

Campus Activities and Student Leadership Assessment Report 2008-2009

Common Student Learning Goal Addressed	University document to which Learning Goal is tied	Student Learning, Customer Service/Satisfaction, or Process Objective	Program or Activity targeted to measure stated objective	Expected Outcome	Instrument Utilized	Actual Outcome, using metrics (if results available)	Tentative Conclusions, Next Steps to integrate results
<p>Help prepare our students to actively participate in effecting change in their own lives and their communities.</p>	<p>Divisional Mission Statement</p>	<p>Greeks will illustrate their understanding of competencies essential for academic success and personal and organizational development.</p> <p>Competencies taken from CAS Standards and changed from program to program</p>	<p>Fall Anti-Hazing Spring Anti-Hazing And Fall 80% Greek educational event ... Each Anti-hazing will include testing of new members separately. SP 80% was presented by well known professional Greek speaker, requested by our Greeks.</p>	<p>Students will be able to explain competencies essential for positive new member activities, improved PR, Recruitment, Values congruence, confronting negative behavior in brothers/sisters and an understanding of the preconceptions our new students have.</p>	<p>Each program will have a post test to prove information retention and topical understanding</p> <p>(we used 80% correct as level of Competency)</p> <p>Each "test" is attached.</p>	<p>FA-Anti-hazing: Battling Stereotypes 83% of ORGs passed, 94% of new members passed 37% scored 100%. Most difficult question involved recruiting.</p> <p>FA 80% - Public Relations and working with national offices/consultants. 90% Passed 75% passed at 100%.</p> <p>Most missed answers were due to leaving questions blank or claiming it didn't pertain to their org.</p> <p>SP-Anti-Hazing – Greek debate: Most failed or tests couldn't be scored. Program was based on student presentations, and they were ineffective. Many questions we're answered based on bad information given during the debate.</p> <p>SP 80% - Buy in or get out – 89% passed – 21% scored 100%, 5 Orgs did not participate. Most frequently missed questions were self</p>	<p>FA-Anti-Hazing, Our Greeks know the stereotypes but feel they aren't affected. They didn't think their recruitment methods are bringing the wrong people that will be addressed in part of the fourth 80% event. New members are paying better attention then current members</p> <p>FA 80% - PR, This event was based on poor performance on end of year reports in this area, but their test scores may have been slightly affected by the lack of seriousness and attentiveness of the students.</p> <p>SP-Anti-Hazing, Debate- Most conclusions are about our presentation techniques; we cannot in future presentations assume the students know enough to teach each other, use peer</p>

						<p>reflection and stereotype questions such as “What stereotypes does my Organization specifically battle?” and “Are they (our Greeks) using stereotypes to recruit?” Most were encouraged by the topic of challenging brothers or sisters who portray negative behavior.</p>	<p>accountability and/or critical discourse. SP 80% - Buy in or get out – This presentation was done by a professional Greek speaker and it seems that our Greeks were more attentive but his topics were much deeper and our students resisted self-inspection. Our cultural Greeks scored worse on self-reflection than our majority orgs ... potentially showing that they don’t feel part of the majority Greek community.</p>
<p>Help facilitate students’ personal development</p>	<p>Divisional Mission Statement</p>	<p>Program participants will identify and integrate an awareness and understanding of various leadership styles and approaches, explore and design personal leadership approaches, critical thinking skills, creativity and motivation which enhance their personal development as leaders.</p>	<p>Pioneer Leadership Institute (Freshman Leadership Program)</p>	<p>First Semester, First-year students will describe their personal leadership styles and identify their participation in leadership activities.</p>	<p>Focus Group held during Spring Retreat for PLI Graduates.</p>	<p>80% of focus group was able to describe their leadership style correctly (3-5 months after educational portion of program. Over half described good leadership experiences they directly attribute to being involved in PLI. All students who participated in the focus group reported high levels of positive outcomes in the areas of personal understanding. 100% described changes they have made to improve their leadership styles to fit needs of the group. Many answers supported that</p>	<p>Our change of recruitment techniques brought more students to the group but our new spring activity isn’t hitting the mark of getting the students back together. We didn’t have a large enough or talkative enough focus group. They suggested a continuing program of leadership development and it was clear they didn’t seek ways of getting involved at the rate of last year’s group.</p>

						they weren't as confident in their abilities as they reported when directly asked... they reported instances of choosing not to take leadership roles or the desire to have more training.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Fraternity and Sorority Advising Programs

Program: We held three educational programs during the school year that was required for 80% of our Active Greek community. Each program had separate learning objectives based on the **Important Tenets, Current issues** and the **Student Learning and Development Outcome Domains** of the CAS standards. We randomly selected a student from each organization (selected after program's conclusion) and post-tested for understanding of the topic and information retention. We also separately tested new members from each organization to test after the Fall Anti-Hazing portion of the program giving us four separately measurable outcomes in three programs. We considered 80% correct on the post test as competent. Since each program date had different results, they will be independently described in the results section.

Results:

Program One: Fall Anti-Hazing for new members: Covered Topics including: High Risk alcohol use within the Fraternity and Sorority community; historically problematic behaviors including hazing, understanding the rights and responsibility of individuals and groups (mostly Group); recognizing and encouraging positive learning experiences (during the new member process), understanding our role as it pertains to enforcing institutional policy and how it relates to their activities. 19 of our 23 Organizations had new member classes so all results are out of 19. 7 scored 100%, one test taker did not score 80% or better. Giving examples of non-hazing activities was the most commonly missed question, which may be due to a lack of positive programs happening on our campus during recruitment. **Next Steps:** Keep up what we're doing and possibly ramp up the discussion into the more thoughtful and difficult topics with our new Greeks that we are currently not finding traction with our current Greeks.

