**Northern Michigan University**

**OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN/REPORT FORM**

**Administrative or Educational Support Unit**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Department or Unit | | Housing and Residence Life | | | |
| This document is the | 🞎 PLAN or 🗹 REPORT for July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 | | | Date Submitted: | July 31, 2012 |
| Submitted by (Unit Representative) | | | Carl Holm, Director | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department or Unit Mission Statement: Was this mission statement revised this year? Yes √ No** |
| The mission of the Housing and Residence Life Office is to make significant contributions to student learning through excellent service, well-managed facilities, and a residential environment rich with opportunities for personal growth, especially that which grows out of interpersonal relationships and interaction, the creation of unique communities, and involvement in other aspects of campus life. |

**Functions within the University:**

|  |
| --- |
| In addition to being part of NMU’s continuous improvement process, outcomes assessment plays a direct role with the AQIP Systems Portfolio (100-page document submitted every four years). To increase awareness and help gather Portfolio information, **please type “X” for all AQIP categories directly related to your unit’s core mission**. Some functions appear in more than one category. This is a first round collection of this information so do the best you can with the selection; if you want help, ask S. Poindexter. (Note: this section of the form is short-term; it will be deleted once functions have been mapped between units and the Systems Portfolio.)  **X** AQIP Category 1: Helping Students Learn documents the curricular and co-curricular processes and student learning support.  **🞎** AQIP Category 2: Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives documents the key non-curricular functions by which NMU serves the region, e.g. community engagement initiatives of students and employees, and department outreach.  **X** AQIP Category 3: Understanding Students’ and Other Stakeholders’ Needs documents how NMU builds relationships with students, alumni and employers and identifies, targets and meets their needs.  **X** AQIP Category 4: Valuing People documents NMU personnel recruitment, training, satisfaction, services and programs.  **🞎** AQIP Category 5: Leading and Communicating documents processes that guide NMU in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and communicating decisions and actions.  **X** AQIP Category 6: Supporting Institutional Operations documents student and administrative support services, safety, and facilities.  **X** AQIP Category 7: Measuring Effectiveness documents IT systems and institutional research NMU employs to collect, analyze, and distribute, and how departments use them to manage improvement, e.g. use of charts, “cubes,” dashboards.  **X** AQIP Category 8: Planning Continuous Improvement documents NMU’s strategic and administrative planning processes.  **X** AQIP Category 9: Building Collaborative Relationships documents how NMU works with external organizations from which we receive students (school systems) or goods and services (vendors and utilities), send our graduates (schools and employers), and support or regulate our programs (agencies).  (A full description of the Portfolio’s categories and its detailed topics are available at [www.nmu.edu/aqip](http://www.nmu.edu/aqip) under the Current Document tab.) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Administrative Objective #1** *(State an ongoing goal by which the unit gauges its overall performance in a key role year after year, i.e. your “bottom line” measure.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** *(Describe the statistic or criteria that measures success in achieving this goal. What is the desired and/or minimum target you expect*? *What method is used to collect the data for the statistic*?) |
| To provide an environment residence hall students find satisfying, engaging, growth producing, and supportive of their persistence. |  | 1. The scores from NMU students who complete the ACUHO-I /EBI Resident Assessment in April 2012 will be at or above those of our comparison schools on at least 50% of the items to include specifically the following items: 2. Opportunities to meet other people, 3. Benefited from interactions with residents different from you, 4. Current room assignment process, 5. Feel accepted by others in your house, 6. Opportunities to improve communication skills, 7. Opportunities to learn to live cooperatively, 8. Opportunities to learn to solve problems, 9. On-campus housing experience, 10. Enhanced learning experience, 11. Performance of resident adviser. 12. Residence hall retention from W12 to F12 will be at least: 13. Continuing freshmen – 70% 14. Continuing sophomores – 19% 15. Continuing juniors – 30% 16. Continuing seniors – 40%   3. When surveyed in April 2012, 100% of the residence hall presidents (or their representatives) will indicate that they agree or strongly with our accomplishment of this over-arching objective. |
