

**SAM Center**  
**Assessment Plan Summary**

**SAM Center**

**Academic Advising**

**Goal Description:**

The SAM Center will actively promote undergraduate student’s awareness of university rules & regulations, degree specifics, and course requirements to the benefit of the students and the university.

**RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS**-----

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1**

**Advising - Promote Access to Advising Services**

**Performance Objective Description:**

Students pay a fee for advising services at SHSU. As such, they should have access to quality advising.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**Advising - Distance & Online Services**

**KPI Description:**

Students are enrolling in online and distance learning courses in record numbers; as such, advisors must adapt to provide services to these students. The SAM Center will research methods by which these students may be helped thereby lessening the gap that exists between traditional face-to-face advising and non-traditional advising.

**Results Description:**

After researching several options, the SAM Center employed the following strategies to meet the demands of distance and online students:

1. An academic advisor was set up at SHSU - The Woodlands Center to provide traditional advising to students who had previously been reliant upon phone calls, e-mails, or long-distance driving to achieve their academic advising needs.
2. Several software was investigated; however, none seemed to fulfill the needs of the online/distance-learner while matching the stringent FERPA legalities in HIED or the advising requirements of the software were inadequate. For example,
  - Blackboard Collaborate – the implementation of this system was glitchy causing communication errors.
  - GoToMeeting – cost prohibitive for enough licenses to make online advising functional.
  - Online software (e.g., Podio, Slack, Igloo) – Requires both users (i.e., advisor, advisee) to purchase the software, which is not an option when students have paid their school fees. Additionally, the FERPA compliance requirements for security were lacking.

Given these issues, the SAM Center will maintain the full-time advisor at SHSU – The Woodlands Center and continue looking for alternative options regarding online/distance advising.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**Advising - Distance & Online Services (Action)**

**Action Description:**

A full-time advisor currently is housed at SHSU -The Woodlands Center, but the administration of online advising services relies on e-mail communication, which is incredibly time consuming and is not practical given the growing online student population. As such, the office will continue looking for a new software during the next year to facilitate the process.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**Advising – Identify Online Students**

**KPI Description:**

In order to better provide services to the online student population, the SAM Center will research options and methods by which online students can be identified in the hopes of creating a feasible and functional method of identifying online students.

**Results Description:**

After discussions with several offices on campus (i.e., Registrar’s Office, SHSU Online, Enrollment Management, Undergraduate Admissions), a pre-existing tag (i.e., computer-based identifier) was found which identified students who were currently enrolled in online courses at a 100% rate. Moreover, working with the Registrar’s Office and the My Success Planner Leadership Team, this tag was added to students’ 90-second Gut Check page in the My Success Planner platform.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**Advising - Identify Online Students (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As the task of finding a way to identify online students was completed, no further action is necessary on this front.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Advising - Provide A Positive And Informative Advising Experience

Performance Objective Description:

The entire point of advising is to support students in a healthy environment that allows them to leave the session feeling positive about their experience and being informed of the necessary activities necessary for academic progression.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Advising - Feedback Survey Response Rate

KPI Description:

An advising feedback survey was created to provide a simple method of gathering students' feedback concerning their experiences with advising at the SAM Center.

A hardcopy of the survey was handed to students when they checked in for their advising sessions with the instructions to fill it out after the session and then to drop it in the survey response box at the exit.

As this survey had never been used, no baseline response rate existed for comparison; as such, the 2015-2016 will become the baseline for next year's assessment.

Attached Files

 [Advising Feedback Survey](#)

Results Description:

The table below depicts the number of surveys returned to the SAM Center, the number of advising sessions conducted at the SAM Center, and the overall response rate (i.e., # surveys returned / # of advising sessions) to the survey.

Term	# of Surveys Returned	# of Advising Sessions	Response Rate
Fall 2015	4,192	11,803	35.5%
Spring 2016	2,982	10,482	28.4%
2015-2016 Academic Year	7,174	22,285	32.2%

Now that the numbers of surveys, advising sessions, and response rate have been identified, they will serve as the benchmark against which the SAM Center will compare future attainments regarding advising feedback.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Advising - Feedback Survey Response Rate (Action)

Action Description:

Now that the baselines for the advising survey have been established, next year's assessment cycle will focus on getting more responses, particularly during the spring semester which saw a 7% decrease in survey completions.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Advising - Students' Perception of Academic Advising

KPI Description:

A new advising survey was created to provide a simplified method of gathering students' feedback concerning their experiences with advising at the SAM Center.

A hardcopy of the survey was handed to students prior to their advising sessions with the instructions to fill it out after the session and then to drop it in the survey response box at the exit.

The survey consists of basic demographic information, a checklist for reasons for advising, a comments section, and four 5-point Likert-style questions concerning the students' perceptions of the advising session:

1. The advisor was knowledgeable.
2. The advisor explained my degree plan and requirements.
3. The advisor answered my questions.
4. I am satisfied with my advising session.

As this survey had never been used, no baseline existed for comparison; as such, the 2015-2016 will become the baseline for next year's assessment.

