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.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Advising - Distance & Online Services Action

Action Description:

The SAM Center should pilot an online advising process during the 2017-2018 academic year.

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.

Last academic year's (15-16) was the first year the response rate was tracked, so it will serve as the baseline for this year's (16-17) assessment cycle. A such, the goal for the 16-17 academic year is to increase the response rate by 5% by stressing to the advisees the importance of their feedback and comments.

Attached Files

📄 Advising Feedback Survey

Results Description:

The table below indicates the baseline data (15-16 academic year) and the current assessment data (16-17 academic year).

Term	# of Surveys Returned	# of Advising Sessions	Response Rate*
Fall 2015	4,192	11,803	35.50%
Fall 2016	285	13,242	2.15%
% Change	-93.20%	12.19%	-93.94%
Spring 2016**	2,982	22,081	13.50%
Spring 2017	962	22,149	4.34%
% Change	-67.74%	0.31%	67.85%
15-16 Academic Year	7,174	33,884	32.20%
16-17 Academic Year	1,247	35,391	3.52%
% Change	-82.62%	4.45%	-89.07%

Data was gathered from the ADVS report in Banner, and represents all advising sessions conducted in the SAM Center in the Fall (August-December) and Spring (January-May) regardless of type of advising session or semester of intended coursework (spring, summer, or fall).

*Response Rate = # of Surveys Returned / # of Advising Sessions

**Spring 2016 advising totals were adjusted to reflect the new calculation of advising totals.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Advising - Feedback Survey Response Rate Action
Action Description:
Upon visual inspection of the data, it is evident that the intended boost to retention did not occur.

Upon investigation, it was discovered that surveys were either not handed out at all or only a handful were dispersed to the advisees during 6 months of the 10 month assessment period (August-December and January-May). To say the least, this is an issue.

Student workers, whose responsibility it is to hand these paper surveys out, were counseled regarding the importance of the surveys.

Moreover, this has broached a different subject regarding a more effective way to seek advisee feedback. For 2017-2018, the SAM Center will look into digital modes of survey tracking, hopefully using technology that already exists on campus to lessen the financial impact on the department.

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 is the average rating for each of the 4 items (e.g., Strongly Agree = 5, Strongly Disagree = 1), which is below:

Item	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Spring 2016	Spring 2017	2015-2016	2016-2017
The advisor was knowledgeable	4.71	4.7	4.73	4.73	4.72	4.72
The advisor explained my degree plan and requirements	4.66	4.67	4.68	4.7	4.67	4.69
The advisor answered my questions	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.77	4.75	4.76
I am satisfied with my advising session	4.73	4.71	4.74	4.75	4.74	4.74

The number of surveys submitted dropped drastically from last year (i.e., -82.62%). However, the overall comparisons remained relatively the same, which lends validity to the survey. That being said, there was no marked change from one year to the next, so this survey may be placed on hold for the next assessment cycle.

Additionally, each of the four items can be broken down by the number/percent of the students who scored the advisor/advising session at each of the five levels. This data is in the attached pdf.

Attached Files

📄 Advising Assessment 16-17_Item Response

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Advising - Students' Perception of Academic Advising Action

Action Description:

As there was a tremendous in-house error regarding the dissemination of the feedback surveys, this will have to be remedied for the next assessment cycle.

1. First, the student workers, who hand out the surveys, will be constantly reminded and supervised to make sure they are handing out the surveys as needed.
2. Also, given the difficulties of communications, and the digital age in which we find ourselves, the SAM Center will investigate additional avenues of advisee surveying. Namely, we will look into a digital process for surveying the students in hopes of improving the accuracy, validity, and timeliness of the data.

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:

One-semester persistence rates are not yet available. Persistence rates from fall 2015 to spring 2016 and spring 2016 to fall 2016 will be reported during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

AIM - Participants' 1-semester Persistence Rates Action

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:

Fall 2015: KPI met for suspended and proba on groups but not met for good standing group.

