

**Humboldt State University  
Residence Life  
2013-2014 Annual Report**

**1.A. Mission/Brief Description of Services**

State your department's mission (statement that outlines the purpose and/or guiding principles of your department) and briefly describe the services/activities provided. Explain the program's impact on student success and how the program supports the broader university's mission.

**Narrative**

The Residence Life Program at Humboldt State University stands apart from other residential programs in the CSU system due to the location of the campus and student population. As a residential campus in a rural setting, our program faces unique opportunities and challenges with a student population that is several hundred miles from home. We strive to provide a safe and welcoming environment for students to be successful in academics and have purposeful growth as they matriculate.

**FAST FACTS ABOUT HSU RESIDENCE LIFE**

- Serves an on-campus residential population of more than 2000 students;
- Offers 11 themed living options for students, centered on similar academic, cultural, or personal interests;
- Employs about 60 students each year that reflect the diversity found in Humboldt State University and the state of California;
- Engages students in a robust leadership model consisting of one general student council: Resident Housing Association (RHA), six local governance councils, and six special interest councils: Residents of Culture Council (ROCC), Residences Official Board of Technology (ROBOT), Queers and Allies (Q & A), Active Minds, National Residence Hall Honorary (NRHH), Residence Programming Board (RPB);
- Adjudicates over 1700 violations of housing policy in an educational student conduct setting to maintain a safe and academically focused living environment;
- Provides over 500 events for students each academic year focusing on academic success, community building and social networking, conflict management, and supporting the mission of the institution and department;

**STUDENT STAFF**

Residence Life has over 60 student staff that work for the office. All student staff in Residence Life are required to maintain a minimum GPA of 2.25. Our average GPA for the 2013-2014 academic year was a 3.0. Residence Life student positions go through a two week training preceding the fall semester and one week training in the spring semester. These students serve in a variety of different capacities:

Community Advocates (40) – These positions are comparable to Resident Advisors at other institutions and serve as a live-in resource for residents. These student staff members provide day-to-day support for residents and maintain a safe living area. All CAs must complete our community development model which includes interviews with

residents, curricular event planning, and maintaining a regular academically focused spaces in the living area. CAs are also present in the community after hours and enforce housing and university policy to maintain safety.

Living Learning Community Advisors (4) – These unique positions are designed to provide additional programmatic support for special living areas. These positions are only provided for living areas that are directly in-line with the mission of the department and are primarily found in the communities that involve identity development or intensive administrative planning. They are found in the Rainbow Community, International Living, Natural Resources and Sciences, and Outdoor Adventures and Community Service (O.A.C.S.).

Student Assistants (9) – These positions primarily provide administrative support to Residence Life Coordinators and peer mentoring to the student staff members. Depending on the area, the position responsibilities may vary due to the needs of the Residence Life Coordinator.

Residence Sustainability Advisor (1) – This position is a student staff member that serves all of housing in promoting awareness and planning events regarding energy consumption. This position is co-supervised by the Lead Maintenance and a Residence Life Coordinator.

## **PROFESSIONAL STAFF**

Residence Life has eight full time staff members that compose the professional staff team. In 2012-2013 there were six Residence Life Coordinators (RLCs), one Area Coordinator (AC), and one Assistant Director (AD). Most RLCs are assigned a living area that they are primarily responsible. The management and leadership of this area includes student staff supervision, facility stewardship, oversight of community development, leadership development through area councils, and addressing student conduct. The position also includes special projects that are essential to the operation of Residence Life, the Department, or the University. One RLC did not have a residential area, but focused on programmatic functions such as the RAMP program and engagement activities in housing. All RLCs “live-in” and serve on a rotational duty to respond to after hour issues and emergencies in housing.

Due to the critical role of this position, the hiring of the right people for this position is essential. Many of our resources and time in the spring semester are dedicated to finding well prepared applicants and individuals we can trust to think critically and make good decisions after hours. The live-in and duty aspect of the position makes these positions uniquely challenging and increases the likelihood of burnout. However, the position is also well supported by the department with a plethora of professional development opportunities and focus on self-care. It is typically viewed as a position that an employee can explore different elements of student affairs to determine if this is the career pathway they would like to pursue and prepare for their next step in the field.

