OUTCOME
Residents will engage in intentional residential experiences that foster titan pride, community, and student learning.

OUTCOME SUPPORTS
☒ University: Goal 1
☒ Division: Goal 5
☐ Department:
☐ Other:

OUTCOME TYPE
☒ Performance Outcome
☐ Student Learning Outcome

ASSESSMENT APPROACH
☒ Direct assessment
☒ Indirect assessment

DATA COLLECTION METHODS
• Surveys

METHODS AND MEASURES
HRE defines engagement as the time and quality of effort that students dedicate to participating in co-curricular activities. HRE will measure engagement by looking at the following:
• Student self-reported experiences via end of the year survey results
• Program Tracking – the number of residents who attended all programming in the Housing community via sign in sheets.
• Focus groups will be conducted with a random sample of residents who currently live in the housing community.

CRITERIA OF SUCCESS
• 50% of residents will attend at least 1 program per semester
• 50% of respondents will agree that Residence Life provides opportunities to participate or attend athletic events on campus
• 70% of respondents will agree that Residence Life provides opportunities to interact with campus partners through programming
• 70% of respondents who have gone through the conduct process will agree that through sanctioning, they have been able to interact with campus partners
• 10% of respondents will have been referred to a campus service by staff or peers (RAs)
• 70% of respondents will utilize at least 1 of the spaces/services offered by residential life (ARC, Study Spaces, PRC, FIR Office Hours, RA Office Hours, etc.)

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS
The previously created outcome and the following data process was used to measure how residents are engaging in meaningful residential experiences. Of the approximately 1,900 students that live on campus, about 204 responded (10.74% response rate) to an online survey which asked self-perception questions, a majority ranking on a Likert scale. The survey was distributed via email in late April 2016, and it was sent to all current 2016-2017 “in room” status residents. Residents were encouraged to respond within a two-week time frame, and upon completion they could participate in an incentive opportunity drawing to win an iPad and/or food vouchers from the Late Night Café. Our criteria for success goals were created by reviewing previous year’s data on attendance and satisfaction and determining a general percentage goal we believe meets basic expectations and which we would like to see become consistent over time.
• 58.72% of respondents reported attending between 1-3 programs each semester. This met our overall goal of 50%. Additionally, a total of 33.98 % of respondents reported attending 4 or more programs per semester.
• 80.66% of respondents agreed that Residential Engagement provides opportunities to attend or participate in athletic events on campus
• 81.55% of respondents agreed that Residential Engagement provides opportunities to interact with campus partners through programming. The previous academic year, our goal of 70% was not met.
• 76.93% of respondents who have gone through the conduct process agree that through sanctioning, they have been able to interact with campus partners.
• 94.39% of respondents have utilized at least 1 service that they have been referred to a campus service by staff or peers (RAs). Our goal to have 10% of respondents agree to this statement was met and exceeded. It is a positive increase and one that will set our goal higher in the future.
• 97.54% of respondents have utilized a common area space offered by Residential Engagement at least once.

IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS
Overall, this academic years’ assessment project design has assisted the department in moving closer to measuring and reviewing our goals as a department and the practices that reinforce these goals through the student experience. Each of our criterion this year was met, and many of the responses exceeded the criterion. This was positive validation for the work that the department is currently doing. Regarding this outcome, there were a few responses to areas that our department will work toward achieving in the future. There were also concerns with the implementation of the survey and data collection that should be addressed. Specifically, those areas are listed below:
• Incorporating program tracking in the data analysis, as we were unable to do so this year. This however can be a lengthy process that will require time and funds. The department is already exploring this process and will continue to explore this process.
• It was the goal of the department to include focus groups as a part of the assessment project, however time and resource constraints were a concern. In the future, the department should begin planning for this aspect of the assessment earlier in the academic year.
• The low response rate could have been attributed to a campus-wide survey that was distributed around the same time. It could have resulted in survey fatigue for our residents. If possible, it is recommended in the future that our survey is sent out at a time that will not compete with university-wide surveys.
• Questioning why students reported not having attended any programs for the entire year.
• Including a question about Internet/Wi-Fi services offered to students, as this question was included on last year’s survey, and many respondents were dissatisfied with the quality of Internet/Wi-Fi services. Including this question will aid the department in determining whether or not satisfaction with these services has improved.

The department will continue in the next academic year to measure the level of engagement that students self-report within the Housing community. The survey also provided context for other areas of improvement that are not mentioned in this report. This tool was useful in giving a broad scope of the students’ perspective. The outcome will be re-evaluated and re-assessed the following 2017-2018 academic year by the department assessment committee.