FALL 2015 BEGINNING ACADEMIC STANDING	PARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE COURSE COMPLETION RATE	NONPARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE COURSE COMPLETION RATE (based upon control groups)
Suspended	74%	54%
Proba on	81%	68%
Good Standing	76%	88%

Due to student worker error in collec ng the data that help define treatment groups, Spring 2016 data requests were not submi ed. The Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 data requests will be submi ed during Fall 2017. All available data from these requests will be reported during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle.

AIM - Participants' Course Completion Rates Action

Action Description:

We will review two to three more semesters of data during the next cycle to determine the trend for each group of students (i.e., with academic statuses of suspended, probationary, and good standing).

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:

Fall 2015: KPI met for suspended and proba on groups but not met for good standing group.

FALL 2015 BEGINNING ACADEMIC STANDING	PARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE GP GAINS	NONPARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE GP GAINS (based upon control groups)
Suspended	+5.42	-2.26
Proba on	+7.24	+3.78
Good Standing	+4.88	+9.44

Due to student worker error in collecting the data that helps define treatment groups, Spring 2016 data requests were not submitted. The Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 data requests will be submitted during Fall 2017. All available data from these requests will be reported during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle.

AIM - Participants' Grade Point (GP) Gains Action

Action Description:

We will review two to three more semesters of data during the next cycle to determine the trend for each group of students (i.e., with academic statuses of suspended, probationary, and good standing).

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:

Fall 2015: KPI met for all groups.

FALL 2015 BEGINNING ACADEMIC STANDING	PARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE GPA GAINS	NONPARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE GPA GAINS (based upon control groups)
Suspended	+0.26	+0.07
Probation	+0.41	+0.22
Good Standing	+1.28	+1.06

Due to student worker error in collecting the data that helps define treatment groups, Spring 2016 data requests were not submitted. The Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 data requests will be submitted during Fall 2017. All available data from these requests will be reported during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle.

AIM - Participants' Grade-point Average (GPA) Improvement Action
Action Description:

We will review two to three more semesters of data during the next cycle to determine the trend for each group of students (i.e., with academic statuses of suspended, probationary, and good standing).

AIM - Positive Perception of Mentoring Services

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:
To be consistent with the data from Institutional Effectiveness that we plan to report during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle, Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 survey data will also be reported during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle.

Fall 2015:

The survey's overall response rate was 31%.

KPI met for "I found the mentor meetings helpful" and "overall, I found the mentoring program helpful," but not for "I found the grade-checks helpful in monitoring my academic progress" or "I found the study skills sessions helpful to my academic performance."

Survey Item	Percentage of respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
I found the mentor meetings helpful.	86%
I found the grade-checks helpful in monitoring my academic progress.	72%
I found the study skills sessions helpful to my academic performance.	74%
Overall, I found the mentoring program helpful.	85%

KPI met for respondents selecting more "most helpful" sessions than "least helpful" sessions.

Type of Study Skills Session Selected	Number of Instances of Selection
most helpful	338
least helpful	126

KPI met for respondents referencing more "most helpful" parts than "least helpful" parts of the mentoring program and for the majority of the suggestions for improvement being bene cial to the program.

Type of Mentoring Component Referenced	Number of Instances of Reference
most helpful	128
least helpful (suggested improvements)	42

Of the 42 references to improvements, 23 (55%) were actually feasible and could be beneficial to the program. Examples of suggestions that were feasible included making study skills more interesting and relevant, as well as asking for more grade-checks. Examples of suggestions that were not feasible included mentors providing subject-specific tutoring and policies that are already in place and thus do not need to be implemented (but may be better publicized, such as the ability to meet online).

KPI met for respondents referencing more positive than negative experiences, with 95% being positive.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

AIM - Participants' Perception of Mentoring Components Action
Action Description:
We will review two to three more semesters of data during the next cycle to determine trends.