## **1.B. Description of Program Goals and Learning Outcomes for Year Under Review**

*Goals* (broad, general statements about what the program intends to accomplish) must include corresponding *objectives* (statements that describe ways to achieve goals) and/or *learning outcomes* (statements that describe ways to achieve desired learning). Discuss how the goals and WASC themes of the university (see University Vision, Mission, and Values-found in the University's Strategic Plan-link in the URL sources below) are integrated into the program. If the program goals have changed since the last self-evaluation, explain how and why they have changed. Goals may have objectives, learning outcomes, or in some cases both goals and objectives.

Example:

GOAL (state the goal and describe how it supports department mission)

Objective (state the objective and how it supports the goal)

SLO (state the learning outcome, "As a result of \_\_\_\_, students should be able to \_\_\_\_,  
and how it supports the goal)

### **Narrative**

The Residence Life professional staff team gathers during the late summer to determine the direction of our program for the upcoming year. This includes setting goals and learning outcomes that are then evaluated at a mid-year meeting in January before the start of the spring semester. The final assessment is completed during the end of the year retreat at the conclusion of the academic year. In 2013-2014, the goal and learning outcomes were designed to work together by both focusing on academic success.

### **LEARNING OUTCOME**

The learning outcome was the same as 2012-2014 and is discussed in greater detail in section 1E:

"Residents who attend an academic success program provided by Residence Life will be able to identify at least one way in which the information presented during the program can be applied toward achieving their academic goals."

### **GOAL**

The goal for Residence Life was designed to improve study incentive initiatives and pair well with the Learning Outcome. In particular, objectives were created regarding the Study Bucks program:

"We will review the effectiveness and relevancy of the Study Bucks program, and update it to reflect the needs of the HSU residential student population."

Objectives included:

- Outline Current Study Bucks Program. Assigned to Joselle Bannie to be completed in October.
- Obtain, Review, and analyze data on HSU Residential Students. RAMP, Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and institutional research as resource. Assigned to Elijah Carr to be completed in November.

- Research best practices on Academic Incentive Programs. Assigned to Brittany Henry to be completed in November.
- Assess knowledge of existence and use by residents. To be completed by Heather Pearson and Roger by December.
- Review information and make recommendations for changes at the Mid-Year Meeting.

Due to two staff members leaving at mid-year, Elijah Carr and Brittany Henry, the objectives for this goal were not accomplished. When the mid-year meeting was going to be spent reviewing information and making recommendations, it was used to train new Residence Life Coordinators. Subsequent years will feature broader goals that will remain the same and relate to the entire department of housing.

### **1.C. Enrollment/Participant Data**

Demographic profile of student enrollment/participants by majors, class level, and enrollment status (part-time vs. full-time). Analysis of the data should disaggregate by ethnicity, gender, abilities, veteran status, remediation, foster youth, first generation, income level. Compare enrollment/participation with HSU enrollment and participant data. In your discussion and interpretation, consider how you use this data to make programmatic decisions and to what extent diversity goals are met.

### **Narrative**

Statistics for this section are taken from the 10 year Student Census Data set.

#### **FAST FACTS**

- Most students live on-campus during their HSU experience, usually during the first year;
- Underrepresented students are more likely to live on-campus during their first and subsequent years;
- First-year male students are more likely to live off-campus than first-year female students;
- Geographic place of origin is a strong indicator if a student will live on-campus.

#### **ON-CAMPUS STUDENTS**

The resident student population at Humboldt State University is comprised of both first time undergraduate and continuing students. Facilities for these students have a maximum capacity of 2023. In the fall of 2013, 61% of the students living on campus were first time undergraduate students. First time undergraduate resident students totaled 1192, representing 89% of all first time undergraduate students, and continuing resident students totaled 766, representing 11% of all other students.

