The Annual Report is an opportunity to document the year’s highlights, challenges, and the impact of your programs, services, and resources as they relate to department, division, and university goals. Through the collection of this key information, the Division is better positioned to identify ways of continually improving our services and to tell the collective story of the SMU Student Affairs in a comprehensive, compelling way.

The information submitted in this report is also included in:
- The Student Affairs Division Annual Report (submitted to the Board and Trustees and campus partners)
- The Student Affairs Impact Report

Submission Instructions:
1. Save the final version of your report in this form as a word document using the following naming convention: <your department’s name> 2018-19 Annual Departmental Report.docx
2. (Optional) If you wish to include appendix files (e.g., an excel data spreadsheet, graphs, or tables), use the following naming convention: <your department’s name> 2019-20 Annual Departmental Report-Appendix <A/B/C/etc.>.pdf
3. Submit your final report via email to the Office of Assessment and Strategic Initiatives (saassessment@smu.edu) by 5pm on May 1, 2020.

Executive Summary
Provide an executive summary (200 words or less) of your department’s major activities/focus areas during the last year. Articulate how your department has impacted students, informed university policies/practices, and/or contributed to the Division of Student Affairs and University strategic priorities.

This has been a year of clarification and focus for Residence Life and Student Housing (RLSH). We have undertaken much of the foundational work needed to propel RLSH forward in providing the foundational SMU undergraduate experience.

We created a revised mission statement that is more representative of our work and campus identity, solidified our constituent outcomes and advanced a full program evaluation and strategic planning process. Process details will be covered in Section X: CAS Program Review and Future Priorities.

With the construction of Daniel House Apartments (72 beds of Upper Division Housing) RLSH will provide an attractive alternative for upper-division students to remain on campus.

RLSH has contributed to the Division of Student Affairs through individual representation via participation and active engagement across Division committees and task forces, as well as collectively, by functioning in a way that expects, values, and prioritizes collaboration.
Evaluation, study, and intentional review of the Residential Commons (RC) Model, as it concluded its 5th year has been an area of significant focus. With the hiring of Dr. Dustin Grabsch, Director of Academic Initiatives, RLSH has been able to capture important historical data around the impact of the RC model on student success, in addition to undertaking a thoughtful and comprehensive review of the Residential Commons model, its definition, tenets, and contributions to the student experience at SMU.

General Summary (optional)
If desired, please use the additional space below to pen a more comprehensive summary of your department’s major activities/focus areas during the last year. Articulate how your department has impacted students, informed university policies/practices, and/or contributed to the Division of Student Affairs and University strategic priorities.

RLSH chose to utilize this section to highlight our work in response to the COVID-19 Pandemic that stared, in earnest the week prior to Spring Break, 2020.

Residence Life and Student Housing has worked along-side various campus partners in order to provide nimble processes and procedures to best support our students during this critical time. When the decision was made to move to remote instruction for the two weeks after spring break, RLSH made the necessary changes to the student staffing structure so that Resident Assistants did not have the expectation to be on campus or provide on-call response. On-call response was shifted to only full-time staff members. In addition, RLSH communicated with all residential students in order to set up a process that students who did not have other living arrangements could request to live on campus. The initial number of students continuing to live on campus was over 300. That number decreased to approximately 125 once the University decision was made to move to remote learning for the remainder of the semester. As of May 5, there were 79 students living on campus with 34 of those confirmed to need housing for at least a portion of the summer. The majority of the students in housing are: (a) international students, (b) students that do not have a stable or alternate living arrangement, and (c) specific extenuating circumstances. RLSH will continue to house those with critical need. Most students, while not living on-campus, needed to retrieve belongings and complete a formal move out process at a later time. RLSH continued planning in the background to devise a new process that adhered to social distancing guidance and emphasized health and safety for all.

While the majority of our students were away, the residence life team and Faculty-in-Residence (FIRs) continued to do what they do best: keeping community communities together. Although they were unable to meet in person, Residential Community Directors (RCDs) and leadership teams utilized technology – including communication servers, newsletters, and social media takeovers – in order to keep everyone engaged and involved in their communities. Newsletters have been an integral part in maintaining community connections for the Residential Commons. In addition to keeping students updated with important information, the newsletters have been revamped to incorporate fun interactive elements as well. Supplementing the newsletters are other online events – a popular option being Instagram takeovers and interactive Instagram templates. Commons are also continuing their cooking clubs and traditions online, using social media to share recipes and results.
After a great deal of planning, the Spring 2020 Move-Out process were adjusted to accommodate local students, students traveling, and students from restricted areas. This included a four-week, three-phase move out process. Phase one included one of four, University-assigned vendors packing and shipping or packing and storing student belongings. Students contracted with a preferred vendor assigned to their geographic campus area to finalize arrangements. Phase two includes students who returned to campus in order to move themselves out or utilizing a family member as proxy. This process extended through May 15. Move-out time blocks were selected by students. Each time block was four hours with 3 students per time slot (student plus 2 guests) ensuring that no more than 9 people were in each building during each time block. Card access was managed by the Residential Community Director on call. Phase three included one final moving vendor to pack-and-store or pack-and-move the belongings for any students not yet moved out. Families have provided consistent, positive feedback regarding our move out process, and the precautions put in place to ensure social distancing and protecting the health of our community.

Rate adjustments were made for parking, dining, and housing at an average of a 37% reduction. This adjustment was applied to any current balance, credited forward for a fall balance, or refunded to the student.

RLSH immediately convened four task forces to focus on scenario planning to include; Move-In, Housing Occupancy, Summer School Occupancy, and Camps and Conferences. RLSH developed multiple scenarios in each category that allowed RLSH to be well positioned in contributing to the President’s Task Force for a Healthy Opening, the later adopted Summer Term Task Force, and contribute to the Athletics Task Force.

The proposal for Summer II housing to begin in early July was approved by the President’s Task Force for a Healthy Opening, endorsed by the Emergency Operations Committee (EOC) and approved by the President’s Executive Council (PEC). RLSH will house student in primarily suite style, single occupancy rooms across two building (287 capacity) with modifications to services to support social distancing.

Additionally, at the time of this report, the recommendations for Fall Occupancy have been submitted to the PEC. Membership on the Emergency Operations Committee (EOC), President’s Task Force for Healthy Opening, the subcommittees within, and related task forces includes the following members of RLSH:

Melinda Carlson; Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of RLSH
President’s Task Force for a Healthy Opening member and Co-Chair of the Student Continuity Sub-Committee, and Member of the Emergency Operations Committee (EOC)

Dr. Dustin Grabsch; Director of Academic Initiatives
Member of the Student Continuity Subcommittee (President’s Task Force for a Healthy Opening)

Amanda Bobo; Assistant Director for Residence Life
Member of the Campus Health and Wellbeing Subcommittee (President’s Task Force for a Healthy Opening)

Ashley Wendler; Director of Housing Operations
Member of the Emergency Operations Committee (EOC) and Member of the Summer II Task Force
**Divisional Mission Statement**

The Division of Student Affairs creates and supports a robust student experience and forges strategic partnerships to best serve the entire SMU community. As educators and scholar-practitioners, we create purposeful learning and leadership opportunities for students to clarify and develop their knowledge, values, skills, and identities—challenging each to become a world changer.