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:
To be consistent with the data from Institutional Effectiveness that we plan to report during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle, Spring 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 survey data will also be reported during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle.

Fall 2015:

The survey's overall response rate was 31%.

KPI met for all items.

Survey Item	Percentage of respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The mentor clearly explained mentoring requirements/recommendations for the semester.	91%
I felt that all mentoring staff—including front-desk and study-skills staff—treated me courteously.	87%
Overall, I was satis ed with the mentoring program.	86%

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

Action Action Description:

We will review two to three more semesters of data during the next cycle to determine trends.

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.

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.

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:

There was a 14.7% increase in the number of First Alert referrals from fall 2015 – fall 2016. From spring 2016 – spring 2017, there was a 28.4% increase in the number of referrals. Altogether, there was a 21.2% increase in referrals from the 2015 – 2016 to the 2016 – 2017 assessment cycle.

While the number of referrers did increase for the entire academic year, the growth was minimal. During the fall 2016 semester, 142 professors issued alerts, which is ten more than the number who referred in the fall semester of the year prior. During the spring 2017 semester, 135 professors referred students to the First Alert program, which is only one more than the number of professors who referred during the spring semester of the previous year.

Semester	Number of Referrals	Number of Referrers
Fall 2015	656	132
Spring 2016	584	134
Fall 2016	753	142
Spring 2017	750	135

First Alert - Increase Referrals and Referrers

Action Action Description:

Both the number of referrals and the number of referrers increased. The hope is that this trend will continue so the First Alert program is used by far more than 10% of campus instructors.

The Texas Legislature passed House Bill 2223 recently. In response, the university is activating a progress report function in EAB's SSC software (MSP). This function is tied to the Alert system. This means that the First Alert program will be receiving anywhere from 0 (assuming every students is doing phenomenally) to over 2000 new referrals in the fall semester alone. The goal in the office is to train a new hire to help facilitate these referrals.

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:
A benchmark has been established for the response rate of students referred during the upcoming assessment cycle. Although the number of First Alerts issued has been steadily growing each semester since 2013-2014, the number of referred students reached has been in decline. The average number of referrals received during a fall semester is 587, a number exceeded during fall 2016, in which 753 referrals were issued. However, the average percentage of students reached for fall semesters is 61.96%. During fall 2016, only 48.34% of the referred students were reached. During the spring 2017 semester, the number of referrals rose from 329 during the previous year to 385 referrals. However, the percentage of referred students reached fell from 56% during the year prior to 51%. Furthermore, phone is the method of outreach by which the majority of First Alert referred students are reached, with the average number of respondents reached by phone being 58.76%.

Semester	Number of Referrals	Number of Referred Students Reached	Percentage of Referred Students Reached
Fall 2015	656	364	55.49%
Fall 2016	753	364	48.34%
Spring 2016	584	329	56.34%
Spring 2017	750	385	51.33%

Semester	Number of Students Reached	Number Reached via E-mail	Percentage Reached via E-mail	Number Reached by Phone	Percentage Reached by Phone	Number Interviewed	Percentage Interviewed
Fall 2015	364	95	26.10%	194	53.30%	75	20.60%
Fall 2016	364	41	11.26%	277	76.10%	46	12.64%
Spring 2016	329	83	25.23%	176	53.50%	70	21.28%
Spring 2017	385	49	12.73%	250	64.94%	86	22.34%

First Alert - Increase Response Rate Action
Action Description:
To increase the response rate, the First Alert program will incorporate a texting option housed in the EAB SSC's software (MSP). This will be the second step in the outreach, after the initial email and before the phone call. Given the connection between students and their cell phones, we hope this will increase the likelihood of response.

Additionally, the Texas Legislature passed House Bill 2223 recently. In response, the university is activating a progress report function in MSP. This function is tied to the Alert system. This means that the First Alert program will be receiving anywhere from 0 (assuming every students is doing phenomenally) to over 2000 new referrals in the fall semester alone.