Program One: Fall Anti-Hazing for all members: Covered Topics including: the stereo-types new students at William Paterson have for our Greeks, and how it affects the potential members and how to improve the public image of Greeks on campus. This program was presented as a game show based on family feud and included the actual results from surveys taken during new student orientation. 18 Orgs took test showing that several of our groups did not stay until the end or were non-compliant to our directives. 83% of test takers passed at an 80% level or better. Most commonly missed question was "Are we recruiting the wrong people or the right people the wrong way?" Most wrong answers took no responsibility for either wrong action. Many answers seemed to show a lack of accountability for their own issues. **Next Steps:** We may need to find new ways to instill responsibility in our Greeks with their problems. Our fourth presentation will cover some of these topics.

Program Two: Fall 80% educational: covered topics including: Public Relations issues in Greek life and how to use public relations to your advantage. Also how to work with national offices and traveling consultants to the benefit of the organizations and its membership was covered. 75% of our tested orgs scored 100% on the test and 90% scored a passing grade of 80% or better. Most wrong answers were either left blank or considered not applicable to the org filling out the test, neither of which is valid. This program received the most complaints from our Greek community as not being valuable even though we based this program on the lack of ability in these areas in the annual reports from the prior year. The professional staff in attendance felt the topics were covered well and the presenter was very capable in both the topics and the ability to present in a fun and engaging way. The complaints may be showing us that the students are

unaware or don't care about their needs to present a better image and also have better relationships with their national offices. We are also aware of several of our multi-cultural groups unsure of our presenter's ability to speak to their cultural issues. This was not supported by either the understandings of our professional staff or the test results. **Next Steps:** We need to find ways to improve the trust with our multi-cultural Greeks in the educational process of our events and all Greeks must learn to trust that we know what they need topically.

Program Three: Spring Anti-hazing: the Greek Debate. We used an idea from a Greek leadership conference to highlight the problems in Greek life by asking the students to debate the merits of Greek life in an objective way. Many of our Greeks did not buy into this exercise and either chose to tune out or based their arguments on misleading or downright wrong facts. This made our tests practically un-scoreable. When Greeks are making arguments that "we don't drink" and "we throw more programs than anyone else on campus", we must consider them wrong for agreeing with the presenter on the instrument, but they were the most common arguments for keeping Greek life on campus. At this level of competency almost all groups failed. **Next Steps:** We learned not to trust our students to hold each other accountable or to have enough self-understanding to present meaningful discussions on the topics. It quickly became like a pep rally for a losing team.

Program four: Spring 80% - Buy in or get out presented by David Stollman, this was the least attended program and several of our groups sent no members (which they will be sanctioned for). The concepts of this lecture are summed up by the speaker himself as:

Fraternity and sorority leaders often face the challenge of cleaning up after members who don't 'get it'. Cliques, apathy, fighting, poor appreciation for ritual, and members who belong for the wrong reasons are all obstacles in the way of achieving success. Cleaning up negative images and solving internal problems take away from time otherwise devoted to positive, productive accomplishments. David Stollman confronts these members, telling them to "Buy In or Get Out!"

The concepts are delivered as a calling out of our Greeks behaviors and a challenge to live a life more congruent to the values of the Greek orgs. He shows that Greeks have image problems by discussing national issues and then showing local examples of similar behavior. This "calling out" of our Greeks was taken well by some and not by others. David followed up with personal examples of his Greek experiences and then gave tools to challenge bad behavior. The answers given by the students seem to reflect the inability of the students to see themselves as part of the problem. They were prepared to talk about how they plan of confronting bad behavior, but couldn't list the stereotypes they themselves need to battle or how they are contributing to the stereotypes. It seems that they are willing and able to blame others for their issues but not correct their own behaviors.

Leadership Programs:

Program: The goal of the Pioneer Leadership Institute (PLI) is to educate select first year students about the theories behind non-positional leadership. The students were recruited during the orientation program and we had a great response to these new methods. All Students then attend three class sessions during the same week of the Fall semester (we held two separate sections of classes, one in September and one in November). Students were then invited back for a spring program which included some action based service and reflection of the first semester, we also included in this part the focus group which tested their ability to retain and use the concepts learned during the Fall semester. The backbone of the curriculum is the Social Change Model of Leadership, which

views leadership as a process that focuses on the interrelation of the self, group, and community at large. The program begins by assisting the students in identifying their own leadership strengths, using the Leadership Process Inventory. The program focuses on each student's role in groups as a leader. Also the program included the area of citizenship and explored what it means to be a good citizen and how each student can be more responsible to the community.

Results:

20% of graduates participated in the focus group and spring activity. The returning group seemed to be made up of the students who didn't get heavily involved in the spring semester and had the time to spend a weekend day with PLI. The Group was quite introverted and did not include many of the students we know have grown in their leadership roles. Participants expressed increased involvement and spoke more clearly on their shortcomings as leaders than we expected. Both their actions and abilities to talk about their leadership issues showed great improvement in their abilities but their perceptions of this improvement and self-confidence may still be lagging behind.

Next Steps:

We were very happy with the improved numbers of students participating in the program and feel our recruitment techniques are on the right track. The spring program needs to still be improved and if possible, include a "classroom" series along with the retreat. We also may need to add to the retreat something "fun" to entice more graduates. We still wish to include a mentoring experience using former graduates of PLI to work with the current PLI classes.