**Student Affairs Learning Domains:**

**2018-2023 Strategic Plan Goals:**

**Goal One**  
*Develop a comprehensive student experience*

**Goal Two**  
*Understand Diverse Perspectives*

**Goal Three**  
*Develop Strategic Partnerships*

**Goal Four**  
*Promote Comprehensive Well-being*

**Goal Five**  
*Data-Informed Decision-Making*

**Goal Six**  
*Advance Professional Excellence*
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Section I. Closing the Loop from 2018-19
This section of the Annual Departmental Assessment Report is intended to collect follow-up information related to departments’ report submissions from the prior year. Please refer to your submission from last year in order to complete this section.

I-A. Initiative of Interest—Please indicate the initiative(s) identified as underperforming through 2018-19 assessment efforts and your department’s subsequent course of action. —Strategic Plan Objective 5.6—

Initiative:  
Faculty-in-Residence (FiR) Recruitment and Selection Process  
Removed  
Revamped

Describe your department’s rationale for selecting this initiative. What assessment findings suggested the need to address this particular initiative? (1-3 sentences)

RLSH chose to focus on the Faculty-in-Residence (FiR) program as the Residential Commons program is entering its sixth year of existence. The FiR program, an essential component of the Residential Commons, was selected to be reviewed. Specifically, the recruitment and selection process of the FiR program was chosen first to be revamped with the goal to increase the number of applicants and ensure candidates had a better understanding of the role throughout the selection process. The selection process for the Faculty-in-Residence positions is resource intensive, so the goal is to manage the process every other year. As such, the applicant pool must be robust in number and in quality. The efforts identified in this section were made in order to ensure an alternate pool of qualified candidates from which off-cycle selections may be made.

Describe the changes made by your department. (1-2 sentences)

- If “Revamped,” please outline how the initiative was altered.
- If “Removed,” how have resources and other capacity factors been reallocated?

New FiR (Faculty-in-Residence) recruitment efforts included the placement of the Faculty-in-Residence position announcement on the faculty career opportunities website. Additionally, a new webpage was developed and included information related to anticipated vacancy locations, application components, how to apply, selection process, appointment, compensation, and contact information. This webpage sought to increase candidate understanding of the FiR role and process. A new faculty development program created in collaboration with the Center for Teaching Excellence, served as a recruitment event while also highlighting the FiR experience and insight into campus life. A total of 37 faculty attended. The selection process was also modified and included Provost Office representatives on the search committee.

Provide evidence of improvement. (1-3 sentences)

- “If Revamped,” provide evidence that speaks to whether, how, and the extent to which the prescribed changes to the initiative resulted in enhanced achievement of the intended outcome(s) of that initiative (or new insights if no improvement is witnessed).
- If “Removed,” discuss outputs or achievements related to the reallocation of those resources/capacity factors.

The number of completed applications increased from 11 in 2018 to 15 in 2019. Additionally, FiR candidates had coffee chat with the Assistant Vice President and Dean along with a signed acknowledgement of FiR-related policies (e.g., guests, parking, families, pets, etc.). The additional coffee chat and policies document acknowledgement were added to achieve the desired increase in FiR candidates’ understanding of the role.
I-B. Priorities and Goals—How did your department address and enact the priorities and goals identified in last year’s report section VII-C, “Annual Priorities and Goals (19-20)”? What (if any) work remains to achieve these priorities?

Last year’s 2018 – 2019 annual report did not identify a list of annual priorities or goals. The intent was to submit at a later date but no addendum was submitted.

Section II. Utilization Indicators
Indicate the number of visits/contacts per utilization category that took place within your department during the past year (i.e., June 1 – May 31). If your department does not have the capability to report for any of the below categories, leave the box(es) blank and address any challenges to collecting that data in the text box below.

II-A. Tracking Methods—Describe the methods your department implements to collect utilization data:

Residence Life and Student Housing utilization methods are tracked in a variety of ways: (a) all events are submitted in SMU Connect and attendance is tracked via the check-in feature; (b) outreach and information sharing is not currently tracked by the department. We are currently investigating possible ways to track this data; and (c) office visits and service consultations are tracked utilizing an excel tracker at the front entrance of our main office in Boaz Commons. Additionally, we tracked the number and type of e-mails received to our departmental e-mail account (housing@smu.edu).

II-B. Findings—Specify any patterns in utilization (new and/or compared to those from previous years) that suggest areas for (a) change/improvement and/or (b) replication/amplification in your department.

Residence Life and Student Housing has seen a large increase in the number of office visits, phone calls to the main departmental number, and e-mails to the departmental account. Between June 1, 2018 and April 11, 2019, Residence Life and Student Housing counted 9,953 interactions (3,633 e-mails, 1,671 contractor walk-ins, 1,149 general office walk-ins, and 3,500 phone calls). Between June 1, 2019 and April 11, 2020, Residence Life and Student Housing counted 12,792 interactions (7,249 e-mails, 1,025 contractor walk-ins, 1,046 general office walk-ins, and 3,472 phone calls). This is a 29% increase. Some of this increase could be explained by the Covid-19 pandemic, as the departmental e-mail account received 1,103 on that topic alone. Other than Covid-19, the most common e-mail topics pertained to reapplication changes and the waitlist (n = 935), reapplication assignments (n = 788), and exemptions (n = 739).

For programming interactions, our numbers appear to be lower than last year. This may be due to the new tracking system, and further investigation is needed to understand the drop in numbers. Tracking programs in Connect has many benefit such as the ability to identify students not participating in events. However, sometimes attendance is not entered while only the program is logged. More training and emphasis are needed to encourage front-line staff on its use. Additionally, Housing Operations and Fraternity Housing programs should be encouraged or added to Connect.

In addition to the numbers listed below, we can also share the following capture rates for 2019-2020. Capture rates help Residence Life and Student Housing in understanding the percentage of term cohorts we were through our programs and services:

- 98% of first-year students live on-campus
- 72% of second year students live on-campus
II-C. Counts—Provide data in the spaces below for all programs/services. Please remember to submit an additional appendix document if you wish to represent your utilization data in greater detail.

**SUMMER AND FALL ONLY DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Primary LD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Programs</td>
<td># Student</td>
<td># Programs</td>
<td># Student</td>
<td># Programs</td>
<td># Student</td>
<td># Programs</td>
<td># Student</td>
<td># Programs</td>
<td># Student</td>
<td># Programs</td>
<td># Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events etc.</td>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Events etc.</td>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Events etc.</td>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Events etc.</td>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Events etc.</td>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Events etc.</td>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational programs/presentations/group meetings:</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>8,724</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; information sharing:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments/office visits/service consultations:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale outreach events/fairs:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>297</td>
<td>16,136</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Educational programs/presentations/group meetings
Meetings or sessions at which departmental staff members are involved in delivering content, mentoring, or organizing groups of students or other constituents; not structured one-on-one appointments. (Examples: departmental open houses; educational programs/workshops; student leader training; recreation classes/trips; web-based trainings)

### Outreach & information sharing
Communication with constituents—solicited or unsolicited—regarding departmental programs, services, outreach, etc. (Examples: email; public response email; social media (Facebook, Tumblr, Twitter, OrgSync); GA positions posted online; website hits; postal mailings.)

