



UNIT/PROGRAM NAME: Housing & Residence Life
OFFICE OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY: Housing & Residence Life
ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR: Cindy Dysart, E. Zach Helms, Debra J. Franks, Jalysa O. Green
SUBMISSION DATE OF THE REPORT: Monday, October 01, 2018

ACADEMIC YEAR 2017-2018

INSTRUCTIONS:

To comply with institutional effectiveness expectations, units/programs **MUST**:

- identify expected outcomes,
- assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and
- provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results

Guidance for preparing Unit Goals and Indicators of Success Reports:

- Use multiple assessments (Indicators of Success) for each Unit Goal.
- Reports must demonstrate engagement in on-going planning and assessment which is consistent over time to enable the unit to evaluate students, courses or a program. Shared widely within and across programs, the results of this assessment must be used to inform decisions about curricular and programmatic revisions. At appropriate intervals, program and learning outcomes and assessment methods should be evaluated and revised.
- Develop and/or use methods and instruments that are uniquely suited to the goal statements/Indicators of Success and that are supported by faculty/unit.
- Each Report must contain “mature data” (at least five years - sufficient information used as a basis for sound decision making).
- Each Report must provide evidence of improvement, based on the analysis of the assessment results, as opposed to a plan for improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS AND SUMMARY

(Edit document below this Table of Contents and then press Ctrl+8 to update the Table of Contents.)

1. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 1: Monitor occupancy rates to report to the President’s Cabinet and for the purpose of determining projected capacity for an academic year	8
1.1. STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED: 2. Selective, Competitive Recruitment and Enrollment of Ambitious and Talented Students	8
1.2. TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: Academic Year 2017-2018	8
1.3. INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES	8
1.4. AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 3.00	8
1.5. ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:	8
1.6. REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: Click here to enter a review date.	9
1.6.1.1. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1: None	9
1.6.1.2. EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	9
1.6.2.1. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2: None	9
1.6.2.2. EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	9
1.7. SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-5:	9
1.8. CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-2: No proposed changes due to the outcome on this unit /program goal.	10
2. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 2: Provide Lander University resident students with a satisfactory living and learning environment.	11
2.1. STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED: 2. Selective, Competitive Recruitment and Enrollment of Ambitious and Talented Students	11
2.2. TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: Academic Year 2017-2018	11
2.3. INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES	11
2.4. AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 3.00	13
2.5. ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:	13
2.6. REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018	13

2.6.1.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1: NONE	14
2.6.1.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	14
2.6.2.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2: None.....	14
2.6.2.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	14
2.6.3.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 3: None.....	14
2.6.3.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	15
2.6.4.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 4: None	15
2.6.4.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	15
2.6.5.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5: None.....	15
2.6.5.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	15
2.6.6.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 6: None.....	15
2.6.6.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	15
2.7.	SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-6:.....	16
2.8.	CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-6: No changes made or proposed.	16
3.	UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 3: Provide a residence life environment that promotes the opportunity for resident students to grow and develop academically and socially.	17
3.1.	STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED: 3. Robust Student Experience.....	17
3.2.	TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: Academic Year 2017-2018.....	17
3.3.	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES.....	17
3.4.	AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 3.00	18
3.5.	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:	19
3.6.	REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018.....	19
3.6.1.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1: None	19
3.6.1.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	19
3.6.2.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2: None.....	20

3.6.2.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	20
3.6.3.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 3: None	20
3.6.3.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	20
3.6.4.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 4: None	20
3.6.4.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	20
3.6.5.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5: None	21
3.6.5.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	21
3.6.6.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 6: None	21
3.6.6.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	21
3.7.	SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-6:	21
3.8.	CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-6: Two indicators which were dropped from the Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey by the company will be included on the survey again as two new institutional specific questions: “ <i>Living on-campus improved the integration to college for resident students</i> ” and “ <i>Living on-campus enhanced the retention and graduation of resident students from Lander University</i> ”. They will be included under the second unit goal of “ Provide Lander University resident students with a satisfactory living and learning environment ” as a retention measure.	21
4.	UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 4: 4. Resident Assistant student staff members to grow and develop academically and socially.	22
4.1.	STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED: 3. Robust Student Experience.....	22
4.2.	TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: Academic Year 2017-2018.....	22
4.3.	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES	22
4.4.	AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 3.00	23
4.5.	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:	23
4.6.	REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018.....	23
4.6.1.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1: None	24
4.6.1.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	24
4.6.2.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2: None	24
4.6.2.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	24

4.6.3.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 3: None	24
4.6.3.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	24
4.6.4.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 4: None	25
4.6.4.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	25
4.6.5.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5: None	25
4.6.5.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	25
4.7.	SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-5:	25
4.8.	CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-5: Maintain current indicators for this goal. None proposed.	25
5.	UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 5: Provide adequate and satisfactory supervisory support and training for Resident Assistants.	26
5.1.	STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED: 2. Selective, Competitive Recruitment and Enrollment of Ambitious and Talented Students	26
5.2.	TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: Academic Year 2017-2018	26
5.3.	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES	26
5.4.	AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 2.86	27
5.5.	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:	28
5.6.	REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018	28
5.6.1.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1: None	28
5.6.1.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	28
5.6.2.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2: None	29
5.6.2.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	29
5.6.3.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 3: None	29
5.6.3.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	29
5.6.4.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 4: None	29
5.6.4.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	29
5.6.5.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5: None	30