Attached Files

 [Advising Feedback Survey](#)

**Results Description:**

There are two ways in which student perceptions regarding their advisement can be viewed through this metric. First, the average rating for each of the 4 items (e.g., Strongly Agree = 5, Strongly Disagree = 1) is below:

Item	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	2015-2016
The advisor was knowledgeable	4.71	4.73	4.72
The advisor explained my degree plan and requirements	4.66	4.68	4.67
The advisor answered by questions	4.75	4.76	4.75
I am satisfied with my advising session	4.73	4.74	4.74

Additionally, each of the four items can be broken down by the number/percent of students who scored the advisor/advising session at each of the five levels:

**Fall 2015 (4192 Surveys Returned)**

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The advisor was knowledgeable*	37 (0.9%)	24 (0.6%)	147 (3.5%)	687 (16.4%)	3,293 (78.6%)
The advisor explained my degree plan and requirements**	61 (1.5%)	55 (1.3%)	212 (5.1%)	579 (13.8%)	3,273 (78.1%)
The advisor answered my questions***	41 (1%)	25 (0.6%)	137 (3.3%)	529 (12.6%)	3,454 (82.4%)
I am satisfied with my advising session****	54 (1.3%)	38 (0.9%)	165 (3.9%)	477 (11.4%)	3,456 (82.4%)

**Note:** \*5 students did not respond to this item, \*\*13 students did not respond to this item, \*\*\*7 students did not respond to this item, \*\*\*\*3 students did not respond to this item

**Spring 2016 (2982 Surveys Returned)**

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The advisor was knowledgeable*	27 (0.9%)	14 (0.5%)	99 (3.3%)	448 (15.0%)	2,391 (80.2%)
The advisor explained my degree plan and requirements**	45 (1.5%)	34 (1.2%)	145 (4.9%)	382 (12.8%)	2,364 (79.3%)
The advisor answered my questions***	31 (1.0%)	18 (0.6%)	102 (3.4%)	337 (11.3%)	2,486 (83.4%)
I am satisfied with my advising session****	42 (1.4%)	29 (1.0%)	101 (3.4%)	304 (10.2%)	2,500 (83.8%)

*Note:* \*3 students did not respond to this item, \*\*12 students did not respond to this item, \*\*\*8 students did not respond to this item, \*\*\*\*6 students did not respond to this item

**2015-2016 Academic Year (7174 Surveys returned)**

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The advisor was knowledgeable*	64 (0.9%)	38 (0.5%)	246 (3.4%)	1135 (15.8%)	5,684 (79.2%)
The advisor explained my degree plan and requirements**	106 (1.5%)	89 (1.2%)	357 (5.0%)	961 (13.4%)	5,637 (78.6%)
The advisor answered my questions***	72 (1.0%)	43 (0.6%)	239 (3.3%)	866 (12.1%)	5,940 (82.8%)
I am satisfied with my advising session****	99 (1.4%)	67 (0.9%)	266 (3.7%)	781 (10.9%)	5,956 (83.0%)

*Note:* \*8 students did not respond to this item, \*\*25 students did not respond to this item, \*\*\*15 students did not respond to this item, \*\*\*\*9 students did not respond to this item

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**Advising - Students' Perception of Academic Advising (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As this survey had never been used, no baseline existed for comparison; as such, the student responses from 2015-2016 will act as the baseline for next year's assessment cycle.

**Academic Improvement Mentoring (AIM)**

**Goal Description:**

Through the AIM program, professional mentors will aid students in their academic endeavors by meeting with them to foster a better understanding of academic issues and processes, all while improving academic performance.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

**AIM - Positive Effect on Academic Performance**

**Performance Objective Description:**

Participating in the SAM Center’s Study Skills seminar series will have a positive effect students' academic performance.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**AIM - Participants' 1-semester Persistence Rates**

**KPI Description:**

SAM Center Academic Improvement Mentoring (AIM) program participants, defined as those who complete one or more mentoring requirements/recommendations beyond the initial intake interview, will demonstrate greater mean 1-semester persistence rates (defined as persistence from long semester to long semester) during the semester of participation than nonparticipants.

*Note:* Due to the time frame in which this data is available, the results for this KPI will always be delayed by at least one long semester.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**AIM - Participants' 1-semester Persistence Rates (Action)**

**Action Description:**

Given the data acquisition issues, data for the 2015-2016 academic year will be assessed during the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. As such, all future assessment processes will use data from the previous year to determine program effect.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**AIM - Participants' Course Completion Rates**

**KPI Description:**

SAM Center Academic Improvement Mentoring (AIM) program participants, defined as those who complete one or more mentoring requirements/recommendations beyond the initial intake interview, will demonstrate greater mean course completion rates (defined as the

number of semester credit hours completed divided by the number of semester credit hours attempted) during the semester of participation than nonparticipants.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**AIM - Participants' Course Completion Rates (Action)**

**Action Description:**

Given the data acquisition issues, data for the 2015-2016 academic year will be assessed during the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. As such, all future assessment processes will use data from the previous year to determine program effect.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**AIM - Participants' Grade Point (GP) Gains**

**KPI Description:**

SAM Center Academic Improvement Mentoring (AIM) program participants, defined as those who complete one or more mentoring requirements/recommendations beyond the initial intake interview, will demonstrate greater mean grade point (GP) gains during the semester of participation than nonparticipants.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**AIM - Participants' Grade Point (GP) Gains (Action)**

**Action Description:**

Given the data acquisition issues, data for the 2015-2016 academic year will be assessed during the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. As such, all future assessment processes will use data from the previous year to determine program effect.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**AIM - Participants' Grade-point Average (GPA) Improvement**

**KPI Description:**

SAM Center Academic Improvement Mentoring (AIM) program participants, defined as those who complete one or more mentoring requirements/recommendations beyond the initial intake interview, will demonstrate greater growth in mean grade-point average (GPA) during the semester of participation than nonparticipants.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**AIM - Participants' Grade Point Average (GPA; Action)**

**Action Description:**

Given the data acquisition issues, data for the 2015-2016 academic year will be assessed during the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. As such, all future assessment processes will use data from the previous year to determine program effect.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1**

**AIM - Positive Perception of Mentoring Services**

**Performance Objective Description:**

AIM program participants will view the program and its components positively.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**AIM - Participants' Perception of Mentoring Components**

**KPI Description:**

AIM program participants who respond to the program satisfaction survey—an internally developed instrument containing 3 demographic items, 13 closed-ended items, 2 multiple-response items (checklists), and 3 open-ended items—will find the mentoring components helpful.