### Appointments/office visits/service consultations
Appointments/consultations with an individual SA staff member (student staff or career); generally one-on-one (some small group); often in person, but could also be delivered remotely. (Examples: counseling/advising appointments; office visits; conduct cases; student employee 1:1s; recreation personal training; medical appointments; drop-in services (e.g. Computer Labs, The Shop visits)).

### Large-scale outreach events/fairs
Events with 100+ participants. Departments provide representation from office & outreach/answer questions, may or may not include a formal presentation. (Examples: career fairs; resource fairs.)
Section III. Signature Program/Service and Student Spotlight Submissions (Optional)

A select number of signature program/service and student spotlight submissions will be published in the Student Affairs Divisional Report; all others will be made available in a linked online location. Please note the below deadlines for signature programs/services—any program concluding in the fall semester will only be considered for inclusion if it is submitted by January 15. All submission can be entered on a rolling basis using the below form link:


III-A. Signature Program/Service Submission Log—Please indicate which signature program/service submissions have been entered for your department.

Signature program/service summaries highlight the types of strategies we as a Division use to affect growth or development across the Division's learning domain areas. These descriptions should give an outside reader a very clear idea of the types of programming / services we provide to our constituents (students or otherwise) and how these offerings are intentionally designed to make an impact on student learning and development. These do not necessarily have to be high-volume events; rather, these are your high-impact practices, even if that impact is limited to a handful of individuals in a non-programmatic setting (e.g., 1:1 counseling sessions, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Submissions (due Jan. 15) — For programs/services that conclude in the fall semester —</th>
<th>Spring Submissions (due May 1) — For programs/services that conclude in the spring semester —</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taste of Diversity (Global Consciousness)</td>
<td>Loyd Health Fair (Holistic Wellness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC Games (Courageous Leadership)</td>
<td>MoMac at the Movies (Global Consciousness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SnoMac (Courageous Leadership)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food Festival (Global Consciousness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoMac at the Movies (Global Consciousness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bows and Bow Ties (Amplified Capacity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Crumpkin (Amplified Capacity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuizBowl (Amplified Capacity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III-B. Student Spotlight Submission Log—Please indicate which signature program/service submissions have been entered for your department.

These narratives provide specific, anecdotal evidence of student learning and development in a way that is relatable and moving. Please identify one (or more using additional forms) student who has demonstrated marked growth or development in one of the Division's learning domain areas. This student's development could span many years or it can pertain just to 2019-2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Submissions (due Jan. 15)</th>
<th>Spring Submissions (due May 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Jackson (Personal Congruence)</td>
<td>Brock Rigsby (Courageous Leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Wang (Social Responsibility)</td>
<td>Daniel Heard (Amplified Capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Walker (Amplified Capacity)</td>
<td>Isabel Costian (Courageous Leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madi Tedrow (Amplified Capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jessica Wang (Personal Congruence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IV. Departmental Mission Statement and Constituent Outcomes

Provide your department’s mission statement and indicate the selected departmental constituent outcome of focus for the 2019-20 year. Indicate the divisional learning domain(s) to which each constituent outcome maps. Then, list all programs and services related to each constituent outcome and the primary learning domain to which each maps in parentheses. Some programs and services will be listed more than once if they map to multiple constituent outcomes. —Strategic Plan Objective 1.10—

Mission statement:

Residence Life & Student Housing fosters the foundational SMU experience where every student belongs, learns, and connects through their residential community. We make campus home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Constituent Outcome of Focus (2019-20)</th>
<th>Programs and Services (Primary Learning Domain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop cultural intelligence and an appreciation of diversity.</td>
<td><strong>Operations</strong> - Set up of residential commons system through intentional assignments (Global Consciousness); common spaces (Global Consciousness); <strong>ResLife</strong> – Programming (Amplified Capacity), Leadership Opportunities (Personal Congruence), Student Leadership Training (Amplified Capacity), Peer Leader Programming &amp; Interactions (Amplified Capacity), Roommate Agreements (Global Consciousness), Signature Events (Personal Congruence), Student Staff Training (Amplified Capacity), Service House Programming/Interactions (Amplified Capacity); <strong>Academic Initiatives</strong> - FIR Programming &amp; Interactions; <strong>Multi-Area</strong> – Employment (Amplified Capacity); Room Change Process (Personal Congruence); Commons Cup (Personal Congruence), Diversity, Equity, and Access Leaders (Global Consciousness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Constituent Outcome of Focus (2019-20)</td>
<td>Programs and Services (Primary Learning Domain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop leadership through formal and informal opportunities and roles.</td>
<td><strong>Operations</strong> - Percentage of Upperclassmen in Commons (Courageous Leadership), Peer Supervisor (Courageous Leadership); <strong>ResLife</strong> - Community Council (Courageous Leadership), HUB (Courageous Leadership), Student Leadership Training (Amplified Capacity); <strong>Academic Initiatives</strong> - Peer Leaders (Courageous Leadership), Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (Courageous Leadership); <strong>Multi-Area</strong> - Stampede Guides (Courageous Leadership), RC Chaplin (Personal Congruence), Employment Training (Amplified Capacity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section V(A). Learning/Development Outcomes Assessment (Due: January 15, 2020)

STEP 1. IDENTIFY OUTCOME(S) OF INTEREST
Identify the constituent outcome to which the focus of this assessment corresponded. Briefly describe your department’s overall approach (e.g., programs and services provided, overarching philosophy toward, etc.) to achieving the constituent outcome. What part(s)/aspect(s) of this approach did your department choose to assess? Why was it important to learn more about this? How does the focus of the assessment relate to the divisional learning domains and broader institutional priorities?

Residence Life & Student Housing (RLSH) develops leadership by providing both formal and informal roles to students via a variety of programs. Programs include peer leaders, community councils, the Housing Unification Board (HUB), student employment, and the Resident Assistant (RA) position. For the purposes of our Fall 2019 assessment, we chose to focus on Student Leader Training. Student Leader Training, which occurs in August, is the foundational training for our RAs, community council members, peer-leaders, and HUB executives. The August Student Leader Training is an eight-day training that occurs prior to just before first-year students move into the Residential Commons (RCs) and Upper Division Housing (UDH). The first five days of training is only required for the 95 (2019) RAs and focuses on issues that are specific to the RA role. The second portion of the training is open to all community council members, peer-leaders, and HUB executives and is required for the RAs. The August Student Leader Training that incorporates all of the student leaders in Residence Life and Student Housing is an innovative practice that helps develops leadership skills for our residential students. This outcomes assessment connects to the constituent outcome intending to develop leadership through formal and informal roles.
STEP 2. ARTICULATE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

Assessment Questions—What over-arching questions did you seek to answer through this assessment?

1. Were student leaders adequately trained to carry out the various aspects of their roles?

2. What sessions should be reconsidered or revamped for the August 2020 Student Leadership Training?

Assessment Type(s)—Check all that apply

- Learning/development outcomes assessment
- Needs/environmental context assessment
- Program outcomes assessment
- Business/service outputs assessment
- Satisfaction assessment
- Utilization assessment

STEP 3. SELECT METHOD AND LOCATE/COLLECT DATA

Data Collection Method—Check all that apply:

- Survey
- Focus group
- Existing data
- Rubric
- Observation
- Interview
- Other:_______________

Process and Sample—Describe the steps taken to conduct this assessment. Include information about your rationale for the method(s) of data collection, time-frame, and assessment sample.