5.6.5.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	30
5.6.6.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 6: None.....	30
5.6.6.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	30
5.6.7.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	30
5.7.	SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-7:	30
5.8.	CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-7: The following plans will be instituted for the 2017/2018 Academic Year: (1) The Area Coordinators (formally Residence Life Coordinator) will meet with the Assistant Director of Housing and Residence Life to evaluate the Fall Resident Assistant Training in order to determine what items need to be removed or added to the training as needs are identified. In addition, the evaluation will consider different types of trainings that could be done as in-service type events throughout the year (i.e. etiquette dinner). More training exercises will take place throughout the year as a lack of confidence/knowledge is seen in certain areas. The findings and thoughts from this meeting will be given to the new, current vacant Area Coordinator position once filled. (2) The Housing and Residence Life supervisory staff (Director and Assistant Director) will implement a mid-year (December) and end of the year evaluation (April) assessment utilizing a Likert scale evaluation tool, evaluating the Area Coordinators. The evaluation will be given to each Area Coordinators supervisees. Evaluations will be reviewed and discussed with each specific Area Coordinator during EMPS meeting with the Assistant Director of Housing and Residence Life typically held in December. Additionally, the Assistant Director of Housing and Residence Life plans to meet with the Area Coordinators on a regular basis in an effort to provide them with more guidance in solving issues that RAs may be having amongst themselves as a staff or with their supervision.	31
6.	UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 6: 6. The Department of Housing and Residence Life was effective in its provision of services to students.....	32
6.1.	STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED: 2. Selective, Competitive Recruitment and Enrollment of Ambitious and Talented Students.....	32
6.2.	TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: Academic Year 2017-2018.....	32
6.3.	INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES	32
6.4.	AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 3.00	32
6.5.	ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:	32
6.6.	REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018.....	32
6.6.1.1.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1: None	33
6.6.1.2.	EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable	33
6.7.	SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOME 1:	33

The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that the Department of Housing & Resident Life was effective in its provisions of services to students was met. This supports the retention of resident students due to the criteria for the indicator. Resident students agreed that the provision of services from the

Department of Housing and Residence Life provided them with a sense of belonging to this institution, assisted in their learning, promoted their satisfaction with their on-campus housing experience, positively contributed to their academic performance, gauged their agreement they would recommend living in on-campus housing to new students, positively impacted their decision to return to Lander University next year, and rated the cost worth the experience. All indicators for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the “select six” institutions and 4/259 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator

- 6.8. **CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOME 1:** No proposed changes. Continue to monitor. 33
- 7. **UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 7:** Provide a quality safe living learning environment for Lander University Resident Students. 34
 - 7.1. **STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED:** 3. Robust Student Experience..... 34
 - 7.2. **TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** Academic Year 2017-2018..... 34
 - 7.3. **INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES**..... 34
 - 7.4. **AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** 3.00 34
 - 7.5. **ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:** 34
 - 7.6. **REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018**..... 35
 - 7.6.1.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1:** None 35
 - 7.6.1.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable 35
 - 7.6.2.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5:** None 35
 - 7.6.2.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable 35
 - 7.7. **SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-5:** 36
 - 7.8. **CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-5:** No proposed changes. Continue to monitor..... 36

1. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 1: Monitor occupancy rates to report to the President’s Cabinet and for the purpose of determining projected capacity for an academic year

1.1. **STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED:** 2. Selective, Competitive Recruitment and Enrollment of Ambitious and Talented Students

1.2. **TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** Academic Year 2017-2018

1.3. **INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES¹**

	Indicator of Success / Student Learning Outcome	Summary Data for this Timeframe	Expected Outcome: Met (3)	Expected Outcome: Partially Met (2)	Expected Outcome: Not Met (1)	Score
1.3.1.	Occupancy report is submitted to the Vice President for Student Affairs weekly and tracked in a yearly report.	Housing Application Report Submitted	Report submitted with Monthly Tracking Document	N/A	Report Not Submitted	3.00
1.3.2.	Number of decisions made based on information from the projected capacity of the occupancy rate regarding residence life staff, residence assistants, residence halls remaining open, and building new and/or repairing current residence halls.	1 Decision Made	At least one decision made based on projected occupancy rates	N/A	No Decisions Made	3.00

1.4. **AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** 3.00

1.5. **ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:**

Indicator of Success	Assessment Instruments	Frequency of Assessment
1.5.1.	Housing Application Report	Annually
1.5.2.	Student Affairs Board Report	Annually

¹ Expected Outcomes **must** be mutually exclusive for Met, Partially Met and Not Met.

--	--	--

1.6. REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: [Click here to enter a review date.](#)

(THE FOCUS OF NARRATIVE SHOULD BE ON PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS OF THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS, AND NOT A PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT):

1.6.1. **OUTCOME 1 COMMENTS:** This indicator of success was met. The Director of Housing and Residence Life submitted reports on a monthly basis and submitted a year end annual Housing Application report to the Vice President for Student Affairs on 6/12/2018. The summary is included the Student Affairs' June 19, 2018 Board Report.