Related closed-ended items include the following:

- o I found the mentor meetings helpful.
- o I found the grade-checks helpful in monitoring my academic progress.
- o I found the study skills sessions helpful to my academic performance.
- o Overall, I found the mentoring program helpful.

Related multiple-response items ask the participant to select the most helpful study skills session(s) and least helpful study skills session(s).

Related open-ended items include the following:

- o What were the most helpful parts of mentoring program?
- o How can we improve the mentoring program?
- o Is there anything else you would like us to know about your experience with the mentoring program?

To establish a benchmark, at least 75% of participants who respond to the satisfaction survey during the semester of participation will (a) either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the above closed-ended items, (b) select more “most helpful” sessions than “least helpful” sessions in the multiple-response items, and (c) reference more “most helpful” parts than “least helpful” parts of the mentoring program. In addition, the majority of the suggestions for improvement will be beneficial to the program, and the majority of comments regarding experiences will be positive.

Attached Files

 [AIM Program Satisfaction Survey.](#)

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**AIM - Participants' Perception of Mentoring Components (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**AIM - Participants' Satisfaction with Academic Support Programs Staff and AIM**

**KPI Description:**

Program participants who respond to the program satisfaction survey—an internally developed instrument containing 3 demographic items, 13 closed-ended items, 2 multiple-response items (checklists), and 3 open-ended items—will demonstrate satisfaction with Academic Support Programs Staff and AIM.

Related closed-ended items include the following:

- o The mentor clearly explained mentoring requirements/recommendations for the semester.
- o I felt that all mentoring staff—including front-desk and study-skills staff—treated me courteously.
- o Overall, I was satisfied with the mentoring program.

To establish a benchmark, at least 75% of participants who respond to the satisfaction survey during the semester of participation will either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the above closed-ended items.

Attached Files

 [AIM Program Satisfaction Survey.](#)

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**AIM - Participants' Satisfaction with Academic Support Programs Staff and AIM (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

**First Alert**

**Goal Description:**

The First Alert program is an early alert referral system that enables SHSU faculty and staff to refer students whose in- or out-of-class performance demonstrates a need for academic support to the SAM Center mentors who aid those referred to improve their academics.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

**First Alert - Increase Program Outreach**

**Performance Objective Description:**

The mission of the First Alert program relies upon both the faculty and staff, who refer students, and the students, who must respond, to use the program. Given this, it is important to monitor the outreach conducted on behalf of the program.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**First Alert - Increase Referrals and Referrers**

**KPI Description:**

To establish a benchmark, the number of referrals made to the First Alert program and the number of referrers who use the First Alert program will be tracked for each semester (Fall and Spring) as well as for the entire academic year.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**First Alert - Increased Referrals and Referrers (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**First Alert - Increase Response Rate**

**KPI Description:**

To establish a benchmark, the method (i.e., phone, in person, email, all responses, and no response) and the rate at which students respond will be tracked for each semester (Fall and Spring) as well as for the entire academic year.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**First Alert - Increase Response Rate (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

**First Alert - Positive Effect on Participants' Academic Performance**

**Performance Objective Description:**

Contact with First Alert mentors in the SAM Center will help the academic performance of students who were responded to the proactive outreach.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**First Alert – Participants’ 1-semester Persistence Rates**

**KPI Description:**

SAM Center First Alert program participants, defined as those who actually responded to the various methods of outreach (e.g., e-mail, phone, letter), will demonstrate greater mean 1-semester persistence rates (defined as persistence from long semester to long semester) during the semester of outreach than nonparticipants, defined as those who were referred but did not respond.

***Note:*** Due to the time frame in which this data is available, the results for this KPI will always be delayed by at least one academic year.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**First Alert - Participants' 1-semester Persistence Rates (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**First Alert – Positive Effect on Participants’ Course Grades**

**KPI Description:**

SAM Center First Alert program participants, defined as those who actually responded to the various methods of outreach (e.g., e-mail, phone, letter), will demonstrate statistically significantly fewer negative course grades, defined as D’s and/or F’s in the course(s) for which they were referred, than nonparticipants, defined as those who were referred but did not respond.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**First Alert - Positive Effect on Participants' Course Grades (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2



**First Alert – Positive Effect on Participants’ Semester Grade Point Average (GPA)**

**KPI Description:**

SAM Center First Alert program participants, defined as those who actually responded to the various methods of outreach (e.g., e-mail, phone, letter), will possess a greater mean grade-point average (GPA) during the semester of participation than nonparticipants, defined as those who were referred but did not respond.

*Note:* Due to the time frame in which this data is available, the results for this KPI will always be delayed by at least one academic year.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**First Alert - Positive Effect on Participants' Semester Grade Point Average (GPA; Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

**First Alert – Positive Perception of Program**

**Performance Objective Description:**

Stakeholders for the First Alert program will view the program positively.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**First Alert – Survey Response Rate**

**KPI Description:**

The First Alert program sends out two surveys to its stakeholders: one for students and one for referrers. It is important for the stakeholders to respond to these surveys so that the First Alert mentors have a clearer idea of what stakeholders perceive as positive and negative about the program. Given this, it is incredibly important to have a strong response rate.

To serve as a benchmark, data regarding response rates will be collected for the 2015-2016 academic year.

**Results Description:**

The following table has the response rates for each survey by both semester and academic year:

Survey	Fall, 2015	Spring, 2016	Academic Year, 2015-2016
Student	73 of 562 responded (13%)	46 of 506 responded (9%)	119 of 1068 responded (11%)
Referrer	25 of 127 responded (20%)	29 of 125 responded (23%)	54 of 252 responded (21%)

These numbers will serve as the benchmark against which future assessments will be conducted.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**First Alert - Survey Response Rate (Action)**

**Action Description:**

Now that the benchmarks for the First Alert survey response rate are established, the SAM Center will endeavor to increase both student and referrer response rates to provide a more comprehensive understanding of their perceptions, wants, and needs.