Prior to the August Student Leadership Training, the planning committee wrote learning outcomes for 29 of the training sessions. Altogether, there were 73 individual learning outcomes. Learning outcomes were each assessed in one of five different methods:

1. **Pre-test/Post-test:** Many of the cognitive learning outcomes were assessed by comparing a pre-test and a post-test (see Appendix E). The pre-test was administered to the RAs on July 23. They were required to complete the test one week prior to training (August 2). Similarly, the pre-test for other student leaders (i.e. peer leaders, HUB, and community councils) was sent out on August 9th, and those student leaders were asked to complete the test by August 15. The post-tests were sent to both groups two days after the conclusion of training (August 23). All of the tests were housed in Canvas. The RA test included 40 multiple-choice questions. The Student Leader test included 18 multiple-choice questions. The Student Leader test included 18 multiple-choice questions.

2. **Observation – RA Evaluations:** Learning outcomes relating to soft skills (e.g., role modeling and relationship building) were measured through observation of the supervising Residential Community Director (RCD) and recorded in the formal job evaluation of the RA. RA Evaluations took place during the last week of October. Residential Community Directors gave the RAs a score of Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, Must Improve, or Cannot Respond for each item. RA Evaluations utilized a rubric via their performance evaluation tool (see Appendix D).

3. **Observation – RCD Survey:** The training planning committee developed a short survey (7 questions) to assess behaviors that could be immediately observed (e.g., ability to understand and meet expectations for Student Leader Training and ability to complete a room inventory). Responses were on a Likert scale. This survey was distributed to all RCDs and Assistant Residential Community Directors (ARCD) on August 26 and all 16 RCDs and ARCDs responded.
4. Observation/Rubrics – Behind Closed Doors: Several of the learning outcomes related to policy and protocol were assessed through a scenario-based simulation program called Behind Closed Doors (BCD). After formal instructional sessions that covered topics such as policy confrontation or suicide intervention, returning RAs and RCDs created scenarios that represented a real-life scenario pertaining to that topic (see Appendix B). New RAs would then practice acting out the skills they had just learned. RCDs observing the practice were trained to score the performance on a rubric specific to that protocol (see Appendix A). RAs were assessed scores of “Beginning, Developing, and Accomplished” for each of the domains on the rubrics.

5. Rubric: The training committee developed a rubric to measure the RAs ability to write Incident Reports (IR). After formal instruction on how to write an IR, RAs watched a video portraying an RA confronting policy. In groups of 3-4, RAs wrote an IR for the scenario they watched. Those sample IRs were scored along a scale of Never, Sometimes, and Always with the IR rubric on domains (see Appendix C).

**STEP 4. ANALYZE AND INTERPRET FINDINGS**

Data Analysis—Briefly describe how you analyzed the assessment data collected.

1. **Pre-test/Post-test:** For the pre-test/post-test portion of the assessment, the percentage of correct answers was compared between each individual question on the pre-test and the corresponding question on the post-test. The overall test scored were calculated by the Canvas grading program.

2. **Observation – RA Evaluations:** Training committee members identified portions of the evaluation form that related to the individual learning outcomes (Role Modeling and Relationship Building) that connect the target constituent outcome and made a count of how many RAs were scored as having exceeded expectations, met expectations, must improve, or cannot respond.

3. **Observation – RCD Survey:** Training committee members reviewed the percentage of responding RCDs/ARCDs that reported agreeing or strongly agreeing that RAs were performing the trained behavior appropriately.

4. **Observation/Rubrics – Behind Closed Doors:** Reviewers looked for common themes across the scores and worked to identify specific policy and protocols where RAs struggled to master the concepts on the rubrics. They also reviewed the comments for common themes.

5. **Rubric:** The 5 sample Incident Reports (IRs) were scored along a rubric. An observed score of “Never” was awarded 0 points. An observed score of “Sometimes” was awarded 5 points, and an observed score of “Always” was awarded 10 points for a possible total score of 100. Scores in two categories (“Refers to people by their titles and last names in the text” and “Include the time throughout the rapport”) were adjusted to account for the fact that the scenario did not provide last names or time stamps.
Key Findings—Provide bullet points of key findings from the assessment. You may attach any accompanying tables/graphs/etc. in a separate addendum.

1. Pre-test/Post-test:

The average RA Training pre-test (n = 90) total score was 65% with a standard deviation of 5.28. This average total score increased to 72% on the post-test (n = 80) with a standard deviation of 9.24. The average Student Leader Training pre-test (n = 96) total score was 72% with a standard deviation of 1.89. This average total score on the post-test (n = 67) increased to 76% with a standard deviation of 2.75. It is worth noting that most of the questions required a “select all that apply” response with sometimes as many as seven possible responses, and Canvas only awarded a correct point for that question if all seven were correctly answered. Therefore, the overall averages may appear lower and may not accurately reflect the level at which our student leaders performed. However, the overall increase is reflective of the learning that occurred. Additionally, on individual responses, we saw an average increase of 21% in correct answers on the RA post-test in comparison to the RA pre-test and an average increase of 19% in correct answers on the Student Leader post-test in comparison to the Student Leader pre-test. RAs improved the most in their understanding of Sexual Misconduct Response Protocol, the Residential Commons Model, and Bias Incident Reporting. The percentage of correct answers relating to these sessions increase by over 40 percentage points. Conversely, there was little improvement for RAs in their understanding of Event Planning, Running a Meeting, and Strategic Planning. The percentage of correct answers relating to each of these sessions increase was less than 5 percentage points.

2. Observation – RA Evaluations:

On the nine items (i.e., Represents the RA position, the community and RLSH; Makes an intentional effort to get to know all residents; Maintains familiarity, visibility and availability; Maintains appropriate presence for residents; Serves as a resource and advisor; Assists in residents in resolving and managing conflict; Knows residents by name and story; Is a visible role model for study skills and behaviors; and Role models appropriate job performance) of the RA evaluation that related to the target constituent outcome, across all nine items (n = 846):

- 11% of all observations were marked as Exceeding Expectations
- 87% of all observations were marked as Meeting Expectations
- 2% of all observations were marked as Must Improve
- Less than 1% of all observations were marked as Cannot Respond

Because Exceeds Expectations is considered very difficult to obtain, it would appear that RAs are performing well in Role Modeling and Relationship Building.

3. Observation – RCD Survey:

- 100% (n = 16) of responding RCDs reported that RAs (always or almost always) successfully performed room inventories.
- 94% (n = 15) of responding RCDs/ARCDs reported that RAs were respectful of everyone's time (during training).
- 88% (n = 14) of responding RCDs/ARCDs reported that RAs were engaged in the training sessions.
- 94% (n = 15) of responding RCDs/ARCDs reported that RAs had a positive attitude (during training).

Overall, we were pleased with these high levels of agreement from RCDs that RAs met training expectations and performed their responsibilities during training well.
4. **Observation/Rubrics – Behind Closed Doors:**

Across all scenarios and their individualized rubrics,
- RAs were scored as “Accomplished” 60% (n = 145) of the time
- RAs were scored as “Developing” 37% (n = 90) of the time
- RAs were scored as “Beginning” 2% (n = 6) of the time

Overall, these high scores, suggest that RAs were observed to be well-prepared for their RA roles.