1.6.1.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1:** None

1.6.1.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

1.6.2. **OUTCOME 2 COMMENTS:** One decision based off of the occupancy report was made for the 2018/2019 Academic Year. This met the established criteria for success. The decision was documented in the June 19, 2018 Student Affairs' Board report. "Sixty-eight beds were added in Bearcat Village (converted from single rooms to double rooms) to increase the total bed inventory for occupancy utilization for the 2018-2019 academic year. This brought the available bed inventory from 1704 (2017/18) to 1782 (2018/19). Ideally, this should alleviate any shortage of beds based on the increased enrollment projection. The Associate Director of Housing and Residence Life furnished these additional beds with an asset transfer option from excess furniture inventory at Clemson University. This furniture is manufactured by the same vendor, Southwest Furniture, and is the same style utilized throughout the residence halls. The only cost associated with this asset transfer was freight, delivery and installation charges, in addition the purchase of new mattresses." (*June 19, 2018 – Student Affairs Board Report*).

1.6.2.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2:** None

1.6.2.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

1.7. SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-5:

The Director of Housing and Residence Life consistently monitors the new applications and occupancy rates and updates the Vice President for Student Affairs on the projected capacity every week in order for the Vice President to report this information in the President's Cabinet weekly meeting. This information is then documented in a monthly report and the Director of Housing and Residence Life submits a year- end report to the Vice President for Student Affairs. This report was used (in conjunction with other information) to make the decision to convert single rooms to double rooms at Bearcat Village in order to create 68 news beds based on the projections for the 2018/2019 Academic Year. All resident student applications for the 2018-2019 academic year will be processed through the new housing software StarRez. This software allows students to complete their housing application and pay

housing fees on-line. One benefit which could impact this indicator is the ability of the software to alleviate the number the majority of the no show numbers at fall opening and give a more accurate headcount of committed and assigned beds early on.

1.8. CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-2: No proposed changes due to the outcome on this unit /program goal.

2. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 2: Provide Lander University resident students with a satisfactory living and learning environment.

2.1. **STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED:** 2. Selective, Competitive Recruitment and Enrollment of Ambitious and Talented Students

2.2. **TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** Academic Year 2017-2018

2.3. **INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES²**

Indicator of Success / Student Learning Outcome	Summary Data for this Timeframe	Expected Outcome: Met (3)	Expected Outcome: Partially Met (2)	Expected Outcome: Not Met (1)	Score
2.3.1. Students are satisfied with their experience with housing and residence life staff.	Lander Mean:6.36 Select Six:5.70 Carnegie Mean: 5.72 All Institutions 5.93	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00
2.3.2. Students are satisfied with the social / educational / cultural programs and activities provided by resident life staff members.	Lander Mean: 5.68 Select Six: 5.18 Carnegie Mean: 5.17 All Institutions: 5.26	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00

² Expected Outcomes **must** be mutually exclusive for Met, Partially Met and Not Met.

2.3.3	Students are satisfied with their room / hall / floor environment.	Lander Mean:5.93 Select Six: 5.23 Carnegie Mean:5.27 All Institutions:5.46	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00
2.3.4	Students are satisfied with the services provided for their residence hall rooms and / or facilities.	Lander Mean: 5.83 Select Six:5.15 Carnegie Mean:4.90 All Intuitions 5.26	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00
2.3.5	Students are satisfied with the room assignment and/or room change process.	Lander Mean: 5.74 Select Six:4.79 Carnegie Mean:5.12 All Instittions:5.30	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00

2.3.6	Overall, students living on-campus are satisfied with their on-campus housing experience.	Lander Mean: 5.71 Select Six:4.90 Carnegie Mean:5.03 All Institutions: 5.17	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

2.4. AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 3.00

2.5. ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:

Indicator of Success	Assessment Instruments	Frequency of Assessment
2.5.1.	<i>Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey</i>	Annually
2.5.2.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey and Survey Institutional Specific Questions (OQ1, OQ2, OQ3, OQ4)	Annually
2.5.3.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually
2.5.4.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually
2.5.5.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually
2.5.6.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually

2.6. REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018

(THE FOCUS OF NARRATIVE SHOULD BE ON PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS OF THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS, AND NOT A PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT):

2.6.1. **OUTCOME 1 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator, “*Students are satisfied with their experience with housing and residence life staff*”, was met. Lander University’s mean was above all of the Skyfactor Benchworks mean comparison groups. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 2/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 8/259 for all institutions using the same survey. In breaking down the survey responses to specific questions measuring the satisfaction of students with their housing and residence life staff, each question’s mean was above all of the benchmark means except for the two of three institutional specific questions. The two questions which partially met the threshold were: *My resident assistant: assisted me in reaching my academic goals and modeled professionalism*. One question showed improvement by meeting the established threshold, “My resident assistant: assisted me in connecting to campus resources”. This question’s mean improved from 5.11 to a mean of 5.73. This improvement was influenced by the Resident Assistants having access to *Maxient* (a software system) which allowed for uniform reporting platform for many aspects of their jobs. Overall for this indicator, there was an average satisfaction rate of 90% (9337/10373) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. This represents a 2% increase from last year’s data.