More resident students identify as female (58%) than male (41%). (These percentages were calculated by converting first year and all other student percentages of male and female students to numbers, then adding them and determining their percentages overall. Due to rounding, the numbers do not add up to 100%.)

First time undergraduate resident students come largely from outside of Humboldt County. The largest subset of resident students come from Los Angeles region (44%), followed by the San Francisco Bay (14%), San Diego (10%), Northern California (8%), Central California (7%), Western Undergraduate Exchange states (7%), Sacramento (5%), Coast (3%), other states (2%), local (1%), and international (0%) regions.

Underrepresented minority students live on campus at higher proportions than those who live off-campus. Almost half (46%) of resident students are underrepresented minority (URM) students. When broken down further, 50% of first time undergraduate students and 41% of all other students identified as URM. These percentages have increased steadily since 2008.

#### Underrepresented Minority Students Living On-Campus

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
First Time Undergraduate	20%	31%	38%	42%	48%	50%
All Others	20%	22%	29%	37%	38%	41%

More than half (56%) of first time undergraduate resident students identify as first generation students and more than one-third (37%) of first time undergraduate students are classified as low income.

#### First Generation Resident Students

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
First Time Undergraduate	40%	41%	44%	48%	49%	56%

#### Low Income Resident Students

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013
First Time Undergraduate	19%	22%	30%	30%	32%	37%

### OFF-CAMPUS STUDENTS

Students who live off-campus are more likely to be continuing students, from the local region:

- 89% of continuing students live off campus
- 30% of continuing students living off campus are URM students.
- 48% of first time undergraduates living off campus are from the local region.
- 12% of first time undergraduate students with low income status live off campus.
- 34% of first time undergraduate students living off campus are URM students.

### ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The resident student demographic is changing. Specifically, the percentage of low income, underrepresented minority, and first-generation students have increased significantly in the past

few years. Housing may need to explore how effectively it meets the needs of this new demographic, and make modifications, as necessary. This might be an area for professional development for staff within housing and for the entire division.

**1.D. Student Retention & Engagement**

Reports can include graduation rates, satisfaction surveys, etc. Analysis of the data should disaggregate by ethnicity, gender, abilities, veteran status, remediation, foster youth, first generation, income level). Compare retention and engagement with HSU retention and engagement data. In your discussion and interpretation, consider how the data supports or conflicts with university retention efforts.

**Narrative**

Statistics for this section are taken from the Census Data set and the 2014 Annual Housing Satisfaction Survey.

**FAST FACTS**

- Students who live on-campus during their first fall semester are 5% more likely to persist to their second year and nearly 4% more likely to graduate within six years.
- First year students continue to be engaged at higher rates than other students (see last year’s report). 74% of freshmen survey respondents have attended a residence hall program, compared to 61% of all other students.
- When viewing engagement by ethnicity, levels mirror the general demographics of HSU.

**RETENTION**

Resident students persist at higher rates than non-resident students. Across ten years, spanning from 2003 to 2012, the fall semester resident student cohorts were retained at an average of 74.9% compared to the fall semester non-resident student cohort, who were retained at an average of 70%. The only year in this span in which the non-resident cohort was retained at a higher rate was fall 2012, during which the resident student cohort was retained at 77.1% compared to the non-resident student cohort who was retained at 80%, 7.9% higher than the next highest cohort.

Retention Rates for Fall 2003 – Fall 2012 Cohorts

	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012
On Campus	77.4%	71.9%	77.7%	75.3%	74.5%	72.9%	74.6%	74.1%	73.8%	77.1%
Off Campus	69.0%	65.6%	67.9%	71.4%	65.7%	65.8%	72.1%	71.8%	68.1%	80.0%

Additionally, students who lived on campus during their first fall semester at HSU graduate within six years at higher rates than those who lived off campus during their first fall semester. Across ten years, spanning from 1998 to fall 2007, resident student fall cohorts graduating in six

years averaged 42.7% compared to non-resident student fall cohorts, who graduated within six years at an average rate of 38.9%.