| **Summary of Data Collected** *(Provide trend data and summarize)* |  | **Describe how results were used to improve services** |
| Al (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)   1. 1,194 residence hall students (53%) completed the ACUHO-I /EBI Resident Assessment in April 2012.   When our scores on the 10 specified items/factors were compared to the mean scores for our ‘Select 6’ (CMU, EMU, LSSU, MSU, No. Ill. Univ, WSU) 50%were higher and 50 % were lower.  Item #79: To what extent has living in on-campus housing enhanced your ability to meet other people?   * NMU’s Score – 5.35 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.27 * NMU’s score was higher than 4 of our Select 6.   Item #91 - To what degree have you benefited from interactions with residents who are different from you?   * NMU’s Score – 5.27 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.34 * NMU’s score was lower than 4 of our Select 6.   *Item #52*: How satisfied are you with the room assignment process?   * NMU Score – 5.43 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.13 * NMU’s score was higher than all of our Select 6.   *Item #78*: In your living area, to what degree do you feel accepted by other students?   * NMU’s Score – 5.33 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.40 * NMU’s score was higher than 3 of our Select 6.   *Item #89*: To what extent has living in on-campus housing enhanced your ability to improve communication skills?   * NMU’s Score – 5.48 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.38 * NMU’s score was higher than 4 of our Select 6.   *Item #80*: To what extent has living in on-campus housing enhanced your ability to live cooperatively?   * NMU’s Score – 5.50 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.44 * NMU’s score was higher than 5 of our Select 6.     *Item #85:* To what extent has living in on-campus housing enhanced your ability to solve your own problems?   * NMU’s Score – 4.75 * Select 6 Mean Score – 4.98 * NMU’s score was lower than 5 of our Select 6.   *Item #93:* To what degree are you satisfied with your on-campus housing experience this year?   * NMU’s Score – 4.90 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.04 * NMU’s score is lower than 4 of our Select 6 schools   *Item #100*: Comparing the cost to the quality of your on-campus living experience, how do you rate its overall value?   * NMU’s Score – 4.05 * Select 6 Mean Score – 4.01 * NMU’s score is higher than 5 of our Select 6 schools.   *Factor #18*: Overall learning   * NMU Score – 5.03 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.16 * NMU’s score was lower than 4 of our Select 6 schools, Performance of resident adviser   *Factor #1:* Satisfaction with hall student staff   * NMU Score – 5.64 * Select 6 Mean Score – 5.66 * NMU’s score was higher than 4 of our Select 6 schools  1. Residence hall retention from W12 to F12 won’t be available until after Friday, September 7, 2012. 2. Continuing freshmen – XX% 3. Continuing sophomores – Xx% 4. Continuing juniors – Xx% 5. Continuing seniors – XX% 6. When surveyed in April 2012, 100% of the residence hall presidents (or their representatives) will indicate that they agree or strongly with our accomplishment of this over-arching objective.     This was not a good measure since we didn’t have the survey results from EBI until after the students had left for the year. |  | (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)   1. The following goal has been set for 2012-13:   To improve the Overall Program Effectiveness of the Housing and Residence Life Office as measured by the EBI resident and apartment assessments.\*  Department staff will increase planning and efforts in the areas identified through the survey results factor analysis:   * Learning: Manage time, study, solving problems * Learning: Personal interactions * Satisfaction: Room/floor environment * Learning: Sense of community   The extensive results from the ACUHO-I/EBI survey conducted in April 2012 have been shared and discussed with resident directors during their fall training and planning workshop. They will also be discussed with resident advisers during their training and planning workshop. Resident directors and resident advisers will prepare objectives intended to help us work toward this goal in their respective areas.  Progress on staff objectives will be reviewed periodically at meetings at various levels.   1. Relevant EBI assessment results will be shared and discussed with student leaders at all levels with the intent of involving them in planning and implementing objectives that will result in positive change in the key areas identified. 2. The factor with the lowest score for NMU was Dining Services. Those results have been shared with that department’s leadership (vice president and associate vice president). 3. The ACUHO-I/EBI will be conducted again in 2013. |