Given the potential influx of Alerts into the First Alert program, next year's goal will be to maintain the response rate at its current 55-60% level.

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.

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:

KPI met: From the fall 2015 semester to spring 2016, First Alert respondents persisted at a 6% higher rate than did non-respondents.

- Persistence Rate for Control Group (referred students who were not reached)
  56%

- Persistence Rate for Treatment Group (referred students who responded to outreach) 62%

First Alert – Participants' 1-semester Persistence Rates Action
Action Description:

Persistence among First Alert respondents was 6% higher than non-respondents. The goal for the fall semester is to boost respondents' persistence rate to 10% higher than non-respondents.

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 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:

KPI met: For the fall 2015 semester, 41% of respondents received a "D" or "F" grade in the course for which they were referred, compared to 48.7% of non-respondents who received a final grade of "D" or "F". For the spring 2016 semester, 48.7% of respondents received a "D" or "F" grade in the course for which they were referred, compared to 55.6% of non-respondents who finished the course for which they were referred with a "D" or "F".

Semester	Participation Status	Percentage of D/F Recipients
Fall 2015	Non-Respondents	48.7%
Fall 2015	Respondents	41.0%
Spring 2016	Non-Respondents	55.6%
Spring 2016	Respondents	48.7%

First Alert – Positive Effect on Participants' Course Grades Action
Action Description:

First Alert non-respondents received approximately 7% more "D" and "F" grades in the courses associated with their referrals in both fall and spring semesters than did those students who responded to First Alert outreach. The goal for the next assessment cycle is for respondents to earn 10% fewer "D" and "F" grades than non-respondents.

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:

KPI met: The mean SHSU GPA for First Alert respondents at the close of the fall 2015 semester was 2.01, whereas non-respondents' mean SHSU GPA at the close of the term was 1.89. In the spring 2016 semester, First Alert respondents' mean SHSU GPA was 2.00, whereas the mean SHSU GPA for First Alert non-respondents was 1.79.

Semester	Participation Status	Mean SHSU Pre GPA	Mean SHSU Post GPA
Fall 2015	Non-Respondents	2.25	1.89
Fall 2015	Respondents	2.31	2.01
Spring 2016	Non-Respondents	2.02	1.79
Spring 2016	Respondents	2.12	2.00

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

First Alert – Positive Effect on Participants' Semester Grade-point Average (GPA) Action

Action Description:

First Alert respondents' outperformed non-respondents in mean SHSU GPA in the fall and spring semesters. Interestingly, respondents' mean SHSU GPA at the end of each semester was approximately a 2.00. The goal for the upcoming assessment cycle is that First Alert respondents continue producing a higher mean SHSU GPA since they are taking advantage of the academic support they are being offered.

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:

Fall 2016:

- The overall response rate for faculty was 18%

Fall 2016 Faculty Survey:

Survey Item	Percentage of respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
Contacts/Attempts Prompt	100%
Initial Feedback Timely	73%
Updated As Needed	42%
Plan To Use Again	73%
Would Recommend	77%

- The overall response rate for students was 11%

Fall 2016 Student Survey:

Survey Item	Percentage of respondents who "strongly agree," "slightly agree," or "agree"
First Alert referral demonstrated professor's care	67%
First Alert referral had a positive impact on academic performance or behavior	52%
First Alert referral provoked negative reaction	61%
Responding to First Alert increased motivation to seek a mentor's help	38%
Responding to First Alert increased motivation to seek professor's help	38%
After responding, was motivated to seek help from a tutor	26%

Spring 2017:

- The overall response rate for faculty was 21%

Spring 2017 Faculty Survey:

Survey Item	Percentage of respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
Contacts/Attempts Prompt	96%
Initial Feedback Timely	93%
Updated As Needed	79%
Plan To Use Again	93%
Would Recommend	93%