5. **Rubric:**

The average score for the submitted Incident Reports (IRs) was 97 out of 100. While one of the five groups struggled to provide vivid detail in their documentation of the events, the overall scores indicate that the RAs were well-prepared to write IRs.

6. **Other findings of note:**

Through informal feedback and observation, we have learned the following:
- Our more experienced RAs appreciated being given the opportunity to help lead sessions and share their experiences.
- Emotionally heavy topics (e.g., sexual assault and suicide prevention) were better received before lunch.
- Some of our student leaders were also asked to attend the Crain Leadership Conference and felt that the materials were redundant.
STEP 5: SHARE FINDINGS AND PROPOSE ACTIONS/CHANGES

With whom did you share the findings of your assessment? What do the key findings of this assessment suggest for how your department can better achieve the associated constituent outcome? What changes will you (or have you) made to practices and/or policies as a result of these findings? Also, if appropriate, explain how these findings can inform your future assessment plans.

During the first one-on-one of the semester, each RCD shared the results of the RA’s post-test and Behind Closed Doors scoring. The RCD reviewed proper protocol if an RA had an incorrect answer or protocol mistyped. This allowed for on-going training and improved performance. Further, the Student Leader Training Committee will thoroughly review results prior to creating the August 2020 schedule, and each session presenter will receive the full findings for the learning outcomes associated with their topic.

As for proposed changes, there are a few small changes needed for the assessments. As mentioned above, several questions in the pre-test/post-test required a “select all that apply” response. Because Canvas scores on an “all or nothing” system, the scores appear lower than they should. For this reason, we will eliminate all “select all that apply” questions. Second, RCDs/ARCDs will be more thoroughly trained in using the Behind Closed Door rubrics.

Overall, the assessment suggests that Residence Life and Student Housing is developing leaders through Student Leadership Training. Both RAs and other Student Leaders demonstrated an increased capacity for a variety of skills related to leadership: role modeling, active listing, advising and helping other students, and developing community initiatives. The schedule for RA training allowed the RAs to be more engaged than in previous years; however, we will revisit the student leader portions in order to avoid redundancy with Crain Leadership.
Section V(B). Learning/Development Outcomes Assessment (Due: May 1, 2020)

STEP 1. IDENTIFY OUTCOME(S) OF INTEREST
Identify the constituent outcome to which the focus of this assessment corresponded. Briefly describe your department's overall approach (e.g., programs and services provided, overarching philosophy toward, etc.) to achieving the constituent outcome. What part(s)/aspect(s) of this approach did your department choose to assess? Why was it important to learn more about this? How does the focus of the assessment relate to the divisional learning domains and broader institutional priorities?

The ACUHO-I/Benchworks Resident Assessment is used to aid the department in understanding the overall on-campus experience. Of specific interest, the department has not conducted this assessment since the establishment of the Residential Commons. Thus, findings from this assessment may be compared to pre-Residential Commons data. The constituent outcome addressed in this assessment is to develop cultural intelligence and an appreciation of diversity. The connected Learning Domains are Global Consciousness, Personal Congruence, and Amplified Capacity.

In the 2019-2020 academic year, 3,140 SMU residents were invited in February to complete the survey. The Skyfactor survey was jointly designed by ACUHO-I and the survey development team at Skyfactor. This survey enables institutions to evaluate the experiences of on-campus residents, focusing on satisfaction with the housing experience, facilities, staff, dining and roommates; as well as learning related to community interactions, programs, diverse interactions, sustainability, and healthy habits. Specific student learning subscales of personal interactions, personal relationships, diverse interactions, diverse relationships, self-management, and overall learning will be utilized for analysis.

Additionally, 35 students were invited to take a shortened, adapted survey targeting the commuter student experience. The same subscales will be analyzed if the item(s) were relevant to the commuter student sample.

Assessment Questions—What over-arching questions did you seek to answer through this assessment?

1. How does living in on-campus housing contribute to student learning?
2. How does learning in on-campus housing relate to satisfaction?

Assessment Type(s)—Check all that apply
- [x] Learning/development outcomes assessment
- [ ] Needs/environmental context assessment
- [ ] Program outcomes assessment
- [ ] Business/service outputs assessment
- [ ] Satisfaction assessment
- [ ] Utilization assessment
STEP 3. SELECT METHOD AND LOCATE/COLLECT DATA

Data Collection Method—Check all that apply:

- [✓] Survey
- [ ] Focus group
- [ ] Existing data
- [ ] Rubric
- [ ] Observation
- [ ] Interview
- [ ] Other:____________________

Process and Sample—Describe the steps taken to conduct this assessment. Include information about your rationale for the method(s) of data collection, time-frame, and assessment sample.

The population frame included all students within SMU housing who lived on-campus during the entire fall 2019 semester and were presently residing there at the time of the survey distribution in spring 2020. A total of 1,361 students of the 3,140 invited participated in the study via their SMU email address for a response rate of 43.3%. The sample is comprised of 558 men (41%), 784 women (58%), four transgender (0.3%), two other (0.1%), and 12 prefer not to answer (0.9%). Sexual orientation of respondents was: 89% (n = 1,210) heterosexual or straight, 5.2% (n = 71) bisexual, 2.2% (n = 30) gay or lesbian, 0.4% (n = 5) unsure or questioning, 1% (n = 14) other, and 2.2% (n = 30) prefer not to answer. In terms of race, the self-reported races of respondents were: 12% (n = 158) Hispanic, 0.2% (n = 3) American Indian/Alaska Native/First Nation, 12% (n = 162) Asian, Black or African American, 0.1% (n = 1) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 62% (n = 843) White, 4% (n = 49) Two or more races, and 0.1% (n = 1) Race and ethnicity unknown. International students comprised 7% (n = 89) of the sample and the self-reported academic standing of respondents were: 46% (n = 622) freshman/first-year, 38% (n = 515) sophomore, 9% (n = 121) junior, 6% (n = 82) senior, 1.2% (n = 16) graduate/professional student, and 0.2% (n = 3) non-degree or other.

STEP 4. ANALYZE AND INTERPRET FINDINGS

Data Analysis—Briefly describe how you analyzed the assessment data collected.

Descriptive statistics of scale and categorical data were analyzed to produce insights and recommendations. Skyfactor reports results by Major Indicators of Performance. Major Indicators include Overall Satisfaction, Overall Learning, and Overall Program Effectiveness. These indicators are clusters of factors or individual survey items to produce the construct. These constructs allows RLSH to better understand each indicator separately to identify areas in need of improvement. Subsequent reports in the appendix provide detailed information for each indicator including recommendations for improvement. From that analysis, RLSH has identified the factors in need of improvement.
Key Findings—Provide bullet points of key findings from the assessment. You may attach any accompanying tables/graphs/etc. in a separate addendum.

See appendix G for Tables 2 – 15 for results. Results are presented by total mean score, highest and lowest factors by Major Indicator, and results from institutional questions.

STEP 5: SHARE FINDINGS AND PROPOSE ACTIONS/CHANGES
With whom did you share the findings of your assessment? What do the key findings of this assessment suggest for how your department can better achieve the associated constituent outcome? What changes will you (or have you) made to practices and/or policies as a result of these findings? Also, if appropriate, explain how these findings can inform your future assessment plans.