**Presentations & Workshops (P&W)**

**Goal Description:**

The SAM Center will provide outreach services for students, faculty, and staff in the form of presentations and workshops, thereby increasing both the awareness of and use of SAM Center programs and services.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

**P&W - Positive Perception of Presentations and Workshops**

**Performance Objective Description:**

Those who are effected by the SAM Center’s Presentations & Workshops will view the program positively.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**P&W - Participants' Perceptions of Presentations/Workshops**



**KPI Description:**

The SAM Center routinely presents on a variety of topics (e.g., study skills, academic support programs, campus resources, advising, degree plans) to a variety of audiences (e.g., classrooms, student organizations, special populations).

However, no or little tracking or assessment of these presentations has been. To remedy this, an internally-derived instrument, the Post-Presentation Survey, was created which includes (a) fields to write the class/organization, date, presenter, number in attendance, topic, and duration; (b) 3, 5-point Likert questions (i.e., strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree; (c) 1 fill-in-the-blank question; and (d) 1 open-ended question.

The 3, 5-point Likert questions are important regarding participants’ perceptions:

- This information was helpful.
- The presenter was knowledgeable.
- The presentation was well done and informative.

As no surveys or data tracking previously was used, this data will serve as a benchmark for the future assessment regarding attendance and numbers of presentations and workshops.

Attached Files

[📄PRESENTATION SURVEY](#)

**Results Description:**

There are two ways in which student perceptions regarding their advisement can be viewed through this metric. First, the average rating for each of the 3 items (e.g., Strongly Agree = 5, Strongly Disagree = 1) is below:

Item	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	2015-2016
This information was helpful.	4.58	4.55	4.58
The presenter was knowledgeable.	4.70	4.80	4.73
The presentation was well done and informative.	4.63	4.75	4.65

Additionally, each of the three items can be broken down by the number/percent of students who scored the advisor/advising session at each of the five levels:

**Fall 2015 (861 Surveys Returned)**

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
This information was helpful.	14 (1.6%)	1 (0.1%)	17 (2.0%)	265 (30.8%)	565 (65.6%)
The presenter was knowledgeable.*	12 (1.4%)	1 (0.1%)	14 (1.6%)	177 (20.6%)	655 (76.1%)
The presentation was well done and informative.*	12 (1.4%)	6 (0.7%)	24 (2.8%)	201 (23.3%)	598 (69.5%)

*Note:* \*2 students circle multiple responses and were excluded, \*\*20 students did not respond to this item.

**Spring 2016 (263 Surveys Returned)**

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
This information was helpful.	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.8%)	7 (2.7%)	94 (35.7%)	159 (60.5%)
The presenter was knowledgeable.	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.8%)	44 (16.7%)	216 (82.1%)
The presentation was well done and informative.*	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.9%)	52 (19.8%)	201 (76.4%)

*Note:* \*4 students did not respond to this item.

**2015-2016 Academic Year (1124 Surveys Returned)**

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
This information was helpful.	15 (1.3%)	3 (0.3%)	24 (2.1%)	359 (31.9%)	725 (64.5%)
The presenter was knowledgeable.*	13 (1.2%)	1 (0.1%)	16 (1.4%)	221 (19.7%)	871 (77.5%)
The presentation was well done and informative.**	13 (1.2%)	6 (0.5%)	29 (2.6%)	253 (22.5%)	799 (71.1%)

*Note:* \*2 students circled multiple responses and were excluded, \*\*24 students did not respond to this item.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**P&W - Participants' Perceptions of Presentations/Workshops (Action)**

**Action Description:**

Results strongly favored students' positive perception of classroom and organization informationals. As this survey had never been given before, the 2015-2016 responses will serve as a baseline for future comparisons. Additionally, as the results were so favorable, this survey will be placed on hold for the next year in favor of other assessments (tbd) that might provide an alternative perspective of the presentations.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1**

**P&W - Promote Access to Presentations & Workshops**

**Performance Objective Description:**

SAM Center presentations and workshops will be accessible to stakeholders.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**P&W - Increase Attendance & Number of Presentations & Workshops**

**KPI Description:**

The SAM Center routinely presents on a variety of topics (e.g., study skills, academic support programs, campus resources, advising, degree plans) to a variety of audiences (e.g., classrooms, student organizations, special populations).

However, no or little tracking or assessment of these presentations has been conducted. To remedy this, an internally-derived instrument, the Post-Presentation Survey, was created which includes (a) fields to write the class/organization, date, presenter, number in attendance, topic, and duration; (b) 3, 5-point Likert questions; (c) 1 fill-in-the-blank question; and (d) 1 open-ended question.

The number of surveys returned and the number of presentations/workshops conducted will be tracked.

As no surveys or data tracking previously was used, this data will serve as a benchmark for the future assessment regarding attendance and numbers of presentations and workshops.

Attached Files  
[PRESENTATION SURVEY](#)

**Results Description:**

The following numbers will act as the benchmark against which future assessments will be measured:

Term	# Presentations	# Students	# Returned Surveys	Response Rate
Fall 2015	27	922	861	93.4%
Spring 2016	14	279	263	94.3%
2015-2016 Academic Year	41	1201	1124	93.6%

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

P&W - Increase Attendance & Number of Presentations & Workshops (Action)

Action Description:

As the 2015-2016 assessment cycle represented the first use of this survey process for Presentations & Workshops, it will serve as the benchmark against with future semesters will be compared. Given this, the SAM Center will strive to increase campus outreach (i.e., # of presentations) to enhance student knowledge of our programs. This will be assessed in the 2016-2017 assessment cycle.