| **Administrative Objective #2** *(State a 1-2 year objective intended to improve a unit process, service, or output.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Objective* :  To develop a campus housing plan that will improve facility operations and longevity, improve the satisfaction and comfort of students living in University housing, contribute to student recruitment and retention, and engender support from the Board of Trustees for related budget recommendations.  *Rationale (Why you are setting this objective; mark with “X”)*:  X Effectiveness/quality action X Efficiency/cost action  Compliance issue X Satisfaction measure Create baseline  Other (explain):  *Does this objective relate to a Road Map goal? (Refer to last page for the Road Map goals). If yes, type the related Road Map codes here*: CA-1, CA-2 |  | *Describe timetable plans to achieve objective*.   1. Complete an RFP for appropriate consultant services by June 30, 2011. 2. Select a consultant by October 31, 2011. 3. Enlist the support and assistance of residence hall student leaders in the communication, promotion, and satisfactory completion of any reasonable efforts to obtain student input for the study portion of this effort prior to October 31. 4. Contact the North Wind features editor to invite the student newspaper to do at least one article regarding this project prior to October 31. 5. Provide information and documentation per the selected consultant’s protocol and schedule. 6. Provide timely information about this project to students living on campus electronically. 7. Effectively facilitate the collection of input from students and key University personnel through meetings, focus groups, and a survey per the consultant’s schedule. 8. Review draft documents according to the consultant’s schedule.  *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success?[[1]](#endnote-1) Examples: If the rationale was Efficiency/cost, what is the desired and/or minimum target criteria for savings in time or cost? If the rationale was Satisfaction, what is the measure and what increase is desired*? 9. Feedback from the consultant will be positive regarding our partnership on this project. 10. The University will have a viable draft of a long range housing plan in time for consideration in the Housing and Residence Life Office’s FY13 budget development timetable. 11. The University will have a final Housing Study Report to use for long range planning prior to June 30, 2012. 12. Feedback from both the associate provost for student services and enrollment and the vice president for finance and administration obtained prior to Friday, July 6, 2012, will be positive regarding the final report. 13. Members of the Board of Trustees’ Finance Committee and the Board of Trustees will support those aspects of future Housing and Residence Life Office budgets which are based on the long-range housing plan. |
| **Summary of Data Collected** (*Summarize the evidence)* |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** |
| (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)   1. Complete an RFP for appropriate consultant services by June 30, 2011.   The RFP was completed on July 12, 2012.   1. Select a consultant by October 31, 2011.   A consultant was selected on October 28, 2011.   1. Enlist the support and assistance of residence hall student leaders in the communication, promotion, and satisfactory completion of any reasonable efforts to obtain student input for the study portion of this effort prior to October 31.   This was on meeting and workshop agendas during both the fall and early winter semesters.   1. Contact the North Wind features editor to invite the student newspaper to do at least one article regarding this project prior to October 31.   This was done and a short article appeared in the North Wind. There was apparently no interest in doing follow-up articles.   1. Provide information and documentation per the selected consultant’s protocol and schedule.   Our initial response to requests for information and documentation was very good - timely and thorough, which elicited an unsolicited positive comment. We facilitated focus groups as requested (59 students participated) and facilitated the Scion Group’s on-line survey (1,319 students completed the survey.) We bogged down on our response to their draft Market and Demand Analysis due to the fact that the recommendations portion didn’t meet our expectations as well as other matters needing attention.   1. Provide timely information about this project to students living on campus electronically.   This was done with student leaders, but not with the general population of students.   1. Effectively facilitate the collection of input from students and key University personnel through meetings, focus groups, and a survey per the consultant’s schedule.   This was done (see #5 above).   1. Review draft documents according to the consultant’s schedule.   We are working with the Scion Group representatives to develop options and to continue with the rest of this study.   1. Feedback from the consultant will be positive regarding our partnership on this project.   This was not solicited due to the status of the study.   1. The University will have a viable draft of a long range housing plan in time for consideration in the Housing and Residence Life Office’s FY13 budget development timetable.   This did not happen.   1. The University will have a final Housing Study Report to use for long range planning prior to June 30, 2012.   This did not happen.   1. Feedback from both the associate provost for student services and enrollment and the vice president for finance and administration obtained prior to Friday, July 6, 2012, will be positive regarding the final report.   No final report available at this time.   1. Members of the Board of Trustees’ Finance Committee and the Board of Trustees will support those aspects of future Housing and Residence Life Office budgets which are based on the long-range housing plan.   Not applicable at this time. |  | (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)  We are midstream on this major effort. The Market and Demand Study provided by the Scion Group was not adequate; it did not present us with options to consider, but instead presented a single recommendation with questionable feasibility. We are working with Scion Group representatives to obtain a report that better meets our needs and that can lead to a more usable final report. |