2.6.1.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1:** NONE

2.6.1.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

2.6.2. **OUTCOME 2 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Students are satisfied with the social / educational / cultural programs and activities provided by resident life staff members*” was met. Lander University’s mean was above all of the Skyfactor Benchworks mean comparison groups. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 12/259 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 83% (3513/4269) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. This represents a 14% increase from last year’s 69% satisfaction rate.

2.6.2.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2:** None

2.6.2.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

2.6.3. **OUTCOME 3 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Students are satisfied with their room / hall / floor environment*” was met. Lander University’s mean was above all of the Skyfactor Benchworks mean comparison groups. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 3/259 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 84% (3735/4472) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. This represents a 3% increase from last year’s 81% satisfaction rate.

2.6.3.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 3:** None

2.6.3.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

2.6.4. **OUTCOME 4 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Students are satisfied with the services provided for their residence hall rooms and / or facilities*” was met. Lander University’s mean was above all of the Skyfactor Benchworks mean comparison groups. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 4/259 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 82% (5247/6394) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. This represents a 5% increase from last year’s 77% satisfaction rate. No action will be taken.

2.6.4.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 4:** None

2.6.4.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

2.6.5. **OUTCOME 5 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Students are satisfied with the room assignment and/or room change process*”. Lander University’s mean was above all of the Skyfactor Benchworks mean comparison groups. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 6/259 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 79% (811/1026) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. Continue to monitor. No action will be taken.

2.6.5.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5:** None

2.6.5.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

2.6.6. **OUTCOME 6 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Overall, students living on-campus are satisfied with their on-campus housing experience*” was met. Lander University’s mean was above all of the Skyfactor Benchworks mean comparison groups. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 6/259 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 83% (2772/3353) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. Continue to monitor. No action will be taken.

2.6.6.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 6:** None

2.6.6.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

2.7. SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-6:

The Department of Housing and Residence Life supports Lander University's strategic plan's second pillar in terms of retention as evidenced by meeting all indicators of success for the goal of providing Lander University resident students with a satisfactory living and learning environment. There was an average satisfaction rate of 85% (25415/29887) on responses to all of the survey questions for this goal. This represents a 2% increase from last year's 83% satisfaction rate. This was the fifth reporting period the Skyfactor Benchworks assessment surveys were used to measure this goal. The threshold for each unit indicator was set by comparing Lander University's results with several different comparison groups (Select 6 Peers, Carnegie Peers, and all EBI participants). In breaking down the survey responses to specific questions measuring the satisfaction of students with their housing and residence life staff, each question's mean was above all of the benchmark/set means except for two of the three institutional specific questions (see 2.6.1 Outcome above). For this reporting period, there were 51 Resident Assistants compared to 43 last year. Sixteen of these will be graduating Spring 2018. The new software program "StarRez" was used during the 2017/2018 Academic Year and did not seem to impact survey results in any way.

2.8. CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-6: No changes made or proposed.

3. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 3: Provide a residence life environment that promotes the opportunity for resident students to grow and develop academically and socially.

3.1. **STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED:** 3. Robust Student Experience

3.2. **TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** Academic Year 2017-2018

3.3. **INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES³**

Indicator of Success / Student Learning Outcome	Summary Data for this Timeframe	Expected Outcome: Met (3)	Expected Outcome: Partially Met (2)	Expected Outcome: Not Met (1)	Score
3.3.1 Overall, living on campus enhanced the resident students' academic performance/learning.	Lander Mean: 5.84 Select Six:4.92 Carnegie Mean:4.86 All Institutions:5.15	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00
3.3.2 Living on campus enhanced the personal interactions of resident students.	Lander Mean: 5.87 Select Six:4.99 Carnegie Mean:4.92 All Institutions: 5.25	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00

³ Expected Outcomes **must** be mutually exclusive for Met, Partially Met and Not Met.

3.3.3	Living on-campus helped to enhance an awareness of diversity and social justice in resident students.	Lander Mean: 5.85 Select Six:5.00 Carnegie Mean:4.87 All Institutions: 5.14	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00
3.3.4	Living on-campus improved the life skills of resident students (Self-management).	Lander Mean: 5.63 Select Six:4.90 Carnegie Mean:4.77 All Institutions: 5.03	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00
3.3.5	Living on-campus improved the integration to college for resident students.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00
3.3.6	Living on-campus enhanced the retention and graduation of resident students from Lander University.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.00

3.4. AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 3.00

3.5. ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:

Indicator of Success	Assessment Instruments	Frequency of Assessment
3.5.1.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually
3.5.2.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually
3.5.3.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually
3.5.4.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually
3.5.5.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually
3.5.6.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually

3.6. REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018

(THE FOCUS OF NARRATIVE SHOULD BE ON PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS OF THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS, AND NOT A PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT):

3.6.1. **OUTCOME 1 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Overall, living on campus enhanced the resident students’ academic performance/learning*” was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison means. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 2/258 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 94% (2082/2226) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. This is the same percentage rate as last reporting period. No action will be taken. Continue to monitor.

