



2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT-SERVICE UNITS AY 2008-2009

Report Date: July 14, 2009
Division/Office: University Life
Department/Program: Residence Life
Person completing the Report: Golden Venters and Steve Nygaard

1. **Overview Statement:** Briefly summarize the assessment activities that were undertaken this academic year, indicating:
 - a. which program learning outcomes were assessed this year.
 - b. who in your department/program was involved in the assessment of the above learning outcomes

There was one learning outcome assessed in the 2008-2009 academic year;

- 1A. Students will demonstrate behavior that supports the physical and emotional wellbeing of campus community members

This year the focus was on learning outcomes for students who participated in the Fall and Spring Resident Advisor Training (students hired as residence advisors). The primary people involved in the assessment of this outcome were the Associate Director for Business Services, the Director of Residence Life, the Hall Directors and Assistant Hall Directors, and the Complex Coordinator and Assistant Complex Coordinator.

2. **Please Answers the Following Questions for Each of the Student Outcomes Assessed:**
 - a. **What did you do?**

Describe clearly and concisely how you assessed the learning outcomes that were evaluated this year (e.g., measures, research methods, etc.).

 - All professional in-hall staff (Hall Directors, Assistant Hall Directors, Complex Coordinator, and Assistant Complex Coordinator) were requested to provide case examples of incidents in which individual members of their Resident Advisor (RA) staff demonstrated behavior that supported the physical and/or emotional well-being of students living on-campus. They were asked to give one example for as many of their staff members as they could. The achievement measure established



2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

in the Assessment Plan was based on the percentage of RA staff that in-hall staff could give a case example for. The achievement scale is as follows:

Less than 50% = Poor Achievement
50-75% = Average Achievement
76-100% = Very Good Achievement

- Professional in-hall staff were asked to provide brief overviews of all in-hall programs developed and/or facilitated by their RA's during the year. The brief descriptions of these programs provided in the overviews were then reviewed and programs with a description that seemed to have a direct intent to address the emotional or physical wellbeing of students living on-campus were consolidated and compared against total programs. The achievement measure established in the Assessment Plan was based on the percentage of programs developed and/or facilitated by RA's that address topics that support the physical and emotional wellbeing of students living on-campus. The achievement scale is as follows:

Less than 50% = Poor Achievement
50-75% = Average Achievement
76-100% = Very Good Achievement

- Daily Duty Reports were analyzed [**Not Yet Completed**] to identify examples of RA's demonstrating behavior that supports the emotional or physical wellbeing of students living on-campus. The achievement measure established in the Assessment Plan was based on the percentage of incidents documented in daily Duty Reports involving RA's exhibiting behavior that supported the physical and emotional wellbeing of students living on-campus. The achievement scale is as follows:

Less than 50% = Poor Achievement
50-75% = Average Achievement
76-100% = Very Good Achievement



2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

b. What did the staff in the department or program learn?

Summarize your findings and conclusions as a result of the assessment indicating strengths and weaknesses in student learning demonstrated by this assessment.

Results from Measures:

- Professional in-hall staff could provide case examples of incidents in which individual RA's demonstrated behavior that supported the physical and/or emotional well-being of students living on-campus for 83% (56 of 67) of the RA's. Compared against the established achievement scale the learning outcome performance descriptor for this measure is Very Good (76-100% = Very Good).
- There were a total of 284 RA programs submitted in the hall program overviews. Of these, brief descriptions for 102 programs seemed to have address topics or have content that a directly addressed the emotional or physical wellbeing of students living on-campus. This represents 36% (102 of 284) of the total programs and an outcome performance descriptor of Poor for this measure (Less than 50% = Poor).
- The analysis of daily Duty Reports has not been completed. While daily reports for the entire year have now been consolidated, the task is incomplete because of a combination of unanticipated challenges including: access to the data, unresolved methodology for determining the percentage of incidents documented that involve RA's; consistent language/reporting guidelines that demonstrate the assessed target behavior (versus the high occurrence of RA names in reports); limited resources to compile this report.

c. What will be done differently as a result of what was learned?

Discuss how programs will be changed to improve student learning as a result of the assessment. Include a discussion of how staff will help students overcome their weaknesses and improve their strengths.

- The Very Good performance descriptor for the measure of RA's behavior supporting the physical and/or emotional well-being of students, no changes will be made in the training of the Resident Advisors
- The Poor performance descriptor information for the measure of RA programs directly addressing the emotional or physical well-being of students will be given to the Co-Curricular Programming Committee



2008-2009 Assessment Plan Report

currently evaluating the ORL Programming model. This committee expects to develop a new model which will address the overall need and focus of the departmental programs offered by RAs

- Given the challenges faced, we will look at reviewing this methodology of assessment as well as the role of this particular learning outcome.

3. Attach a copy of the components of the department/program assessment plan that have been modified since its initial submission:

- a. Program Mission
- b. Program Learning Goals
- c. Program Learning Outcomes
- d. Program Learning Rubrics aligned with outcomes
- e. Curriculum map that shows the programs that pertain to the outcome

Please return to: Provost Office by June 1, 2009

You can send your replies as either a Word attachment (to: marin@usfca.edu) or as a hard copy to: Provost Office, Lone Mountain Rossi Wing 4th floor.

If you have any questions, please contact: William Murry, Director of Institutional Assessment (wmurry@usfca.edu or x5486).