| **Administrative Objective #3** *(State a 1-2 year objective intended to improve a unit process, service, or output.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |
| *Objective*:  To improve departmental staff communication, coordination, and performance by developing a comprehensive administrative calendar.  *Rationale (Why you are setting this objective? Mark with “X”)*:  X Effectiveness/quality action Efficiency/cost action  Compliance issue X Satisfaction measure Create baseline  Other (explain):  *Does this objective relate to a Road Map goal? (Refer to last page for the Road Map goals). If yes, type the related Road Map codes here*: |  | Describe timetable plans to achieve objective.   1. To identify a staff member to coordinate this project by Friday, September 30. 2. To have a first draft of the administrative calendar by Monday, October 31. 3. To complete the department’s administrative calendar by Thursday, December 22. 4. Implement a process for updating the calendar on a monthly basis prior to Thursday, December 22.   *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success*?1   1. When surveyed during their end-of-year planning meeting, 100% of the resident director staff will indicate they were satisfied or more than satisfied with the timeliness of administrative prompters and materials provided by departmental office staff. 2. When surveyed prior to Thursday, May 31, 100% of the office staff will indicate that they were satisfied or more than satisfied with how the calendar helped them plan and accomplish their duties in a timely fashion. |
| **Summary of Data Collected (**Summarize the evidence) |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** |
| (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)   1. To identify a staff member to coordinate this project by Friday, September 30.   This was done. Our principal secretary provided the coordination for this project.   1. To have a first draft of the administrative calendar by Monday, October 31.   The first draft was completed on Thursday, March 8. It took us much longer than expected to gather the relevant information.   1. To complete the department’s administrative calendar by Thursday, December 22   It was completed on Thursday, April 26.   1. Implement a process for updating the calendar on a monthly basis prior to Thursday, December 22.   This process was part of the initial project implementation.  *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success*?1   1. When surveyed during their end-of-year planning meeting, 100% of the resident director staff will indicate they were satisfied or more than satisfied with the timeliness of administrative prompters and materials provided by departmental office staff. Their contract ended on May 12, 2012.   The administrative calendar was completed too late for us to obtain useful feedback.   1. When surveyed prior toThursday, May 31, 100% of the office staff will indicate that they were satisfied or more than satisfied with how the calendar helped them plan and accomplish their duties in a timely fashion.   The administrative calendar was completed too late for us to solicit useful feedback by this date. Informal feedback indicates that staff do not use the calendar in its final form, but instead use an abbreviated version that each created for him or herself that includes items that are specifically his or hers. |  | (Fill in only for the REPORT at the end of the year.)  Staff do not appear to be using the calendar as intended. During the coming year we will incorporate the administrative calendar into various levels of staff meetings and planning sessions to ensure that staff: 1) are looking far enough into the future, 2) understand what others are planning/doing, and 3) are constantly thinking of ways to improve our procedures and practices. |

Many service units already use an evaluative measure and this approach is now more common in assessment theory– not everything we try works out the way as hoped and creating a target and/or success/bail out threshold is appropriate. In cases where this is a new approach for a unit, in the 2011-12 Plan consider how you *might* measure the added value of an objective; however, it is not yet a requirement. The OA committee will provide suggestions in its feedback for this year. During the year, dialogues, additional resources, one-on-one meetings and/or seminars will be held to evolve our OA process.

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)