3.6.1.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1:** None

3.6.1.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

3.6.2. **OUTCOME 2 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Living on campus enhanced the personal interactions of resident students*” was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison means. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 5/259 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 95% (4181/4415) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. This represents a 1% increase from the 94% percentage rate for the last reporting period. No action will be taken. Continue to monitor.

3.6.2.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2:** None

3.6.2.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

3.6.3. **OUTCOME 3 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Living on-campus helped to enhance an awareness of diversity and social justice in resident students*” was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison means. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 4/259 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 95% (3143/3320) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. This represents a 1% increase from the 94% percentage rate for the last reporting period. No action will be taken. Continue to monitor.

3.6.3.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 3:** None

3.6.3.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

3.6.4. **OUTCOME 4 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of “*Living on-campus improved the life skills of resident students (Self-management).*” was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison means. Lander University’s mean score was ranked 1/7 for the select six comparison group, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups, and 7/259 for all institutions using the same survey. There was an average satisfaction rate of 78% (4277/5492) for responses of “agree” or “satisfied” to all of the survey questions for this indicator. This represents a 4% increase from the 74% percentage rate for the last reporting period. No action will be taken. Continue to monitor.

3.6.4.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 4:** None

3.6.4.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

3.6.5. **OUTCOME 5 COMMENTS:** The indicator, “*Living on-campus improved the integration to college for resident students*”, was dropped from the Skyfactor Benchworks Assessment Survey four years ago. Since it is an indicator that supports retention, it will be added as an institutional specific question to the 2018/2019 assessment survey and included in the second unit goal.

3.6.5.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5:** None

3.6.5.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

3.6.6. **OUTCOME 6 COMMENTS:** The indicator, “*Living on-campus enhanced the retention and graduation of resident students from Lander University*”, was dropped from the Skyfactor Benchworks Assessment Survey four years ago. Since it is an indicator that supports retention, it will be added as an institutional specific question to the 2018/2019 assessment survey and included in the second unit goal.

3.6.6.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 6:** None

3.6.6.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

3.7. **SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-6:**

The Department of Housing and Residence Life supports Lander University’s strategic plan’s third pillar in terms of providing robust student experience as evidenced by meeting all indicators of success for the unit/program goal: “*Provide a residence life environment that promotes the opportunity for resident students to grow and develop academically and socially*”. There was an average satisfaction rate of 89% (13685/15453) on responses to all of the survey questions for this goal. This was the fifth reporting period the Skyfactor Benchworks assessment surveys were used to measure this goal. The threshold for each unit indicator was set by comparing Lander University’s results with several different comparison groups (Select 6 Peers, Carnegie Peers, and all EBI participants).

3.8. **CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-6:** Two indicators which were dropped from the Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey by the company will be included on the survey again as two new institutional specific questions: “*Living on-campus improved the integration to college for resident students*” and “*Living on-campus enhanced the retention and graduation of resident students from Lander University*”. They will be included under the second unit goal of “**Provide Lander University resident students with a satisfactory living and learning environment**” as a retention measure.

4. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 4: 4. Resident Assistant student staff members to grow and develop academically and socially.

4.1. STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED: 3. Robust Student Experience

4.2. TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: Academic Year 2017-2018

4.3. INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES⁴

Indicator of Success / Student Learning Outcome	Summary Data for this Timeframe	Expected Outcome: Met (3)	Expected Outcome: Partially Met (2)	Expected Outcome: Not Met (1)	Score
4.3.1 Employment as a Resident Assistant (RA) improved the intrapersonal competence of the student staff member (empathy)	Lander Mean: 6.49 Select Six:6.14 All Institutions: 5.90	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00
4.3.2 Employment as a Resident Assistant (RA) enhanced self-knowledge and skills of the student staff member.	Lander Mean: 6.47 Select Six:5.97 All Institutions: 5.75	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00
4.3.3 Employment as a Resident Assistant (RA) improved the student staff member’s personal competence.	Lander Mean: 6.43 Select Six:5.92 All Institutions: 5.72	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer	3.00

⁴ Expected Outcomes **must** be mutually exclusive for Met, Partially Met and Not Met.

			institutions and all surveyed institutions.	institutions and all surveyed institutions.	institutions or all surveyed institutions	
4.3.4	Employment as a Resident Assistant (RA) enhanced the student staff member's practical competence.	Lander Mean: 6.44 Select Six:5.84 All Institutions: 5.78	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00
4.3.5	Employment as a Resident Assistant (RA) enhanced the student staff member's diverse interactions.	Lander Mean: 6.62 Select Six:6.19 All Institutions: 6.12	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00

4.4. AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 3.00

4.5. ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:

Indicator of Success	Assessment Instruments	Frequency of Assessment
4.5.1.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
4.5.2.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
4.5.3.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
4.5.4.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
4.5.5.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually

4.6. REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018

(THE FOCUS OF NARRATIVE SHOULD BE ON PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS OF THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS, AND NOT A PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT):

4.6.1. **OUTCOME 1 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor signifying that employment as a Resident Assistant improved the intrapersonal competence of the student staff member was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the “select six” institutions and 1/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action will be taken.