Professional Growth & Training (PG&T)

Goal Description:

One of the goals of the SAM Center is to promote professionalism and excellence in the fields of advising, mentoring, and academic support while acting as a model for other departments both locally and at other institutions.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

PG&T - Enhance Professional Profile

Performance Objective Description:

SAM Center personnel will actively work to enhance their professional profile both internally (i.e., SHSU) and externally (e.g., professional organizations, conferences).

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

PG&T - Increase Number of Professional Presentations

KPI Description:






Establish a baseline for the number of presentations conducted regarding advising and academic support.

Results Description:

SAM Center personnel made seven (7) presentations at seven (7) conferences. These numbers will serve as the benchmark against which future assessment regarding professional presentations will be measured.

Number Of Presenters	Name Of Presentation	Organization/Conference
1	Student support services assessment: Moving beyond headcounts	SACSCOC 2015 Annual Meeting
2	Establishing leadership in and through education – A minority-male initiative	NACADA 2015 Annual Conference
1	From practicum project to parading my assessment attitude	TACUSPA 2015 annual Conference
1	Know whom you serve before serving what you know	Annual SHSU Teaching Conference, 2015
3	Professional mentoring for undergraduate students on academic suspension: An intervention	UNM – Mentoring Institute Conference, 2016
3	Sam Houston's Establishing Leadership In & Through Education Program—a minority-male initiative	THECB – Meeting for Programs of Excellence, 2016
1	Texas initiatives for improving higher education for Latino men	Preparate Annual Conference 2016

Attached Files

-  [From Practicum Project to Paradigm Shift--Adjusting My Assessment Attitude PDF](#)
-  [Know Whom You Serve Before Serving What You Know PDF](#)
-  [Preparate Presentation \(MAL 4.14.16\)](#)
-  [SACSCOC 2015 Final Presentation](#)
-  [SH ELITE NACADA 2015 Final](#)

[!\[\]\(f4912148590488019602cab6e009e597\_img.jpg\) SH ELITE THECB Presentation 2016](#)

[!\[\]\(8af806fb1314382d09bc5ec5b767526c\_img.jpg\) UNM PRESENTATION Final](#)

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

##### **PG&T - Increase Number of Professional Presentations (Action)**

###### **Action Description:**

The 2015-2016 assessment cycle was the first time that the number of presentations made by SAM Center staff was tracked. As such, SAM Center will strive to present more than seven (7) conference presentations during the upcoming cycle. This will promote the SAM Center, and its personnel, as leaders in their fields and the university as an institution of innovation/best practice.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

##### **PG&T - Provide Productive Professional Evaluation**

###### **Performance Objective Description:**

The SAM Center strives to provide constructive and productive feedback to personal to enhance the both the services to stakeholders and the capabilities of personnel.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

##### **PG&T - 360-Degree Mentor Evaluation**

###### **KPI Description:**

Develop a 360-evaluation process for professional mentors comprised of three components (self-evaluation, supervisor evaluation, and peer evaluation) thereby providing triangulation of professional mentor performance.

###### Attached Files

[!\[\]\(41aea2746216b27a6939d696d8e035da\_img.jpg\) 360 evaluation-Mentor](#)

[!\[\]\(7bc43b319a082987e20f7bf78f4bab80\_img.jpg\) Supv-Mentor evaluation](#)

[!\[\]\(e50091943b385fe16d3277389202856f\_img.jpg\) Self Eval - Mentor](#)

###### **Results Description:**

The 360-degree evaluation process was developed during the Fall 2015 semester using an internally-originated process (see attached forms). However, the process was not implemented for two reasons:

1. The campus instituted a modified staff evaluation process that took precedent
2. Both the SAM Center's Director of Academic Support and fellow mentors expressed reservation about the representatives of the topics and the job duties and professional development needs of the office.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

##### **PG&T - 360-Degree Mentor Evaluation (Action)**

###### **Action Description:**

As the reservations regarding the new evaluation process were deemed by administration to hold merit, this process has been shelved indefinitely.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

##### **PG&T - 360-Degree Student Worker Evaluation**

###### **KPI Description:**

Develop a 360-degree evaluation process for student workers comprised of three components (self-evaluation, supervisor evaluation, and peer evaluation) thereby allowing for the evaluative triangulation of student worker performance based on perceived activities. Moreover, this process will include the creation of individualized work goals for each student worker, thereby providing a measure of process effectiveness.

###### **Results Description:**

The 360-degree evaluation process was created, forms regarding each of the three (3) reviewing groups (i.e., individual, supervisor, peers) were created (see attached).

###### Attached Files

[!\[\]\(06456157f083c12e510a7643240746db\_img.jpg\) 360 Peer Review](#)

[!\[\]\(12a8985c56a42f60f1792029977b51c5\_img.jpg\) 360 Individual Review](#)

[!\[\]\(b587d0ccf88bf704c6ce4dd9e3067d12\_img.jpg\) 360 Supervisor Review](#)

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

##### **PG&T - 360-Degree Student Worker Evaluation (Action)**

###### **Action Description:**

The instruments created during the 2015-2016 Academic Year will be used for student worker evaluation during the 2016-2017 academic year. Student reports will be presented, but with redacted information to protect the confidentiality of the students.

## **Study Skills**

### **Goal Description:**

Through the Study Skills program, students learn, develop, and expand the skills, strategies, and techniques needed to improve their academic performance.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

**Study Skills - Acquisition Of Learning and Study Strategies/Skills**

**Learning Objective Description:**

SAM Center Study Skills program participants will acquire study skills involving *preparing, avoiding procrastination, managing time, reading textbooks/taking notes, taking tests*, and *managing stress*, regardless of the delivery mode of the program.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**Study Skills - Learning And Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) Self-regulation Component**

**Indicator Description:**

Program participants will improve their Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) scores during the course of the study skills series. The LASSI, a 10-scale, 80-item instrument developed at the University of Texas at Austin, uses rating scales to measure students’ perceptions of their strategic learning involving the following components: (a) *skill*, which includes their scores on the information processing, selecting main ideas, and test strategies scales; (b) *will*, which includes their scores on the anxiety, attitude, and motivation scales; and (c) *self-regulation*, which includes their scores on the concentration, self-testing, study aids, and time management scales. Each of the three LASSI components’ associated scales will be assessed annually on a rotating basis.