The overall response rate for students was 11%

Spring 2017 Student Survey:

Survey Item	Percentage of respondents who "strongly agree," "slightly agree," or "agree"
First Alert referral demonstrated professor's care	70%
First Alert referral had a positive impact on academic performance or behavior	64%
First Alert referral provoked negative reaction	67%
Responding to First Alert increased motivation to seek a mentor's help	31%
Responding to First Alert increased motivation to seek professor's help	40%
After responding, was motivated to seek help from a tutor	21%

First Alert – Survey Response Rate Action
Action Description:
For the upcoming assessment cycle, the goal is to increase the response rate to the faculty survey by 5% each semester by sending out two reminders following the initial invitation to provide feedback on the First Alert program. As for the student survey, respondents and non-respondents will be surveyed separately: Using the Qualtrics Survey Platform, respondents will receive an invitation via e-mail to provide feedback on First Alert upon case closure, whereas non-respondents will continue being surveyed at the close of the term through Lime Survey. Respondents who do not complete the survey after receiving the e-mail invitation will be texted a reminder to do so on a monthly basis until they complete the survey or the semester ends. Ultimately, the goal is to raise the response rate to the First Alert student surveys from 11%, the rate for both fall and spring semesters, to 15%.

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.

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.

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:

Fall 2016

Survey Items	Participants' Average Perceptions
Q1: Info Was Helpful	4.7
Q2: Presenter Was Knowledgeable	4.8
Q3: Presentation Was Well Done & Informative	4.8

Spring 2017

Survey Items	Participants' Average Perceptions
Q1: Info Was Helpful	4.6
Q2: Presenter Was Knowledgeable	4.8
Q3: Presentation Was Well Done & Informative	4.7

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

Action Description:

These numbers will serve as a benchmark for the next academic year. At that me we will assess if any differences occurred.

P&W - Promote Access to Presentations & Workshops

Performance Objective Description:

SAM Center presentations and workshops will be accessible to stakeholders.

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. 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:

Fall 2016

Survey Items	Participants' Response Rate
Q1: Info Was Helpful	98%
Q2: Presenter Was Knowledgeable	98%
Q3: Presentation Was Well Done & Informative	96%

Presentations Conducted	Number of Attendees	Number of Surveys
Mentoring	199	196
Advising	27	24

Spring 2017

Survey Items	Participants' Response Rate
Q1: Info Was Helpful	98%
Q2: Presenter Was Knowledgeable	98%
Q3: Presentation Was Well Done & Informative	98%

Presentations Conducted	Number of Attendees	Number of Surveys
Mentoring	56	56
Resources on Campus	102	84
Study Skills	65	41

P&W - Increase Attendance & Number of Presentations & Workshops Action
Action Description:
We would like to meet the benchmark for the coming academic year. Additionally, in efforts to exceed the benchmark we will work to increase the number of presentations given. In order to accomplish this goal an email will be sent out to all UNIV 1301 professors regarding possible classroom presentations. In addition, a requester's survey to ensure that we are meeting the needs of requestors.

Attached Files
📄 UNIV 1301 Email
📄 Presentation Requester survey

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.

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.

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:

Fall 2015: KPI met for all but highlighted cells.

LASSI SELF-REGULATION COMPONENT SCALES	PERCENTAGE OF **TOTAL** PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF **FACE-TO-FACE** PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF **ONLINE** PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH
Concentration	50.34%	49.81%	53.13%
Self-testing	86.21%	84.42%	96.88%
Study Aids	88.24%	87.55%	93.75%
Time Management	81.31%	80.93%	84.38%

Spring 2016: KPI met.

LASSI SELF-REGULATION COMPONENT SCALES	PERCENTAGE OF **TOTAL** PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF **FACE-TO-FACE** PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF **ONLINE** PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH
Concentration	77.29%	75.42%	89.19%
Self-testing	70.70%	67.78%	89.19%
Study Aids	74.36%	72.88%	83.78%
Time Management	80.22%	80.51%	78.38%

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

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

Action Description:

Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

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:

Fall 2015: KPI not met.