4.6.1.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1:** None

4.6.1.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

4.6.2. **OUTCOME 2 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor signifying that employment as a Resident Assistant enhanced self-knowledge and skills of the student staff member was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the “select six” institutions and 1/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator.

4.6.2.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2:** None

4.6.2.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

4.6.3. **OUTCOME 3 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor signifying that employment as a Resident Assistant improved the student staff member’s personal competence was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the “select six” institutions and 1/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator.

4.6.3.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 3:** None

4.6.3.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

4.6.4. **OUTCOME 4 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor signifying that employment as a Resident Assistant improved the student staff member's practical competence was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the "select six" institutions and 1/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator.

4.6.4.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 4:** None

4.6.4.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

4.6.5. **OUTCOME 5 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor signifying that employment as a Resident Assistant enhanced the student staff member's diverse interactions was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the "select six" institutions and 1/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator.

4.6.5.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5:** None

4.6.5.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

4.7. SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-5:

The Department of Housing and Residence Life supports Lander University's strategic plan's third pillar in terms of providing robust student experience as evidenced by meeting all five indicators of success for the unit/program goal: "Provide adequate training and support for Resident Assistants to promote the opportunity for Resident Assistant student staff members to grow and develop academically and socially" This was the fifth reporting period the Skyfactor Benchworks assessment surveys were used to measure this goal. The threshold for each unit indicator was set by comparing Lander University's results with several different comparison groups (Select 6 Peers, Carnegie Peers -no comparisons in this group for this reporting period, and all Skyfactor Benchworks participants). When examining the data longitudinally, the mean for the 2017/2018 reporting period was 6.44 compared to the 2016/2017 mean of 6.17.

4.8. CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-5: Maintain current indicators for this goal. None proposed.

5. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 5: Provide adequate and satisfactory supervisory support and training for Resident Assistants.

5.1. **STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED:** 2. Selective, Competitive Recruitment and Enrollment of Ambitious and Talented Students

5.2. **TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** Academic Year 2017-2018

5.3. INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES⁵

Indicator of Success / Student Learning Outcome	Summary Data for this Timeframe	Expected Outcome: Met (3)	Expected Outcome: Partially Met (2)	Expected Outcome: Not Met (1)	Score
5.3.1 The Resident Assistant Training provided Resident Assistants (RAs) with beneficial and useful information needed for the effective performance of their job.	Lander Mean: 6.43 Select Six:5.70 All Institutions: 5.27	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00
5.3.2 Clear job expectations were established regarding aspects of the Resident Assistant student staff position.	Lander Mean: 6.16 Select Six: 6.04 All Institutions: 5.96	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00
5.3.3 Resident Assistants are satisfied with their job demands and compensation.	Lander Mean: 5.94 Select Six:5 .65 All Institutions: 5.19	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00

⁵ Expected Outcomes **must** be mutually exclusive for Met, Partially Met and Not Met.

5.3.4	Resident Assistants are satisfied with their Residence Life Coordinator's supervision.	Lander Mean: 6.10 Select Six: 6.13 All Institutions: 5.87	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	2.00
5.3.5	Resident Assistants are satisfied with their supervisor's management skills.	Lander Mean:6.14 Select Six:6.13 All Institutions: 5.92	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00
5.3.6	Resident Assistants are satisfied with the student staff selection process.	Lander Mean:5.91 Select Six:5.71 All Institutions: 5.46	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00
5.3.7	Overall, Resident Assistants are satisfied with their student staff and academic experience.	Lander Mean:6.22 Select Six:5.81 All Institutions: 5.53	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: the select six peer institutions or all surveyed institutions	3.00

5.4. AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS: 2.86

5.5. ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:

Indicator of Success	Assessment Instruments	Frequency of Assessment
5.5.1.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
5.5.2.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
5.5.3.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
5.5.4.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
5.5.5.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
5.5.6.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually
5.5.7.	Skyfactor Benchworks Student Staff Assessment Survey	Annually

5.6. REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018

(THE FOCUS OF NARRATIVE SHOULD BE ON PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS OF THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS, AND NOT A PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT):

5.6.1. **OUTCOME 1 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that the Resident Assistant Training provided Resident Assistants with beneficial and useful information needed for the effective performance of their job was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the “select six” institutions and 2/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator.

5.6.1.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1:** None

5.6.1.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

5.6.2. **OUTCOME 2 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that clear job expectations were established regarding aspects of the Resident Assistant student staff position was met for this reporting period. Four of the five survey questions gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. One question, “*There were clear expectations on policy enforcement*”, documented responses which were not above the select six comparison group. This will continue to be

monitored. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 3/7 in the “select six” institutions and 5/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no other actions are needed for this indicator.

5.6.2.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 2:** None

5.6.2.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

5.6.3. **OUTCOME 3 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that Resident Assistants are satisfied with job demands and compensation was met for this reporting period. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 2/7 in the “select six” institutions and 3/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator.