Attached Files

 [Portion of LASSI Manual](#)

**Criterion Description:**

To establish a benchmark, at least 50% of SAM Center Study Skills program participants will demonstrate at least 5% growth in each scale of the self-regulation component of the LASSI during the semester of attendance.

**Findings Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this semester.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**Study Skills - Learning And Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) Self-regulation Component (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**Study Skills - Learning And Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) Skill Component**

**Indicator Description:**

Program participants will improve their Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) scores during the course of the study skills series. The LASSI, a 10-scale, 80-item instrument developed at the University of Texas at Austin, uses rating scales to measure students’ perceptions of their strategic learning involving the following components: (a) *skill*, which includes their scores on the information processing, selecting main ideas, and test strategies scales; (b) *will*, which includes their scores on the anxiety, attitude, and motivation scales; and (c) self-regulation, which includes their scores on the concentration, self-testing, study aids, and time management scales. Each of the three LASSI components’ associated scales will be assessed annually on a rotating basis.

Attached Files

 [Portion of LASSI Manual](#)

**Criterion Description:**

Based upon historical performance, at least 50% of SAM Center Study Skills program participants will demonstrate at least 20% growth in each scale of the skill component of the LASSI during the semester of attendance.

**Findings Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

**Study Skills - Learning And Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) Skill Component (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

**Study Skills - Learning And Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) Will Component**

**Indicator Description:**

Program participants will improve their Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) scores during the course of the study skills series. The LASSI, a 10-scale, 80-item instrument developed at the University of Texas at Austin, uses rating scales to measure students’ perceptions of their strategic learning involving the following components: (a) *skill*, which includes their scores on the information processing, selecting main ideas, and test strategies scales; (b) *will*, which includes their scores on the anxiety, attitude, and motivation



scales; and (c) *self-regulation*, which includes their scores on the concentration, self-testing, study aids, and time management scales. Each of the three LASSI components' associated scales will be assessed annually on a rotating basis.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(919a2cb85b99741a73c0c31a427236a8\_img.jpg\) Portion of LASSI Manual](#)

**Criterion Description:**

To establish a benchmark, at least 50% of SAM Center Study Skills program participants will demonstrate at least 5% growth in each scale of the will component of the LASSI during the semester of attendance.

**Findings Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**Study Skills - Learning And Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) Will Component (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1**

**Study Skills - Positive Effect on Participants' Academic Performance**

**Performance Objective Description:**

Participating in the SAM Center's Study Skills seminar series will enhance students' academic performance.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**Study Skills - Participants' 1-semester Persistence Rates**

**KPI Description:**

To establish a benchmark, SAM Center Study Skills program participants will demonstrate mean 1-semester persistence rates (defined as persistence from long semester to long semester) that are at least 10% greater than mean 1-semester persistence rates of nonparticipants, regardless of the delivery mode of the program.

Note: Due to the time frame in which this data is available, the results for this KPI will always be delayed by at least one long semester.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**Study Skills - Participants' 1-semester Persistence Rates (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**Study Skills - Participants' Course Completion Rates**

**KPI Description:**

In an ongoing effort to meet an original benchmark, SAM Center Study Skills program participants will demonstrate mean course completion rates (the number of semester credit hours completed divided by the number of semester credit hours attempted) during the semester of attendance that are at least 10% greater than mean course completion rates of nonparticipants, regardless of the delivery mode of the program.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

**Study Skills - Participants' Course Completion Rates (Action)**

**Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2**

**Study Skills - Participants' Grade Point Average (GPA) Improvement**

**KPI Description:**

In an ongoing effort to meet an original benchmark, the GPAs of SAM Center Study Skills program participants will shift in a positive direction 0.3 more during the semester of attendance than the GPAs of nonparticipants, regardless of the delivery mode of the program.

**Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.



### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

#### Study Skills - Participants' Grade Point Average (GPA) Improvement (Action)

##### Action Description:

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

#### Study Skills - Positive Perception of Services

##### Performance Objective Description:

Participants in the Study Skills program will view the program and its services positively.

### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

#### Study Skills - Online Participants' Perception of Course Design

##### KPI Description:

Study Skills online program participants who respond to the program satisfaction survey—an internally developed instrument containing 11 closed-ended items (14 for online students), 2 multiple-response items (checklists), and 4 open-ended items—will perceive the program's course design as helpful.

Closed-ended items related to participants' perception include the following:

- The course design helped me determine the tasks to accomplish each week.
- The quizzes helped me gauge my understanding of the material.

Based upon historical performance, at least 85% of SAM Center Study Skills online participants who respond to the satisfaction survey during the semester of attendance will either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the closed-ended items related to course design.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(3342c215b2a8b663596a81468d5dc314\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Face-to-Face Students\).](#)

[!\[\]\(56549452e01ca28bdf2500ced9653143\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Online Students--differing items circled in red\).](#)

##### Results Description:

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

#### Study Skills - Online Participants' Perception of Course Design

##### Action Description:

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

#### Study Skills - Online Participants' Perception of Leader Responsiveness

##### KPI Description:

Study Skills online program participants who respond to the program satisfaction survey—an internally developed instrument containing 11 closed-ended items (14 for online students), 2 multiple-response items (checklists), and 4 open-ended items—will perceive the program's leader as responsive.

The closed-ended item related to participants' perception states the following:

- The leader answered my questions in a timely manner.