LASSI SKILL COMPONENT SCALES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 20% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF FACE-TO-FACE PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 20% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF ONLINE PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 20% GROWTH
Information Processing	38.75%	38.91%	37.50%
Selecting Main Ideas	40.83%	40.08%	46.88%
Test Strategies	26.99%	26.07%	34.38%

Spring 2016: KPI not met.

LASSI SKILL COMPONENT SCALES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 20% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF FACE-TO-FACE PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 20% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF ONLINE PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 20% GROWTH
Information Processing	36.63%	36.02%	40.54%
Selecting Main Ideas	44.69%	44.92%	43.24%
Test Strategies	35.53%	37.29%	27.03%

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

Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

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
📄 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:

Fall 2015: KPI met for the anxiety scale but not for the attitude and motivation scales.

LASSI WILL COMPONENT SCALES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF FACE-TO-FACE PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF ONLINE PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH
Anxiety	72.32%	71.98%	75.00%
Attitude	22.84%	23.74%	15.63%
Motivation	26.64%	25.68%	34.38%

Spring 2016: KPI met for all but highlighted cells.

LASSI WILL COMPONENT SCALES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF FACE-TO-FACE PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH	PERCENTAGE OF ONLINE PARTICIPANTS DEMONSTRATING AT LEAST 5% GROWTH
Anxiety	72.89%	71.61%	81.08%
Attitude	46.52%	50.00%	45.95%
Motivation	67.77%	67.80%	67.57%

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

Action Description:

Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

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.

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:

Spring 2015 to Fall 2015: KPI not met.

STUDY SKILLS SPRING 2015 COHORT	PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS PERSISTING TO FALL 2015	PERCENTAGE OF NONPARTICIPANTS PERSISTING TO FALL 2015 (based on control group)
All	77%	86%
Face-to-face	77%	n/a
Online	77%	n/a

Fall 2015 to Spring 2016 and Spring 2016 to Fall 2016 persistence data will be reported during the 2017-2018 assessment cycle.

Study Skills - Participants' 1-semester Persistence Rates Action

Action Description:

Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

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:

Fall 2015: KPI not met.

PARTICIPANTS	PARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE COURSE COMPLETION RATE	NONPARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE COURSE COMPLETION RATE (based upon control group)
Total	83.46%	86.86%
Face-to-face	82.97%	n/a
Online	86.03%	n/a

Spring 2016: KPI not met.

PARTICIPANTS	PARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE COURSE COMPLETION RATE	NONPARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE COURSE COMPLETION RATE (based upon control group)
Total	82.37%	90.20%
Face-to-face	81.11%	n/a
Online	87.47%	n/a

Study Skills - Participants' Course Completion Rates Action
Action Description:

Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

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:

Fall 2015: KPI not met.

PARTICIPANTS	PARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE GPA GAINS	NONPARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE GPA GAINS (based upon control group)
Total	+1.17	+1.27
Face-to-face	+1.24	n/a
Online	+0.81	n/a

Spring 2016: KPI not met.

PARTICIPANTS	PARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE GPA GAINS	NONPARTICIPANTS' AVERAGE GPA GAINS (based upon control group)
Total	+0.44	+0.21
Face-to-face	+0.31	n/a
Online	+0.48	n/a

Study Skills - Participants' Grade-point Average (GPA) Improvement Action
Action Description:

Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

Study Skills - Positive Perception of Services
Performance Objective Description:

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

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
📄 Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 (Face-to-Face Students)
📄 Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 (Online Students--differing items circled in red)

Results Description:

Fall 2015:

The overall response rate to the online survey was 58%.

KPI met for quiz item but not for course design item.