6 Year Graduation Rates for Fall 2003 – Fall 2012 Cohorts

	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007
On Campus	41.7%	46.6%	45.0%	42.9%	42.8%	41.7%	37.5%	42.7%	43.2%	43.5%
Off Campus	39.4%	41.4%	41.7%	37.5%	43.5%	44.1%	38.2%	35.0%	35.4%	33.1%

**ENGAGEMENT**

While questions in the survey can be better tailored to measure engagement, there are a few questions that can be used to determine who participates in programmatic efforts and how relevant they are in the residential experience. In particular, two questions were asked to determine attendance at housing events and whether these events were similar to resident’s interests. From these questions, there are a few notable conclusions that can be made when they are cross tabbed with other data sets.

1. First-Year Students are engaged at a higher rate by residence hall efforts than all other class standings. While they have similar levels of interest, their participation is much higher than sophomores, juniors, seniors, or graduate students. This information is not surprising since most of the students who live in housing are First Year Students and programs such as RAMP cater directly to this demographic.
2. Most ethnicities attend events at similar rates, but some did not feel that their interests were represented in events hosted by Housing.
3. 33 students identified as “other” in regards to sexual orientation and self-identified as pansexual, queer, or other. This student demographic had expressed the lowest rate of interest for events in Housing.

**ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS**

Students living in on-campus housing have higher retention and six-year graduation rates across a ten year span. This could be explained by a number of factors, including: close proximity to academic buildings for class, faculty office hours, study groups, library access, etc., and residence hall programming for academic success. While the six-year graduation rate for on-campus cohorts is higher than off-campus cohorts, it is still low and additional academic support is needed. The increase in retention of both on-campus and off-campus students in the fall 2012 cohort could be explained by RAMP, which intentionally supported academic success in both resident and non-resident students.

## 1.E. Student Learning Outcomes

Analysis of the SLO's from section 1B. Based on the SLO's from section 1B., describe to what extent the learning outcomes were met. Analysis should also include: interpretation of outcome results, how the program evaluates its effectiveness in meeting the university's institutional mission effectiveness of outcome measurement and what program changes have been made based on the result of the assessed outcomes.

### Narrative

#### ORIGINS OF LEARNING OUTCOME

In an effort to improve the department's emphasis on academic success, the team chose to implement the findings from the 2012-2013 learning outcome and measure any additional progress. This previous learning outcome examined programmatic efforts that promote academic success. In addition to maintaining an environment that is conducive to studies, CAs are charged to host an event each semester that fosters academic success. As part of a larger Community Development Model, this requirement equips residents with skills or knowledge that can be applied in their current coursework. The goal of the learning outcome was to assess the effectiveness of these events:

“Residents who attend an academic success program provided by Residence Life will be able to **identify** at least one way in which the information presented during the program can be **applied** toward achieving their academic goals.”

Using Blooms Taxonomy as a theoretical framework, the department intentionally used two verbs in the Learning Outcome. Of the two, identify and apply, the latter is the most significant. Application represents the critical link needed to furnish a positive outcome in academics.

#### USE OF PREVIOUS DATA

The preceding review of this learning outcome revealed considerations for implementation of academic success programming. For example, programs with the greatest success had narrowly tailored topics, were held at appropriate times of the year, and contained clear applications for students. Conversely, events that were the least successful were too all-encompassing, planned at the last minute, and lacked properties for personalization. During the first training of the year, this information and the data from the 2012-2013 learning outcome was shared with student staff to assist in their planning. Additionally, a coversheet for planning purposes was required for all academic success programs.

#### ASSESSMENT DESIGN

The plan for the Learning Outcome was crafted by the entire professional Residence Life team during the summer and assessment was conducted throughout the year. The plan included the development of a survey instrument that would be administered after events, incentives for voluntary feedback from participants, trainings for student staff to enable them to impartially administer the survey, and an information campaign to bring awareness about the outcome. The instrument developed was a half sheet document that asked program participants to identify skills that may have been provided during the event and how it could be applied towards an academic goal.