Arguably the most important piece of the analysis is Recommendations for Improvement. The following recommends are made based on the Major Indicators and institution-specific questions.

Satisfaction
Based on Overall Satisfaction questions, it is recommended:
- Systematically evaluate the room assignment process. Consider the process in terms of assessment items: ease of process, quality of choices, roommates, room type, building
- Consider developing and publishing a programming or engagement model for RLSH student leaders. Consider programming in terms of assessment items: quality, variety, athletic/recreational, etc.

Learning
Based on Overall Learning questions, it is recommended:
- Within the programming or engagement model, center personal interactions as a key tenant.
- Devise and implement ways where classroom learning can be connected to RLSH programs and services.
- Formalize a partnership with Heigi to aid residents in career exploration
- Consider formalizing Peer Academic Leader programming to explore academic interests as well as enrollment tasks.
- Leverage FiR programming to increase resident opportunities to interact with faculty.
- Explore faculty connections to non-RC communities.
STEP 1. IDENTIFY OUTCOME(S) OF INTEREST
What information about the business/service outputs of your department, satisfaction of individuals or participants involved, and/or utilization would empower your department to tailor its programs and services to more effectively or efficiently achieve the selected constituent outcome?

N/A. Covered in Fall assessment.

STEP 2. ARTICULATE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS
Assessment Questions—What over-arching questions did you seek to answer through this assessment?

N/A. Covered in Fall assessment.

Assessment Type(s)—Check all that apply
- Program outcomes assessment
- Business/service outputs assessment
- Satisfaction assessment
- Utilization assessment

STEP 3. SELECT METHOD AND LOCATE/COLLECT DATA
Data Collection Method—Check all that apply:
- Survey
- Focus group
- Existing data
- Rubric
- Observation
- Interview
- Other:_________________

Process and Sample—Describe the steps taken to conduct this assessment. Include information about your rationale for the method(s) of data collection, time-frame, and assessment sample.

N/A. Covered in Fall assessment.

Institutional
Based on intuitional questions, it is recommended:
- Remove in-room coaxial Cable TV due to minimal usage
- Further investigate if strong, negative impact of drug usage can be triangulated within a given community
STEP 4. ANALYZE AND INTERPRET FINDINGS

Data Analysis—Briefly describe how you analyzed the assessment data collected.

N/A. Covered in Fall assessment.

Key Findings—Provide bullet points of key findings from the assessment. You may attach any accompanying tables/graphs/etc. in a separate addendum.

N/A. Covered in Fall assessment.

STEP 5: SHARE FINDINGS AND PROPOSE ACTIONS/CHANGES

With whom did you share the findings of your assessment? What do the key findings of this assessment suggest for how your department can better achieve the associated constituent outcome? What changes will you (or have you) made to practices and/or policies as a result of these findings? Also, if appropriate, explain how these findings can inform your future assessment plans.

N/A. Covered in Fall assessment.
Section VII: Needs/Environmental Context Assessment

STEP 1. IDENTIFY NEEDS/ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT INFORMATION NEEDED
What information about (a) the needs of your constituents, and/or (b) the broader environmental context regarding students’ experiences, perceptions, etc. would empower your department to tailor its programs and services to more effectively or efficiently achieve the selected constituent outcome?

With the significant human, fiscal, and physical investment of SMU in the Residential Commons model, the opportunity presented itself to analyze the program’s effectiveness as it entered its sixth year of existence. As the Residential Commons entered their sixth year, it was paramount that SMU Residential Commons stakeholders concern themselves with mission drift. Mission drift is conceptualized as a form of "divergent change" potentially caused by a lack of clarity around a mission, change in leadership or large staffing turnover, budget constraints, or other factors (Jaquette, 2013). Therefore, this multifaceted research project is meant to firmly reestablish the mission and philosophical elements of the residential college system at SMU. Additional goals are to identify the strengths of, weaknesses of, opportunities from, and threats to (SWOTs) the SMU Residential Commons system.

STEP 2. ARTICULATE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS
Assessment Questions—What over-arching questions did you seek to answer through this assessment?

| 1. How is the Residential Commons system defined by staff, faculty, and students at SMU? |
| 2. What are the strengths of, weaknesses of, opportunities from, and threats to the Residential Commons model at SMU? |

Assessment Type—Check all that apply

☐ Needs/environmental context assessment

STEP 3. SELECT METHOD AND LOCATE/COLLECT DATA

Data Collection Method—Check all that apply:

☑ Survey ☑ Focus group ☐ Existing data ☐ Rubric ☐ Observation ☐ Interview ☐ Other:__________________
**Process and Sample**—Describe the steps taken to conduct this assessment. Include information about your rationale for the method(s) of data collection, time-frame, and assessment sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The research project utilized a mixed-methods, sequential exploratory design. In an exploratory design, qualitative data are first collected and analyzed, and themes are used to drive the development of a quantitative instrument to further explore the research questions (Creswell &amp; Plano Clark, 2011; Onwuegbuzie, Bustamante, &amp; Nelson, 2010; Tashakkori &amp; Teddlie, 2008). As a result of this design, three stages of analyses are conducted: the primary qualitative phase, the secondary quantitative phase, and the integration phase that connects the two strands of data and extends the initial qualitative exploratory findings (Creswell &amp; Plano Clark, 2011).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research occurred throughout the fall 2019 semester on the campus of SMU. The research project and associated methods were approved by the Institutional Review Board. The first phase of the research involved 10 focus groups conducted by a neutral facilitator not associated with the university. The sample included 47 participants from stakeholder groups such as Faculty-in-Residence (FiRs) (n = 6; 14%), residential community directors (RCDs) (n = 11; 26%), Resident Assistants (RAs) (n = 2; 5%), current and former residents (n = 6; 14%), student affairs administrators (n = 7; 17%), academic affairs administrators (n = 5; 12%), and Housing Unification Board (HUB) / Commons Council members (n = 5; 12%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first survey asked for rank-ordering of important focus group themes for each key question, while the second asked for levels of agreement (strongly disagree to strongly agree) with dimensions associated with the top-scoring rank-ordered themes from survey one. There were 69 respondents to survey one and 61 respondents to the survey two. Survey one respondents comprised FiRs (n = 5; 7%), RCDs (n = 10; 14%), current and former residents (n = 27; 42%), Residence Life and Student Housing (RLSH) staff (n = 14; 19%), and academic affairs administrators (n = 14; 19%). Of the respondents, 45% (n = 33) participated in the focus group, while 55% (n = 41) did not. Survey two respondents comprised FiRs (n = 5; 8%), RCDs (n = 11; 18%), current and former residents (n = 24; 39%), RLSH staff (n = 12; 20%), and academic affairs administrators (n = 9; 15%). Of the respondents, 57% (n = 35) participated in the focus group, while 43% (n = 26) did not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 4. ANALYZE AND INTERPRET FINDINGS

Data Analysis—Briefly describe how you analyzed the assessment data collected.

