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| **ACADEMIC AND STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES UNITS****INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT REPORTING TEMPLATE** |
| **Office/Department/Unit Name:**  Click or tap here to enter your unit’s name |
| **Completed by:** Click or tap here to enter your name | **Report date:**  Click or tap here to enter date |
| **Academic/Fiscal year for which the results are reported:** Select from drop-down |
| **RESULTS SECTION****Additional guidelines and examples are available at ipa.fsu.edu. Email your questions to** **ipa@fsu.edu** |
| **Component** | **Instructions** | **Example** | **Your Content** |
| **Results Statement** | **Present the aggregated information/data regarding the levels at which the Program Outcome (PO) was achieved.** The results should be largely quantitative, with ample methodological details. Provide counts and percentages out of total where appropriate and compare to last year’(s’) results for context. | *The quality of provided advising services was measured via a survey. In 2018-19 academic year (Fall 2018 and Spring 2019), 1,014 students responded to the survey. Out of them, 724 self-reported that they were ‘very satisfied’ and 184 self-reported that they were ‘satisfied’ with their academic advisor’s about liberal studies, major, and university wide requirements. In summary, 89.5% of students who were surveyed and responded indicated that they were satisfied.**Compared to the student satisfaction level of 88.1% in 2017-18 academic year, a greater proportion of students reported satisfaction this year. The goal/benchmark for the 2018-19 year to increase the satisfaction level to 90.0% was not achieved, but there is a positive trend indicating improvement.* | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Analysis of Results** | **Determine the reason(s) why the PO was attained at this particular level: state factors (actions/people/events) that negatively and/or positively influenced the results.** Analysis should: 1) be focused on the take-aways from internal discussions or investigations regarding the data, 2) form the link between the data and the improvement plan, 3) highlight areas of success in addition to areas needing improvement. Provide an evaluation of the assessment process if it needs to be changed. | *We believe that the increase in student satisfaction levels was due to the enhancements to the training resources provided to the academic advisors in the Advising First program. Specifically, before the start of the 2018-19 academic year, every continuing advisor participated in the refresher training and every new advisor participated in an enhanced training that included a new module explaining how to best address frequently occurring issues.* *We hypothesize that the increase in student satisfaction level was not as high as we set out to achieve because of a high turn-over rate. About 1/5 of Advising First academic advisors voluntarily separated from their positions in the 2017-18 academic year, which required hiring 12 new employees to fill the vacancies. The newly hired advisors were not as experienced and therefore their student ratings were not as high. The voluntarily separated advisors cited inadequate pay as one of their main reasons for leaving.* | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Improvement Plan** | **Describe a detailed plan of action to improve or sustain performance in the next year(s).** If the goal/ benchmark was not met, develop an improvement plan, which may range from small-scale enhancements to significant changes in unit’s operations. Improvement plans may also include new or modified assessment approaches, changes to job responsibilities, purchasing third-party products, adopting new practices, attitudes and behaviors. If the PO is consistently achieved at a high level, you may increase the desired goal/ benchmark, focus on a different aspect of the same PO, derive a new PO that would address other important aspects of the University’s mission, etc.  | *In order to continue improving student satisfaction levels with their academic advising services, the Assistant Director of Advising First program will design and oversee the training for new advisors and the Director will request increases in salary of the advisors whose compensation is below the median in their job class.**For additional details, please see the two attached supporting documents:*1. *The draft of the training protocol designed specifically for first-year advisors. It contains description of the new one-on-one peer mentoring program and outlines specific conversation topics to be covered during weekly meetings with supervisor,*
2. *Salary analysis of all currently employed advisors and recommended increases. The 17 advisors whose compensation is below the median will be prioritized in salary increase considerations.*
 | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **PLAN SECTION****Only fill out the Plan Section when editing methodology for existing Program Outcomes (POs) or creating brand new POs** |
| **Component** | **Instructions** | **Example** | **Your Content** |
| **PO Name** | **Provide a succinct name for the Program Outcome (PO).** Add “PO – “ to the name. | *PO – Academic advising services* | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **PO Statement** | **Identify the expected outcome that your administrative unit will strive to achieve.** POs should be focused on your unit’s most important contributions to advancing the university, including its [mission](https://www.fsu.edu/about/mission-vision.html#:~:text=The%20university%20is%20dedicated%20to,free%20inquiry%20and%20embraces%20diversity.) and strategic goals. POs may directly align with, or indirectly support, [FSU Strategic Plan](https://strategicplan.fsu.edu/), [state funding metrics](https://ir.fsu.edu/matrix_of_metrics.aspx), your Division strategic plan, and/or your unit’s mission and values. A PO should be chosen because of its assumed or proven positive impact on faculty and student success. | *The quality of academic advising sessions provided by Advising First advisors to students will be high.* | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Assessment Process** | **Describe how the assessment of the PO will be conducted.** Assessment methodology should be focused on accurately measuring the extent to which an academic/student support unit achieved the established Outcome. The unit may choose to assess a micro-level PO through measuring the efficiency of unit’s day-to-day operations, quality of provided services, number of individuals who received support, etc. Macro-level POs are typically the university-level final ‘products’ that unit-level activities support such as faculty and student gains/benefits resulting from receiving the unit’s services, including those of educational nature. Assessment of POs should be methodologically sound, reliable and consistent to allow for year-over-year comparison. When designing an assessment methodology, it is useful to adhere to the S.M.A.R.T. guidelines – POs should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound. | *The quality of provided advising services will be measured via a post-advising session survey, the link to which will be sent to students through email. Student responses will be aggregated per academic year defined as Fall and Spring terms.**The survey was created internally several years ago and is being used to measure various aspects of advising meetings. It contains several items/questions. The question that will be used to measure this PO asks students to rate on a 5-point Likert scale the following statement: “How satisfied were you with your advisor’s knowledge about liberal studies, major, and university wide requirements?”* | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Goal/ Benchmark** | **Specify a measurable standard that defines success.** When units decide how high they should set the PO goal/benchmark, they should study relevant industry standards, performance of similar units at peer institutions, and/or review the unit’s own past levels of achieving the PO. The goal/benchmark should be set at the level that is ambitious, yet achievable with some effort. Over years, goal(s)/ benchmark(s) for the same PO may be changed: if you choose to increase/ decrease the goal/benchmark, record those changes and specify the timeframe. | *According to the most recent available data, 88% of students who were surveyed and responded indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with advisor's knowledge. Over the next five years, we want to increase this number to at least 93%.**Baseline: 2016-17 = 88% satisfaction rate**Year 1 Plan: 2017-18 = at least 89%**Year 2 Plan: 2018-19 = at least 90%**Year 3 Plan: 2019-20 = at least 91%**Year 4 Plan: 2020-21 = at least 92%**Year 5 Plan: 2021-22 = at least 93%* | Click or tap here to enter text. |