The incentive was a scratcher provided to the participant immediately following the survey. If participants had a winning scratcher, they were provided with \$5 in C-points and entered into a drawing for a \$250 gift certificate to the bookstore.

Data obtained was exclusively qualitative and required the development of an evaluation tool for determining if the outcome was met. Each response was individually reviewed with an emphasis on the question regarding application; responses without an application or an improper application were considered as not meeting the outcome. Since this year was the second evaluation of this outcome, we raised the qualifying standard for a “met outcome.” If the majority (80%) of respondents could identify the content and make applications, the Learning Outcome was satisfied by the event. Last year, this standard was at 70%. If more than half could make applications, then the outcome was partially satisfied by the event. If only less than half could make applications, then the outcome was not achieved by the event.

### **OUTCOME RESULTS**

In 2013-2014, Residence Life provided 26 events intended to foster academic success with over 256 residents in attendance. This is two more programs and 54 more participants from the previous year. However, based on the higher standard set, only six (23%) of academic success events hosted by housing met the outcome of identifying and applying information that would assist in their academic goals. 14 (54%) of events had mixed results and six (23%) were unsuccessful. If the results from this year were measured with the same rubric from the previous year, there would be a dramatic increase of programs that met the outcome. 11 programs would meet the outcome. In other words, perhaps the bar was set too high?

### **CONCLUSIONS**

When analyzing the data, the review team made similar conclusions as past years. In particular, narrowly tailored topics and very skill specific events were one of the greatest predictors of success. Programs that were too broad or lacking skill development usually were a failure. This information had previously been shared with staff, so the team determined that supervisors must take a greater role in the oversight of program planning. If a program does not satisfy these factors, then they should not be approved.

## **2.A. Staff Engagement in Institutional Efforts and Activities**

Describe how the department engages all members in the discussion, review, assessment and revision of program SLOs and other services.

### **Narrative**

#### **COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION – Residence Life**

- Staff Council – Roger Wang;
- Student Engagement and Leadership Staff (SEALS) – Joselle Bannie;
- Campus Dialog on Race Committee (CDOR) – Joselle Bannie, Roger Wang;
- Welcome Home to Humboldt Week – Joselle Bannie;
- University Board of Directors – Macy Stewart, Sam Wilson;
- Diversity & Inclusive Student Success Collaborative (DISSCo) – Patty O’Rourke-Andrews;
- Sexual Assault Prevention Committee – Jeremy Davis;

- Alcohol & Other Drugs – Patty O’Rourke-Andrews, Yashvin Madhak;
- International Advisory Committee - Patty O’Rourke-Andrews, Jeremy Davis;

#### ADVISORY ROLES

- Global Connections – Yashvin Madhak;
- Resident Housing Association (RHA) – Joselle Bannie;
- Brothers United – John Capaccio;
- Legacy Club – Brittany Henry.

#### COLLABORATION WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT

- Welcome Meeting – HOP & RAMP;
- Faculty in Residence – Human Resources, APS, various academic departments;
- Tunnel of Oppression – CDOR, MCC, CAPS;
- Student Conduct Norming – UPD, OSRR, Health Center;
- International Student Kick-off – CIP, Academic Affairs;
- Search Committees – OSRR;
- Homecoming – MARCOM, Athletics, Clubs and Activities;
- RAMP – Student Affairs, Academic Affairs;
- Community Advocate Meetings – Health Center, WRRAP, Power Save, Career Center, SDRC
- Theme Living – CNRS, Center Activities, WRRAP, Power Save, CIP, VETS Office, RAMP
- Preview Plus Program – Admissions, SASOP, UPD, EOC;
- Social Justice Summit and California Big Time – MCC;
- Black Graduation – MCC;

#### COLLABORATION WITH OFF CAMPUS AGENCIES

- Theme Housing – Smith River Alliance, Potawot Health Village
- Training – North Coast Rape Crisis Team
- Community Advocate Meetings – Humboldt Domestic Violence Services

### **3.A. Investments**

Staff FTES by classification type, ethnicity and gender. Include budget expenditures distinguishing between temporary staff, student staff, permanent staff, and Operating Expense. (Budgets to include State General Fund, Trust Funds, Grants and Contracts, etc.)

