OUTCOME
Residents and clients will experience quality service from the Housing and Residence Engagement and Food Service staff.

OUTCOME SUPPORTS
- University: Goal 1
- Division: Goal 5
- Department:
- Other:

DATA COLLECTION METHODS
- Surveys

METHODS AND MEASURES
Surveys and reports will be used to capture residents and client’s perception and response to the quality of service that they received per interaction.

- After Services Survey
  - Work Order
  - Main Office Service and ARC
  - Reservations/Events/Conferences
- Standing HRE Survey (add following topics/questions)
  - Main Office Service (lockouts, calls, emails, etc.)
  - Maintenance requests

CRITERIA OF SUCCESS
Quality service is defined as the degree to which our provided service(s) aligns with the expectations of our clients and residents.

- 70% of respondents will agree/strongly agree that the services provided by the housing and dining staff was of high quality.
- 70% of respondents will agree/strongly agree that they received quality service in response to after service surveys.
- 70% of respondents will be satisfied with the overall service received in response to the annual HRE survey.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS
Our primary focus for this year’s assessment was to assess student’s perceptions of the quality of service they receive while living on-campus and utilizing Housing and Residential Engagement (HRE) facilities. This information is beneficial in determining how satisfied students are with the general quality of living and the services provided to them. It is the goal of the department to ensure that residents feel that the customer service they receive when utilizing housing, dining, and facilities services are of high quality. The following process was used to measure how residents are experiencing a quality living and learning environment. The data collection process was conducted through indirect measures. Of the approximate, 1,900 students that live on campus, about 204
residents 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 2017. The survey 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 to help in determining a general percentage goal the department felt met basic expectations, with the anticipation that this percentage would become consistent over time. Over the course of editing the survey, a change was made to eliminate the “Neutral” option and to include “Somewhat Satisfied” as a response option. Below each criterion is listed with the percentage that includes agreed and strongly agreed.

- 77.82% agreed that the services provided by the housing and dining staff was of high quality.
- Our criteria for 70% of respondents to agree that they received quality service in response to after service surveys was not assessed. We were unable to obtain this data from the StarRez software. This is an area we plan to make a priority next academic year.
- 74.02% of respondents were satisfied with the overall service received in response to the annual HRE survey. Including respondents who answered with somewhat satisfied, our satisfaction rate was 94.06%.

IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS
The assessment process revealed that there were issues with timing and the ability for the outcomes to be fully assessed because we were unable to create or utilize the after services surveys through StarRez (work orders, main office services, tours, Aramark assessments). Additionally, we realized after the survey had been administered that the changes in the response categories did not align with the language in our criteria for success making it challenge to interpret the data. For next year’s assessment, we intend to better align our response categories to the language in our criteria to better support the outcome. The response rate for the survey was lower than the past three years. Addressing the low response rate and 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. The HRE department plans to meet during June 2017 to review our process and begin planning and brainstorming how we can address the following topics:

- Planning in advance to obtain data from third-party servicers and auxiliary organizations.
- Adding focus groups
- Time line for assessment tool creation

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.

Lastly, we noticed there was a large gap in comparison to the number of folks who responded “agree/strongly agree” versus “somewhat agree”. For next year’s assessment, we will examine and address the gap difference that exists between these two groups to determine how to better serve the latter group and discuss possible impact of Likert chair response choice.