

University Housing Services

Executive Summary

Within the last two years, University Housing Services (UHS) has undergone organizational restructuring and significant leadership changes. As with any change, the impact can be far reaching and the opportunities tremendous. A thorough assessment of the department would provide a picture to understand the impact of the recent changes and to identify the opportunities for improvement. The commitment by Student Affairs to have each department participate in a CAS Assessment Process was used to complete a comprehensive program review. This also presented the perfect opportunity to involve each staff member and residence hall government executive board member in the process by completing an assessment instrument. It was this decision that shaped our process. It was also this decision that resulted in a rather complicated, but quite useful, result.

Given a one-year time frame (February-January) from introduction to completion from which to work, it was a challenge to determine when to distribute the assessment tool. This challenge stemmed from the number of student staff in the department, and the resulting turnover at the end of each year. Rather than rush the completion at the end of the spring semester, it was determined we would distribute the assessment tools early in the fall semester. This provided adequate time for preparation and ensured widespread participation. The assessment instrument was helpful to our new staff by illustrating those important elements of a quality housing program. However, it also resulted in a good portion of our student staff using an INA as their rating throughout the instrument and providing few comments.

The following summary includes an overview of the department, an explanation of our assessment process and the discussion of the results. In brief, 826 assessment instruments were distributed and 526 were collected. This is a 64% response rate. The average of the component compliance rating is 77%, which according to CAS falls just inside the category range of 75-100% compliance, and it describes this as "functioning in a reasonably adequate way, but action plans should be developed". Our highest compliance rating is 86% in two categories (Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action and Diversity). Our lowest compliance rating is a 65% in the Assessment and Evaluation category.

The feedback provided illustrates that in general, our strengths lie in our programming, ethical standards, commitment to diversity and mission, while

the areas for improvement are related to the upkeep of our facilities, available finances, and the need to improve communication within the department.

Scoring

The CAS guidelines include interpreting an INA rating as a numerical "1" when figuring an overall rating. The premise for this is that respondents should be aware of or familiar with the information needed to assign a rating to each item.

This premise did not hold true for this process given the time of year the assessment was distributed and the number of student staff included. While INA was used by our student staff appropriately, our ratings were significantly lowered by the inclusion of widespread scores of "1" for INA.

In retrospect, we should have included a factor for INA in our database to compare the difference in overall scores of INA and "1" by our staff. Since we did not do this, the scores did not provide an accurate picture of strengths and areas for improvement. For example, a low rating was not necessarily paired with comments identifying areas for improvement. The Leadership Team used tested the scoring in two ways as a means of trying to sort through the feedback, scores, and ratings. The first was a review of two units assessments by comparing the scores with the INA's factored as a "1" (raw score) to the ratings with the INA's removed (revised score). The scoring difference among the student staff was impacted by more than one full point (on a five point scale) in most cases.

The second approach was that the Leadership Team completed the assessment as a team, and used their scores to compare to the raw scores. Again, these scores varied significantly.

Since the integrity of the process and results is a priority, the Leadership Team compared all three scores-the raw score, the revised score from two sample units, and their own rating. While the difference varied by over a point between them in most cases, this seemed to be too much of an adjustment to make. Therefore, it was decided to raise each unit score up to .75 depending on the differences between the three scores and the evidence available. The ratings used for this report reflect these adjusted scores. The raw and adjusted compliance ratings (in percentages) are noted below.

Distribution/Collection

Unit Team	Surveys Distributed	Surveys Returned	% Returned
------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------

Apartment Living	10	10	100%
Facilities	29	29	100%
Fiscal Management	5	5	100%
Night Operations	57	49	86%
Operations	13	12	92%
Residence Halls	615	379	62%
Residential Computing	15	15	100%
Summer School/Conferences	82	27	33%
TOTALS	826	526	64%

Compliance Rating Summary

	AL	Fac.	FM	NO	Op	RH	RC	SS/C	Raw	Adj.
1. Mission	79	55	83	60	83	74	73	70	72	82
2. Program	75	60	83	55	81	75	74	62	69	79
3. Leadership	57	63	84	37	84	65	75	71	68	78
4. Organization & Management	60	57	78	43	78	68	76	69	66	76
5. Human Resources	78	59	82	23	79	69	75	72	67	80
6. Financial Resources	37	40	75	34	62	52	66	44	51	66
7. Facilities, Tech., & Equip	48	58	80	51	78	69	75	65	69	79
8. Legal Responsibilities	54	46	53	48	72	65	58	62	57	72
9. Equal Opp., Access, & A.A.	76	56	77	47	79	65	73	58	76	86
10. Campus & Comm. Relations	55	62	78	38	83	66	84	63	51	66
11. Diversity	84	65	88	56	90	78	77	70	76	86
12. Ethics	72	53	76	42	78	70	70	71	67	82
13. Assessment & Evaluation	47	47	58	36	52	60	82	59	55	65

AL=Apartment Living

O=Operations

Fac.=Facilities

RH=Residence Halls

FM=Fiscal Management

RC=Residential Computing

NO= Night Operations

SS/C=Summer School/Conferences

Raw=Raw Rating

Adj.=Adjusted Rating