In an ongoing effort to meet an original benchmark, at least 75% of SAM Center Study Skills online participants who respond to the satisfaction survey during the semester of attendance will either “strongly agree” or “agree” with above closed-ended item.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(3f5477a6ad7457d6c5a54da9edc797f0\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Face-to-Face Students\).](#)

[!\[\]\(5ca7d0bd23567a9aa1f800590644baea\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Online Students--differing items circled in red\).](#)

##### Results Description:

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

#### Study Skills - Online Participants' Perception of Leader Responsiveness (Action)

##### Action Description:

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

## Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Program Leaders

### KPI Description:

Study Skills program participants who respond to the program satisfaction survey—an internally developed instrument containing 11 closed-ended items (14 for online students), 2 multiple-response items (checklists), and 4 open-ended items—will hold a positive view of program leaders, regardless of the delivery mode of the program.

Closed-ended items related to participants' perception include the following:

- The program objectives were clearly stated and met.
- The leader had a good understanding of the content.
- The leader engaged students in lively discussion.
- The leader used good examples to explain points and responded clearly to questions.
- The material was clearly presented.

The open-ended item related to participants' perception asks the following:

- What was your overall impression of the leader's ability to manage the Study Skills program?

Based upon historical performance, at least 95% of SAM Center Study Skills participants who respond to the satisfaction survey during the semester of attendance will either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the above closed-ended items and reference at least one positive leader quality (e.g., knowledgeable, caring, confident) in the open-ended item.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(6059a5aa8b4ca7bb793408023d6c6e42\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Face-to-Face Students\)](#)

[!\[\]\(c50c8b7b2cc2cf9ff925edec0ee94c0d\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Online Students--differing items circled in red\)](#)

### Results Description:

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

### Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Program Leaders (Action)

#### Action Description:

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

## Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Study Skills Improvement

### KPI Description:

Study Skills program participants who respond to the program satisfaction survey—an internally developed instrument containing 11 closed-ended items (14 for online students), 2 multiple-response items (checklists), and 4 open-ended items—will perceive that the program improved their study skills, regardless of the delivery mode of the program.

Closed-ended items related to participants' perception include the following:

- The program was relevant and useful to me.
- The program enhanced my study skills.
- I would recommend this group to other students.
- Participation in study skills was a valuable use of my time.

The open-ended item related to participants' perception states the following:

- The most important thing I learned was . . .

In an ongoing effort to achieve an original benchmark, at least 75% of SAM Center Study Skills participants who respond to the satisfaction survey during the semester of attendance will either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the above closed-ended items and reference a particular study skill taught in the open-ended item.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(26cddea01ddf7f002af4ba779c4999ee\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Face-to-Face Students\)](#)

[!\[\]\(b78e2d0769ad682766c36e077fde3d60\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Online Students--differing items circled in red\)](#)

### Results Description:

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

### Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Study Skills Improvement (Action)

#### Action Description:

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

##### **Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Subject Matter**

###### **KPI Description:**

Study Skills program participants who respond to the program satisfaction survey—an internally developed instrument containing 11 closed-ended items (14 for online students), 2 multiple-response items (checklists), and 4 open-ended items—will hold a positive view of program subject matter, regardless of the delivery mode of the program.

Closed-ended items related to participants' perception include the following:

- The material was well organized.
- The handouts were clear and easy to understand.

All multiple-response items (checklists) relate to this perception and ask the participant to select the most helpful session(s) and least helpful session(s).

Open-ended items related to participants' perception include the following:

- In the future, what could be added to improve this program?
- In the future what could be left out to improve this program?

In an ongoing effort to meet an original benchmark, at least 75% of SAM Center Study Skills participants who respond to the satisfaction survey during the semester of attendance will (a) either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the above closed-ended items, (b) select more “most helpful” sessions than “least helpful” sessions, and (c) suggest more additions to the program than subtractions.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(0d5ec72f61334709c3fc9450209b754f\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Face-to-Face Students\)](#)

[!\[\]\(b792654f2cef9719eabeb6c5be00811e\_img.jpg\) Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 \(Online Students--differing items circled in red\)](#)

###### **Results Description:**

Due to time constraints associated with data collection difficulties, data were not analyzed this assessment cycle.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

##### **Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Subject Matter (Action)**

###### **Action Description:**

As data were not analyzed nor were findings reported for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle due to time constraints and data collections issues, data from the 2015-2016 academic year will serve as the focus of the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. By doing this, we will avoid potential issues with time or data collection in the future.

## **Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement**

### **Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):**

Concerning the mentoring programs, the existence of multiple programs, each with its own name and specific population, has led to confusion on campus as to what each of the programs actually does and what populations each program serves. As such, the old programs will be scrapped in favor of a new program that aids all students, regardless of their demographic or status. Given the nature of a new program, its academic effectiveness (e.g., GPA boost, course completion rate) will have to be assessed in the following year.

Concerning First Alert, given the horrid response rate of the professors surveyed (ONLY 4 of the 190!!!!), the professor survey will be scrapped. In its place, we will create and disseminate a survey to the students who we contact through the First Alert program to assess their views of the program.

Concerning Study Skills, we intend to raise criteria for success/performance indicators related to the benchmarks we exceeded for the current assessment cycle beginning with the 2015-2016 assessment cycle:

- At least 95% of participants who respond to the satisfaction survey will either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the closed-ended items related to program leaders and reference at least one positive leader quality (e.g., knowledgeable, caring, confident) in the open-ended item.
- At least 85% of online participants who respond to the satisfaction survey will either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the closed-ended items related to course design.

In addition, at least 50% of participants will demonstrate at least 20% growth in each scale of the skill component of the LASSI the next time it is assessed in 2017-2018.