**Narrative** See Housing Operations report

### **3.B. Efficiency**

Staff/student ratio (SSR) within the unit, scope and type of service, number of program participants by discrete service (distinguish between group presentations and one-on-one work with individual students), number of contact hours, and comparisons to benchmarks based on similar size campus and demographic data for student populations.

#### **Narrative**

Residence Life has resident-to-staff ratios that are comparable to other institutions in the California State University system and nationally. The Association of College and University Housing Officers International (ACUHO-I) states that the range of this ratio can vary based on student population needs and existing facilities. For example, First Year populations typically have higher staffing ratios. Upper-class communities may have fewer staff because residents have (or are thought to have) a greater ability to navigate community living. Staffing ratios at HSU model these practices, but it also underscores the importance of the consideration of this information when intentionally designing facilities.

In regards to student staffing, HSU Residence Life has a mean average of 51 students for each Community Advocate. Apartment communities have a higher mean average ratio of 56:1 with the highest in Creekview Apartments at 66:1. Traditional Hall communities have a lower mean average at 47:1. The smallest community is the all-female wing in Sunset Hall at a ratio of 26:1. On average, ACUHO-I states that comparable positions should be responsible for 25 – 50 residents in first-year hall.

For professional staff, there is a mean average of about 405 students for each Residence Life Coordinator overseeing an area. The largest area contains 483 residents and the smallest area has 207 residents. ACUHO-I does not specify an average for this ratio, but outlines a range between 100 and 800 as being common. Higher ratios would involve a secondary level of supervision (such as a graduate student) and might reach up to 1,200 residents. HSU currently does not employ this model. It is also important to note that resident needs vary by institution type. As a remote, rural institution hosting a large amount of first generation students, Humboldt State University necessitates a lower residential staff ratio.

Here is a comprehensive list of full time staff in Residence Life:

- 1 Administrative Support Assistant II (ASA II)
- 5 Residence Life Coordinators, Student Services Personnel II (SSPII)
- 1 Residence Life Coordinator (RAMP), Student Services Personnel II (SSPII)
- 1 Area Coordinator, Student Services Personnel III (SSPIII)
- 1 Assistant Director , Student Services Personnel IV (SSPIV)

In light of recent incidents of bias that occurred at San Jose State University, there were a number of recommendations made by the Special Task Force on Racial Discrimination. Among 14 different points specifically focused on Residence Life, the second recommendations states: “Decrease the RA, ARLC, and RLC student ratios so that there are fewer students per staff person, and fewer staff per supervisor.” A lower staffing ratio would provide greater time for proactive diversity education that may be preventative for discrimination and ensure effective

response to incidents when they do occur. Like many of the proposed recommendations, this recommendation is worth consideration for implementation.

#### **4.A. General Conclusions about Past Year Performance**

Through analysis and personal observation, summarize your conclusions about the past year. Discuss to what extent your department has or has not met stated goals and any challenges faced in achieving goals? What activities has your program engaged in to improve the student success and the HSU environment? Describe notable achievements since your last self-evaluation.

##### **Narrative**

During the academic year of 2013-2014, Residence Life continued to focus on providing students tools and creating environments that are conducive to academic success. While data suggests that students who live on-campus are more likely to persist and graduate, there is still ample room for progress. The following conclusions provide insight about achievements and promise for continued progress:

- First Year Experience - With the shift of the Humboldt Orientation Program to the Fall, Housing checked in an unprecedented amount of first year students in one day. For many of these students, it was their first opportunity to visit campus. To assist first-year students in this transition, Residence Life, HOP, and the RAMP program partnered to provide a special Welcome Meeting. This meeting provided a united welcome from the university, information on what to expect during their first few days on campus, an introduction to their neighbors and a free T-shirt.
- Service - After residents moved in, some residents wanted to swap rooms or move for a variety of different reasons. During this past academic year, Residence Life processed 231 room changes to satisfy residents – that is nearly 11% of our residents changing their original assignment after move-in.
- Staff Transitions – Mid-year professional staff turnover had a significant impact on performance and attainment of goals within Residence Life. In particular, we lost one new and one returning Residence Life Coordinator in January. This was a significant impact as these positions are vital to the program. It disrupted some of our efforts towards our established goal, we had to reassign special projects, divert time from projects to conduct a selection process, and train new incoming Residence Life Coordinators.