As mentioned, 10 focus groups with current residents, former residents, student leaders (i.e., peer leaders, Commons councils, RAs), RCDs, FiRs, and student and academic affairs administrators, were conducted with a total of 47 participants. The duration of focus groups ranged from 43 minutes to 1.5 hours. Focus group key questions included the following: “How would you describe the Residential Commons?” “What should the Residential Commons implement to improve its effectiveness?” “What is the Residential Commons doing that is not working?” “What is working well in the Residential Commons and should be continued?” and “What is working to some extent and would benefit from minor changes?” For the complete focus group protocol, see Appendix A. Focus group recordings were transcribed by a third-party transcription service. Worksheets inviting each focus group participant to describe the Residential Commons at SMU and identify the SWOTs were digitized.

The digitized responses and transcriptions were divided into thought units. A constant comparative content analysis was conducted on the thought units to identify emerging themes of the data. Themes were then each described in narrative form to explain the dimensions and aspects to the theme. Themes with descriptions were then placed in an online survey instrument utilizing Qualtrics. The first five-question survey instrument was then sent to all participants (n = 223) invited to the focus groups—whether or not they participated. The survey invited respondents to rank-order themes by the key questions connected to the research questions (i.e., Residential Commons definition and SWOTs). Themes with the lowest mean of rank-order scores were then organized into a new, second survey. The second, nine-question survey instrument listed dimensions and aspects with the most counts of thought units present in each theme (e.g., under the theme length of experience options of one year, two years, four years, and a lifetime were displayed with the Likert scale). Overall agreement (strongly disagree to strongly agree) was calculated by item per theme. Thought units were then organized into categories and eventually themes through an iterative process by members of the research team. Focus group transcripts were triangulated with digitized written responses by focus group participants to support reliability.

Key Findings—Provide bullet points of key findings from the assessment. You may attach any accompanying tables/graphs/etc. in a separate addendum.

Focus Groups: Across the focus groups, 43 themes arose from analysis that centered the research questions. Additionally, an analysis using setting, behavior, and actors (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was employed to understand components of an ideal definition or philosophy of the Residential Commons model at SMU. The 43 themes identify SWOTs for the Residential Commons at SMU. See appendix F for more details.

Surveys: Results from Survey 1 and 2 are presented in the appendix F. Additionally, the appendix also contains tables of the top five Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats to the Residential Commons system.
STEP 5: SHARE FINDINGS AND PROPOSE ACTIONS/CHANGES

With whom did you share the findings of your assessment? What do the key findings of this assessment suggest for how your department can better achieve the associated constituent outcome? What changes will you (or have you) made to practices and/or policies as a result of these findings? Also, if appropriate, explain how these findings can inform your future assessment plans.

We highlight insights from the first two phases of this mixed-methods exploratory sequential research study. First, we discuss the findings from the focus groups and then articulate insights from the modified Delphi method surveys used to build consensus across students, faculty, and staff participants. We also draw conclusions from consideration of the qualitative and quantitative data together.

First, by using the setting, actor, and behavior analysis, the counts suggest the primary audiences of the Residential Commons system at SMU to focus group participants. These include students and faculty. Therefore, an ideal definition would center these two audience groups based on the focus group findings. Additionally, verbs from the behavior analysis suggest a living environment that is crafted for interacting/connecting for the purpose of involvement.

Next, the strength themes that emerged from the focus group seem well supported by the quantity of thought units encompassed by each theme. A top representative theme was the FiR-RCD relationship. This is surprising to us, as much of the current narrative of the Residential Commons emphasizes a faculty-led environment. While important, it seems as though there was considerable discussion and reflection on the FiR-RCD partnership. This might suggest a leaning toward a shared leadership model being more present within the SMU Residential Commons. The remaining themes were less prominent within their representation of thought units.

Third, based on the numbers of thought units within each theme, it is clear that most participants focused their efforts on providing input (via discussion and the worksheets) within the weaknesses component of SWOT. Twenty-three of the 43 themes within the SWOT analysis were dedicated to capturing the essence of weaknesses. It is important to note that even though some thought units are not high in count, it does not mean considerable time or focus were not invested providing rich descriptions during the focus group. When considering just the counts of thought units, however, there were no clear, singularly identified weaknesses. For this reason, the second phase of the research study aided in consensus building to identify or prioritize the weaknesses themes. These insights are discussed later.

Next, when reviewing the analysis of opportunities and threats, they were not as numerous in terms of their number of thought units or the number of themes that emerged. This might suggest that participants had difficulty in considering or identifying external opportunities or threats beyond the control of RLSH as related to the Residential Commons model. When reviewing the focus group participants, there was not high participation from student affairs administrators. This stakeholder group may be able to provide additional insights into external opportunities and threats. This might also be an area of focus should a taskforce or working group be changed to complete phase three of the research project.
The second, quantitative phase of the research project also lends insights to influence the practice of the Residential Commons system at SMU. Results from survey one reveal a clear leader in the strength of the Residential Commons at SMU. The theme of connecting, belonging, and affiliation scored the lowest mean score (i.e., ranked number one) during the rank-order exercise. The theme mean score was one whole digit lower than the second identified strength. This suggests clarity in this strength among campus stakeholders in the initial consensus-building survey. The number of weaknesses were of the largest representation in terms of quantity during survey one. Therefore, survey two’s primary purpose was to further build census of the most important weaknesses. The top-ranked themes in survey one were: inconsistent facilities, Commons consistency, supporting underrepresented students, and connecting more students to Residential Commons. These top-ranked weaknesses aid an advisory group in addressing these current weaknesses of the Residential Commons system at SMU.

Next, survey two worked to clarify the most identifiable dimensionalities within important themes such as: connecting, bonding, belonging, and affiliation; FiR position; leadership; support and mentorship; length of experience; as well as the representative nature of the Commons. While not always reflective of current anecdotal experiences, the highest percentage scores of each theme potentiality contributes to a better sense of the Residential Commons experience at SMU. Therefore, marketing aspects as well as programmatic practices should be better aligned with these theme dimensionalities. Lower scoring dimensionalities need to be less emphasized or clarified with stakeholders to manage expectations of the RC experience. In conclusion, results and findings from this study require a working group and/or advisory committee to complete the third integrative phase. The insights gleaned from faculty, staff, and student stakeholders of the Residential Commons can solidify a definition, capitalize on the strengths and opportunities, while working to address weaknesses and threats. Our sincere hope is these results will solidify the foundation and ensure the vitality and sustainability of the Residential Commons system at SMU.
Section VIII. Division-wide Learning Domains Assessment

The Division of Student Affairs has identified the following divisional assessment charge for 2019-20:

All departments will work with a Learning Domain Champion to articulate clear learning/development outcomes and program outcomes for every student-facing program or service offered across the Division (departments are also welcomed and encouraged to complete this charge for all programs/services that are non-student facing as well).

These outcomes will be documented using the “SMU Student Affairs Program/Service Overview” form.

Working with your Learning Domain Champion liaison, please list all programs/services below for which your department has created a Program/Service Overview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of Program/Service Prospectus Forms Created</th>
<th>Completed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Learning Domain</td>
<td>Program/Service Name (# associated learning/developmental outcomes; # associated program outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous Leadership</td>
<td>RLSH Ambassadors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Academic Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honors Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Unification Board (HUB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Assistants (RA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Conference Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Consciousness</td>
<td>Commons Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Congruence</td>
<td>Fraternity Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Wellness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplified Capacity</td>
<td>Commuter Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Life and Safety Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Student Learning Services</td>
<td>Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IX. Connections to the SA Strategic Plan

The following section exists to support the collection of data and information that will help to inform the Division of progress achieved toward objectives outlined in the 2018-2023 SA Strategic Plan.