Because online participants' survey responses did not meet the benchmark for the indicator related to leader responsiveness, we will create a forum for a virtual office within Blackboard by the beginning of fall 2015. The forum will (a) remind participants that the instructor is available only during normal business hours, (b) give participants a time frame in which to expect e-mail responses from the instructor, and (c) house threads to answer frequently asked questions. Also beginning in fall 2015, the online instructor will make specific reference to the study skills handouts in the first two weekly updates of each series, explaining what they are and the importance of accessing them; during fall 2015, we will explore alternative

ways to present the study skills handouts in Blackboard. Both actions are in response to (a) the large discrepancy between online and face-to-face (FtF) participants' survey responses for the item related to the clarity of handouts and (b) the fact that online participants' survey responses did not meet the benchmark for this item. By the beginning of spring 2016, we will implement some form of a "Talk to a Mentor" system, designed to encourage participants to seek further assistance from academic mentors in hopes that we can begin to raise all participants' results for the indicators related to academic achievement and progress toward graduation.

Long-term actions, to be completed by the end of the 2015-2016 academic year (i.e., by the beginning of fall 2016), involve qualitatively analyzing spring 2015 survey data to determine: (a) how best to change the study skills content and/or materials to better facilitate participants' growth in the test strategies scale of the LASSI, (b) possible explanations for the fact that online participants' survey responses did not meet the benchmark for three of the items related to the study skills improvement indicator, (c) possible explanations for the two areas of greatest discrepancy between online and FtF participants' survey responses for the items related to program leaders (*the leader had a good understanding of the content* and *the material was clearly presented*), and (d) the existence of patterns in participants' survey responses regarding most helpful/least helpful sessions and program additions/subtractions, as all participants' responses fell considerably short of the benchmark for these items.

SH ELITE will be added to the SAM Center assessment plan as it was recently shifted back under the umbrella of Academic Support Programs. Additionally, the program's assessment plan will emphasize long-term academic success, address a pilot student management/leadership program, and contain a component concerning funding.

Concerning advising, the SAM Center will continue requesting more advising personnel in order to handle the growing population both on campus and online. Moreover, to expand advising assessment, a student survey will be created in order to identify student satisfaction concerning advisement and to provide a more information concerning the student advising experience.

#### **Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:**

There were several issues with data collection, both departmental/programmatic and institutional, that precluded the analysis of said data by the closing date of the 2015-2016 Assessment Cycle. As such, data analysis for the SH ELITE, AIM, and First Alert were placed on hold for a year, leading to an internal assessment cycle that relies on data that is one year behind the current year.

Regarding the online nature of Study Skills, a Blackboard system was created and implemented with mediocre success.

Long-term actions discussed in then 2014-2015 Assessment Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement were attempted, but, again due to issues with data collection, were unable to be assessed. However, this assessment will be conducted during the 2016-2017 Assessment Cycle.

SH ELITE was not added to the overarching SAM Center Assessment plan, but it will have been taken care of by the time the next assessment cycle begins.

Regarding advising, additional personnel were acquired and a short advisee survey was created and implemented during the 2015-2016 Assessment Cycle.

## **PCI for 2016-2017 Assessment Cycle**

### **Closing Summary:**

#### **Concerning Advising:**

Unfortunately, there was no success during 2015-2016 academic year in the search for an adequate online advising system. As such, SAM Center personnel will continue investigating possible technological avenues to handle this need. In contrast, there was success regarding the identification of students enrolled in 100% online courses; therefore, no further action will be taken at this time. Regarding perception-based assessment of advising, SAM Center personnel created and administered a new advising-student survey during the 2015-2016 year. This survey allowed the SAM Center to capture the numbers of advising sessions, response rates to the surveys, and general student perceptions relating to their advising experiences. These data will serve as the baseline for comparison in the 2016-2017 academic year.

#### **Concerning Academic Improvement Mentoring (AIM), First Alert, and Study Skills:**

Although SAM Center personnel designed and implemented assessment plans for the Academic Improvement Mentoring (AIM), First Alert, and Study Skills programs, there were unforeseen issues regarding data collection that prevented timely data analysis that, in turn, prevented interpretation and evaluation of the findings. As such, data findings were not included in this assessment (2015-2016) cycle due to the lack of adequate time and confusion regarding office data needs and campus data suppliers. To avoid future time and data complications, assessment cycles, starting with 2016-2017, will use data from the previous year, thereby circumventing potential data and analysis hurdles.

#### **Concerning Presentations & Workshops (P&W):**

The 2015-2016 assessment cycle represented the first assessment of presentations and workshops at the SAM Center. As such, the results of the perception survey process will serve as the benchmark for future assessment comparison. Given this, the SAM Center will strive to increase campus outreach (i.e., # of presentations) to enhance student knowledge of our programs. This will be assessed in the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. Additionally, the SAM Center will strive to present to a greater number of courses/organizations to enhance outreach and communication regarding department services.

**Concerning Professional Growth and Training (PG&T):**

In an attempt to create a more in depth and hopefully a more professionally meaningful evaluation process in the office, SAM Center mentoring personnel constructed 360-degree evaluation processes for student workers and professional mentors. The 360-degree student worker evaluation will be implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year. Student reports will be presented, but with redacted information to protect student worker confidentiality. The 360-degree mentor evaluation process, however, will be shelved indefinitely given the concern regarding application of the process along with questions concerning interpretation of the questions as well as the applicability of the process to the existing required staff evaluation process on campus.

Regarding professional presentations, this year’s assessment cycle (2015-2016) will serve as the point of comparison for next year’s assessment. SAM Center personnel will strive to present more papers/topics/workshops during the 2016-2017 academic year than the 2015-2016 academic year. Moreover, the department will urge a greater number of individuals to present at conferences, as professional growth is one of the SAM Center’s central goals and having more people establishing themselves as authorities in fields related to the SAM Center is thrice beneficial: (a) personnel develop research and speaking skills and enhance knowledge in their fields, (b) the SAM Center benefits from this added growth in its advisors and mentors, and (c) this enhances the reputation of the university by boosting external perceptions of university personnel, specifically in the realm of its advising and academic support services and leadership.

-----