was created and used to grade the essays. These results indicate that students are learning the same amount (84%) as last year, but we could improve services further by more individualized education about their reflections.

Outcome 3 - Action Plan

The following actions will be implemented in 2011-2012 to improve timeliness of and satisfaction with the Student Justice process as well as increase student learning.

- add staff member to help adjudicate cases to improve timeliness of process
- share students’ reflective essay with the Alcohol and Drug Compliance Services Coordinator to allow more impactful meetings with students that may increase their learning
- change second offense alcohol violation sanctions from repeating alcohol class to assessments with the Alcohol and Drug Compliance Services Coordinator to increase student learning and decrease student dissatisfaction with the same sanction
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