5.6.3.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 3:** None

5.6.3.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

5.6.4. **OUTCOME 4 COMMENTS:** Overall, the threshold for this indicator, “Resident Assistants are satisfied with their Residence Life Coordinator’s supervision” was partially met. Lander University’s mean was not above the “select six” comparison group means. This is the second time in five reporting periods that this indicator has not been fully met. Only one criterion was met with the following six criteria partially met due to not being above the select six comparison group: satisfaction on supervisors ability to set goals, satisfaction on supervisor’s ability to prioritize responsibilities, satisfaction on the supervisor’s expectations of performance, satisfaction on being treated with respect (second consecutive year), satisfaction with supervisor’s fairness, and satisfaction with supervisor supporting Resident Assistant’s work. Lander University ranked 4/7 in the “select six” institutions and 18/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey.

5.6.4.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 4:** None

5.6.4.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

5.6.5. **OUTCOME 5 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that Resident Assistants are satisfied with their supervisor’s management skills was met. There were two criteria which were not met. One has not been met for two consistent reporting periods – *supervisor’s consistency in enforcing policy*. The second criterion – *supervisor providing constructive criticism* – was met last year. There was improvement shown from “*partially met*” to “*met*” on the criterion of the supervisor helping to resolve problems. This is the second time in five

years this indicator has not been fully met. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 4/7 in the “select six” institutions and 22/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action other than continued monitoring is needed for this indicator.

5.6.5.1. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5: None

5.6.5.2. EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable

5.6.6. OUTCOME 6 COMMENTS: The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that Resident Assistants are satisfied with the student staff selection process was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. Improvement was noted from the last reporting period on the criterion around the fairness of the selection process. The mean score improved from 5.51 to 5.91 and was above all comparison group means. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 3/7 in the “select six” institutions and 10/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator.

5.6.6.1. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 6: None

5.6.6.2. EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable

5.6.7. OUTCOME 7 COMMENTS: The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that overall, Resident Assistants are satisfied with their student staff and academic experience was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the “select six” institutions and 1/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator

5.6.7.1. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 7: None

5.6.7.2. EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED: Not Applicable

5.7. SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-7:

The overall goal of providing Lander University Resident Assistants with adequate supervisory support and training was met for six of the seven indicators of success. One indicator of success was partially met based on the established thresholds: “*Resident Assistants are satisfied with their Residence Life Coordinator’s supervision*”. This was the second reporting period this indicator has not been met. Six of its seven criteria were not fully met. A plan of action needs to be developed to improve on this measure. There was improvement for the indicator, “*Resident Assistants are satisfied with their supervisor’s*

management skills”, from the last reporting period. This indicator was met for the 2017/2018 Academic Year. For this reporting period, there were two new Resident Life Coordinators. In addition, there were 51 total Resident Assistants. This was the fifth reporting period the *Skyfactor Benchworks* assessment surveys were used to measure this goal. The threshold for each unit indicator was set by comparing Lander University’s results with several different comparison groups (Select 6 Peers, Carnegie Peers, and all *Skyfactor Benchworks* participants).

5.8. **CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-7:** The following plans will be instituted for the 2017/2018 Academic Year: (1) The Area Coordinators (formally Residence Life Coordinator) will meet with the Assistant Director of Housing and Residence Life to evaluate the Fall Resident Assistant Training in order to determine what items need to be removed or added to the training as needs are identified. In addition, the evaluation will consider different types of trainings that could be done as in-service type events throughout the year (i.e. etiquette dinner). More training exercises will take place throughout the year as a lack of confidence/knowledge is seen in certain areas. The findings and thoughts from this meeting will be given to the new, current vacant Area Coordinator position once filled. (2) The Housing and Residence Life supervisory staff (Director and Assistant Director) will implement a mid-year (December) and end of the year evaluation (April) assessment utilizing a Likert scale evaluation tool, evaluating the Area Coordinators. The evaluation will be given to each Area Coordinators supervisees. Evaluations will be reviewed and discussed with each specific Area Coordinator during EMPS meeting with the Assistant Director of Housing and Residence Life typically held in December. Additionally, the Assistant Director of Housing and Residence Life plans to meet with the Area Coordinators on a regular basis in an effort to provide them with more guidance in solving issues that RAs may be having amongst themselves as a staff or with their supervision.

6. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 6: 6. The Department of Housing and Residence Life was effective in its provision of services to students.

6.1. **STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED:** 2. Selective, Competitive Recruitment and Enrollment of Ambitious and Talented Students

6.2. **TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** Academic Year 2017-2018

6.3. **INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES⁶**

Indicator of Success / Student Learning Outcome	Summary Data for this Timeframe	Expected Outcome: Met (3)	Expected Outcome: Partially Met (2)	Expected Outcome: Not Met (1)	Score
6.3.1 The Department of Housing & Residence Life was effective in its provision of services to students.	Lander Mean:5.71 Select Six: 4.81 Carnegie Mean: 4.70 All Institutions: 5.09	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander’s Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00

6.4. **AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** 3.00

6.5. **ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:**

Indicator of Success	Assessment Instruments	Frequency of Assessment
6.5.1.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually

6.6. **REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018**

(THE FOCUS OF NARRATIVE SHOULD BE ON PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS OF THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS, AND NOT A PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT):

⁶ Expected Outcomes **must** be mutually exclusive for Met, Partially Met and Not Met.