Additionally, there were other staff changes in the department of Housing. The long-time director retired, prompting three interim appointments. We also had the Associate Director for Facilities begin his position in the Fall. Despite these changes, transitional issues were minimal and operations were not impacted.

- Faculty in Residence – After several years of advocating for a Faculty in Residence, the program received approval and funding. The fall was spent designing the program and the spring focused on the launch. This program is an excellent practice and prospect for enhanced living-learning environments.
- Events - Residence Life hosted a record of 513 events during the 2013-2014 academic year. These events focus on community building, academic success, environmental

responsibility, and social justice. Half of these events occurred on the weekends and 319 of them did not require any funding.

Overall, 2013-2014 was a period marked by bittersweet transitions and change. However, the change provides promise for greater student success at Humboldt State University.

### **5.A. Recommendations, Goals and Student Learning Outcomes for Next Year**

Summarize program modifications or changes to be made as a result of assessment. Show how the changes responded to changing demographics, technologies, external requirements, or other relevant factors. Goals may be carried over from year to year but changes must be informed by your data analysis and conclusions in 4.A.

#### **Narrative**

#### **LEARNING OUTCOME**

The same learning outcome in 2013-2014 will be used for the following year:

“Residents who attend an academic success program provided by Residence Life will be able to identify at least one way in which the information presented during the programs can be applied toward achieving their academic goals.”

This will be the last year the outcome is measured and an indicator if we can changes to the fidelity of the program.

Similar methods of measurement, such as the paper survey, will be used to evaluate the responses. The Residence Life team will also be developing an additional survey to measure how helpful students found the information later in the semester and a coversheet for program facilitators to assist in planning.

The outcome will be met if residents are able to identify skills that may contribute to the achievement of their academic goal or a potential application of the information presented during the event. Data coding will be developed to interpret the results from the open-ended questions in the survey. All assessment results will be reviewed during the mid-year and end of the year meetings conducted by Residence Life to determine if the outcome has been met.

The new measurement criteria established in 2013-2014 will be used again in 2014-2015. If 80% of respondents make an appropriate application, the learning outcome will be deemed as accomplished. An application rate of 80%-40% would constitute a partially met outcome, and below 40% would result in a designation of not being met.

Similar efforts from last year will be made for an education campaign regarding the learning outcome. Efforts will include placing the learning outcome on our website, bulletin boards, fliers for academic success programs, email signatures, and in our *Residence Life and You* Handbook. It will also be discussed with students during CA training, mandatory first area meetings with residents, and during new resident orientation in the spring semester. The primary difference between the two years will be the oversight provided by supervisors.

## **GOAL**

As part of the new assessment plan, Housing has developed three broad goals that will be utilized each year:

1. Improve and enhance housing facilities.
2. Expand services to increase student satisfaction and operational efficiency.
3. Integrate the curricular and co-curricular experiences to promote a culture of learning.

Each year “measurables” (also known as objectives) will be set to accomplish the desired outcome for each goal. Residence Life will be contributing to all goals, but primarily on the goal pertaining to curricular and co-curricular integration.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the assessment and data examined in this report, it is recommended that Residence Life:

- Continue to evaluate engagement opportunities and offer a range of events that appeal to all demographics,
- Continue to focus on academic support programming and provide stronger supervisor oversight of planning,
- Shift focus to set and evaluate objectives that are created annually,
- Evaluate efforts to retain current professional staff and advocate for smaller staffing ratios,
- Begin new efforts to integrate the curricular and co-curricular experiences.