Survey Item	Percentage of respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The course design helped me determine the tasks to accomplish each week.	80%
The quizzes helped me gauge my understanding of the material.	91%

Spring 2016:

The overall response rate to the online survey was 63%.

KPI met.

Survey Item	Percentage of respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The course design helped me determine the tasks to accomplish each week.	92%
The quizzes helped me gauge my understanding of the material.	90%

Study Skills - Online Participants' Perception of Course Design Action

Action Description:

Course design has been slated for change anyway; we will assess data for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

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

🗋 Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 (Face-to-Face Students)
🗋 Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 (Online Students--differing items circled in red)

Results Description:

Fall 2015:
The overall response rate to the online survey was 58%.
KPI met. A total of 82% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that "the leader answered my questions in a timely manner."

Spring 2016:
The overall response rate to the online survey was 63%.
KPI met. A total of 76% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that "the leader answered my questions in a timely manner."

Study Skills - Online Participants' Perception of Leader Responsiveness Action
Action Description:

Because the decrease from fall 2015 to spring 2016 in percentage of participants who strongly agreed or agreed with the item occurred most likely due a temporary change in leadership, the benchmark will be raised to 80% based on fall 2015 results.

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

🗋 Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 (Face-to-Face Students)
🗋 Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 (Online Students--differing items circled in red)

Results Description:

Fall 2015:

The overall response rate to the survey was 80%.
The overall response rate for online students was 58%.
The overall response rate for face-to-face students was 86%.

KPI met for all but highlighted cells.

Survey Item	Percentage of **TOTAL** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of **FACE-TO-FACE** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of **ONLINE** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The program objectives were clearly stated and met	94%	95%	91%
The leader had a good understanding of the content.	95%	95%	93%
The leader engaged students in lively discussion.	88%	91%	67%
The leader used good examples to explain points and responded clearly to questions.	93%	94%	87%
The material was clearly presented.	95%	95%	96%

KPI met for open-ended item: A total of 98% of respondents referenced at least one positive leader quality (e.g., knowledgeable, caring, con dent), and results were similar for face-to-face respondents (98%) and online respondents (97%).

Spring 2016:

The overall response rate to the survey was 77%.
The overall response rate for online students was 63%.
The overall response rate for face-to-face students was 81%.

KPI met for all but highlighted cells.

Survey Item	Percentage of **TOTAL** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of **FACE-TO-FACE** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of **ONLINE** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The program objectives were clearly stated and met	95%	96%	94%
The leader had a good understanding of the content.	96%	97%	94%
The leader engaged students in lively discussion.	92%	93%	88%
The leader used good examples to explain points and responded clearly to questions.	96%	97%	92%
The material was clearly presented.	96%	96%	98%

KPI met for open-ended item: A total of 98% of respondents referenced at least one positive leader quality (e.g., knowledgeable, caring, con dent), and results were similar for face-to-face respondents (99%) and online respondents (97%).

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Program Leaders Action
Action Description:
Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

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

Results Description:

Fall 2015:

The overall response rate to the survey was 80%.
The overall response rate for online students was 58%.
The overall response rate for face-to-face students was 86%.

KPI met.

Survey Item	Percentage of **TOTAL** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of **FACE-TO-FACE** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of **ONLINE** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The program was relevant and useful to me.	87%	88%	80%
The program enhanced my study skills.	81%	82%	76%
I would recommend this group to other students.	85%	86%	80%
Participation in study skills was a valuable use of my time.	81%	82%	80%

KPI met for open-ended item: A total of 99% of respondents referenced a particular study skill taught, and results were similar for face-to-face respondents (99%) and online respondents (98%).

Spring 2016:

The overall response rate to the survey was 77%.
The overall response rate for online students was 63%.
The overall response rate for face-to-face students was 81%.

KPI met.