6.6.1. **OUTCOME 1 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that the Department of Housing & Resident Life was effective in its provisions of services to students was met. Each survey question gauging this indicator for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 2/7 in the “select six” institutions and 2/82 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator.

6.6.1.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1:** None

6.6.1.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

6.7. SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOME 1:

The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that the Department of Housing & Resident Life was effective in its provisions of services to students was met. This supports the retention of resident students due to the criteria for the indicator. Resident students agreed that the provision of services from the Department of Housing and Residence Life provided them with a sense of belonging to this institution, assisted in their learning, promoted their satisfaction with their on-campus housing experience, positively contributed to their academic performance, gauged their agreement they would recommend living in on-campus housing to new students, positively impacted their decision to return to Lander University next year, and rated the cost worth the experience. All indicators for success documented survey responses with a mean above all the Skyfactor Benchworks comparison groups. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 1/7 in the “select six” institutions and 4/259 in all institutions taking the assessment survey. At this time, no action is needed for this indicator

6.8. CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOME 1: No proposed changes. Continue to monitor.

7. UNIT/PROGRAM GOAL 7: Provide a quality safe living learning environment for Lander University Resident Students.

7.1. **STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK PILLAR SUPPORTED:** 3. Robust Student Experience

7.2. **TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT OF THIS GOAL AND INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** Academic Year 2017-2018

7.3. **INDICATORS OF SUCCESS/STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES, SUMMARY OF OUTCOME DATA AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES⁷**

Indicator of Success / Student Learning Outcome	Summary Data for this Timeframe	Expected Outcome: Met (3)	Expected Outcome: Partially Met (2)	Expected Outcome: Not Met (1)	Score
7.3.1. Conduct Health & Safety Inspections of the Lander University Residence Hall facilities with Residence Life Staff in regard to maintenance and facility needs and safety and security issues.	100% (654/654)	Greater than or equal to 100%	Not Applicable	Less Than 100%	3.00
7.3.2. Evaluate overall satisfaction of safety and security of residence hall room and building.	Lander Mean: 6.23 Select Six: 5.73 Carnegie Mean: 5.76 All Institutions: 6.02	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is above only one of the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	Lander's Skyfactor mean score is not above the mean scores of the following comparison groups: select six peer institutions, Carnegie peer institutions, and all surveyed institutions.	3.00

7.4. **AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL INDICATORS OF SUCCESS:** 3.00

7.5. **ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND FREQUENCY OF ASSESSMENT:**

⁷ Expected Outcomes **must** be mutually exclusive for Met, Partially Met and Not Met.

Indicator of Success	Assessment Instruments	Frequency of Assessment
7.5.1.	Inspection compliance Form	One time each semester.
7.5.2.	Skyfactor Benchworks Resident Assessment Survey	Annually

7.6. REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES – Date Reviewed: 5/10/2018

(THE FOCUS OF NARRATIVE SHOULD BE ON PROVIDING EVIDENCE OF IMPROVEMENT, BASED ON THE ANALYSIS OF THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS, AND NOT A PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT):

7.6.1. **OUTCOME 1 COMMENTS:** Residence Life staff complete an inspection form indicating compliance or requirements needed to remedy non-compliant room conditions. Residence Life Staff completed 654 inspection forms for 654 occupied rooms indicating compliance or requirements needed to remedy non-compliant room conditions. The inspections were conducted on October 16-20, 2017 (Resident Assistants followed up on issues) for Fall semester and on February 26-March 1, 2018 for the Spring semester. All room violations were corrected from the Inspection Orders. Resident Assistants keep a log of violations and report to Residence Life Coordinators any violations not corrected. No Action Needed.

7.6.1.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 1:** None

7.6.1.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

7.6.2. **OUTCOME 5 COMMENTS:** The threshold for the indicator of success on the survey factor demonstrating that Resident students are satisfied with the safety and security of their residence halls and buildings was met. All four criteria were met for this reporting period. There was improvement on two criteria from the 2016/2017 reporting period: “*Students are satisfied with the safety and security of their residence hall room and building*” and “*Resident students feel safe in their room*”. These two criteria showed improvement in their mean scores which were above all comparison group means. In terms of comparison ranking against other institutions on this factor, Lander University ranked 2/7 in the “select six” institutions, 1/8 for the Carnegie Class comparison groups and 29/258 in all institutions taking the assessment survey.

7.6.2.1. **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE OR SUSTAIN RESULTS FOR INDICATOR OF SUCCESS 5:** None

7.6.2.2. **EXPLANATION OF HOW RESOURCES WILL BE USED:** Not Applicable

7.7. SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR OUTCOMES 1-5:

Lander University's Department of Housing and Residence Life strives to ensure resident student safety by supporting Lander University's Strategic Plan - Pillar 3: Robust Student Experience as evidenced by meeting the two indicators of success established in measuring the unit/program goal – "Provide a quality safe living learning environment for Lander University Resident Students".

7.8. CHANGES MADE/PROPOSED TO PROGRAM AS A RESULT OF OUTCOMES 1-5: No proposed changes. Continue to monitor