Survey Item	Percentage of **TOTAL** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of **FACE-TO-FACE** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of **ONLINE** respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The program was relevant and useful to me.	86%	86%	88%
The program enhanced my study skills.	77%	79%	78%
I would recommend this group to other students.	90%	88%	96%
Participation in study skills was a valuable use of my time.	82%	81%	85%

KPI met for open-ended item: A total of 99% of respondents referenced a particular study skill taught, and results were similar for face-to-face respondents (99%) and online respondents (98%).

Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Study Skills Improvement Action
Action Description:
Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

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
 Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 (Face-to-Face Students)
 Study Skills Survey Fall 2015 (Online Students--differing items circled in red)
Results Description:

Fall 2015:

The overall response rate to the survey was 80%.

The overall response rate for online students was 58%.

The overall response rate for face-to-face students was 86%.

KPI met.

Survey Item	Percentage of TOTAL respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of FACE-TO-FACE respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of ONLINE respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The material was well organized.	94%	95%	87%
The handouts were clear and easy to understand.	95%	97%	84%

KPI met for respondents selecting more "most helpful" sessions than "least helpful" sessions.

Type of Study Skills Session Selected	TOTAL Number of Instances of Selection	Number of Instances of Selection for FACE-TO-FACE respondents	Number of Instances of Selection for ONLINE respondents
most helpful	805	695	110
least helpful	321	257	64

KPI met for respondents selecting more additions to the program than subtractions.

Type of Suggestions	TOTAL Number of Unique Suggestions	Number of Unique Suggestions for FACE-TO-FACE respondents	Number of Unique Suggestions for ONLINE respondents
Additions	65	47	18
Subtractions	24	18	6

Spring 2016:

The overall response rate to the survey was 77%.

The overall response rate for online students was 63%.

The overall response rate for face-to-face students was 81%.

KPI met.

Survey Item	Percentage of TOTAL respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of FACE-TO-FACE respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"	Percentage of ONLINE respondents who "strongly agree" or "agree"
The material was well organized.	98%	97%	100%
The handouts were clear and easy to understand.	96%	97%	92%

KPI met for respondents selecting more "most helpful" sessions than "least helpful" sessions.

Type of Study Skills Session Selected	TOTAL Number of Instances of Selection	Number of Instances of Selection for FACE-TO-FACE respondents	Number of Instances of Selection for ONLINE respondents
most helpful	757	608	149
least helpful	302	246	56

KPI met for respondents selecting more additions to the program than subtractions.

Type of Suggestions	TOTAL Number of Unique Suggestions	Number of Unique Suggestions for FACE-TO-FACE respondents	Number of Unique Suggestions for ONLINE respondents
Additions	58	37	21
Subtractions	24	17	7

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Study Skills - Participants' Perception of Subject Matter Action

Action Description:
Because study skills will be offered only online during academic year 2017-2018, only results for online participants will be assessed for academic year 2016-2017 (in the 2017-2018 assessment cycle) to determine trends.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement

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

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.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

Concerning Advising:

Although the survey was created, there was a miscommunication regarding how to properly implement the surveys, thereby resulting in a very poor survey response rate which severely skewed the results. As such, communication will be increased to prevent this glitch from happening next assessment cycle.

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

Data were gathered and baselines were created. The next assessment cycle will use these baselines for future growth and assessment.

Concerning Presentations & Workshops (P&W):

Both the number of presentations and the variety of presentations were increased, thereby creating a baseline against which future assessments can be compared.

<u>**Concerning Professional Growth & Training (PG&T):**</u>

Much of the Professional Growth & Training assessment was canceled for this assessment cycle as changes in the department shifted focus for professional development.

Plan for Continuous Improvement for the SAM Center

Closing Summary:

The central goal for the SAM Center in the upcoming assessment cycle is to simply, to clarify, and to streamline the assessment plan for the office. We will refocus our assessment attempts on institutional metrics (e.g., retention, GPA, course completion rates). This will also necessitate the reformatting and rethinking of what, how, and if programs should be assessed in this system.

RELATED ITEMS

- -