Division Partnerships Steering Committee and Student Experience Steering Committee

(contact chairs for more information on requested data: Brittany Barker, Michelle Madsen, Dr. Lindsey Koch, and Bonnie Hainline)

- Our department confirms that all relevant requested data has been entered by January 15 through the following data link: https://baseline.campuslabs.com/smu/partnershipinventorytool.

Confirm: ___X___Yes    ______No

Strategic Initiatives Steering Committee

(contact chairs for more information on requested data: Dr. Allison Kanny & Stephanie Howeth)

Provide the following information for staff in your department for the 2019-20 year (due May 1, 2020):

# staff members holding membership to 1 or more state- or national-level professional organizations: 18

# staff who attended a professional conference: 14

# staff who presented at a professional conference: 9

List all state- or national-level professional organizations for which your staff are members: See below

# staff involved in campus-wide committees: 7

List all staff publications (published this year): See below

Professional Awards

Grabsch, D. K. –
- Dissertation of the Year, Texas Association of College and University Student Personnel Administrators, 2019

Mucci-Ferris, M. –
- Courageous Change Leader Award, SMU, 2019

Leadership Positions

Bobo, A. –
- Chair, Exhibits and Displays Committee, SWACUHO, 2018 - 2022

Carlson, M. –
- Chair, Women in Housing Network, ACUHO-I, 2020 – 2021

Grabsch, D. K. –
- Editorial Board Member, Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, NASPA, 2018 – 2021

Luna, E. -
- Texas State Director, SWACUHO, 2018-2020

Madsen, M. –
- Exhibits & Displays Committee, SWACUHO, 2018 - Present

Mucci-Ferris, M. -
- Committee Member, SWACUHO, Exhibits and Displays Committee, 2019-2020
Post, J. –
• Executive Board Member, Residential College Society, 2014-2019

Salinas, M. –
• Adjunct Faculty - Learning Frameworks Course, El Centro Community College, Fall 2019

Strobel Hogan, S. –
• Historian, SWACUHO, 2017-2020
• Chair-elect, Talking Stick
• Advisory Board, ACUHO-I, 2019
• Chair, Talking Stick Advisory Board, ACUHO-I, 2020

Degrees & Credentials
Cove, L. –
• Statement of Accomplishment for Adaptive Leadership Course, +Acumen and Adaptive Change Advisors, 2019

Mucci-Ferris, M. -
• MBA, Southern Methodist University, 2020

Grants
Garner, D. –
• Academic and Student Success in Residential Colleges, Research Grant, SWACUHO, $500

Grabsch, D. -
• Academic and Student Success in Residential Colleges, Research Grant, SWACUHO, $500

Post, J –
• Academic and Student Success in Residential Colleges, Research Grant, SWACUHO, $500

Presentations
Ballman, S. –

Blair, N. –
• Kilburg, E. & Blair, N. (2019, November). Working for or against you, operating within the complex culture of residential colleges. Presented at the Residential College Symposium, Waco, TX.

Bobo, A. –

Grabsch, D. K. –

Kilburg, E. –
• Kilburg, E. & Blair, N. (2019, November). Working for or against you, operating within the complex culture of residential colleges. Presented at the Residential College Symposium, Waco, TX.
Luna, E. –

• Luna, E. (2020, February). *Intentional RA recruitment*. Presented at the Southwest Association for College and University Housing Officers Conference, Sugar Land, TX.

Madsen, M. –


Nadler, M. –


Post, J. –


Professional Publications

Grabsch, D. -


Section X. CAS Program Review and Future Priorities

As part of the SA Strategic Plan, all departments will undergo a CAS Program Review and enact a resulting action plan. Please complete the section below that corresponds with your department’s status in the CAS Program Review Cycle —Strategic Plan Objective 5.7—

X-A. CAS Program Review Self-Study Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21; 2021-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please provide the two-year follow up report regarding your department’s approach and progress toward implementing and the action plan.</td>
<td>Reflect on your departments’ participation in the CAS Program Review this year. What went well in the process and what could be improved? What suggestions do you have for either the Office of Assessment and Strategic Initiatives and/or next year’s participants to help make departments more successful?</td>
<td>In order to support departments in preparing for an upcoming CAS Program Review, Central Administration has provided a set of suggested activities located on the Canvas site for CAS Program Review. Which of these activities has your department completed and what is your plan for completing the rest before your self-study begins?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a period of synthesis and review to include the following:

1. Review of Artifacts
   a. Document Review
      Assessment/Annual Reports
      i. Position Descriptions
      ii. CAS Reviews
         1. Internal & External
      iii. Ethnographic Study of RCs
      iv. Division Strategic Plan
      v. University Strategic Plan
      vi. University Curriculum (proficiencies & experiences)
   b. Budget Review
   c. Internal Interviews with all RLSH Staff
   d. External Interviews with Key Stakeholders

Critical areas of focus were identified under each functional area of RLSH: Housing Operations, Residence Life and Academic Initiatives. Several areas of focus spanned more than one functional area. Examples of areas of focus included, setting a shared mission with clear priorities, re-affirmation of University buy-in to the RC model, standard reporting for assignments, the international student experience in the RCs, off campus student integration into the RC model, transfer student experience, audit and review of the room management software, and review of the base level service agreement. The complete listing of areas of focus is include in the attached document (Appendix G).

During the summer of 2019, RLSH hosted a two-day retreat for all staff to focus on advancing the findings of the CAS Program Review as well as the findings and observations through the synthesis and review phase completed by the AVP of Student Affairs and Dean of RLSH. RLSH was able to focus forward and advance several priorities identified as areas of focus.
The following committees and task forces were developed with membership throughout all functional areas of RLSH and intersections with campus partners where appropriate. The committees are viewed as an on-going function of our unit, while the task forces have a targeted end date.

**Committees**
StarRez Audit and Implementation  
Student Leader Training  
Professional Staff Development and Recruitment  
RA Development and Recruitment  
Recognition

**Task Forces**
Mission Creation  
Base Level Service Agreement Review  
Fraternity Lease and Sublease Processes  
University Commitment to the RC Model  
Residential Student Experience for Marginalized Identities  
Upper Division Housing Integration into the RC model  
Training and Recruitment in an RC Model  
Use of Consistent Language and Terminology  
Furniture Inventory and Lifecycle Planning

Each task force and committee reported on their progress to the staff in February, 2020 which included goals for next steps. All groups had made important progress. Adjustments to timelines were made in order to best support the inclusion of new information gleaned from several, robust research initiatives. Current progress and critical next steps are listed below for groups that had target dates within this reporting period. In addition, teams were added after new information was available. The start date for those task forces or committees is listed next to their title if the group was not one of the originally named above.

**Mission Creation Task Force:** A new mission was created through a task force that included students, faculty and staff.

*Residence Life and Student Housing fosters the foundational SMU experience where every student belongs, learns, and connects through their residential community. We make campus home.*

**StarRez Audit and Implementation Committee:** A business process audit was completed by StarRez. Staff on this committee reviewed, set targets, and dates for completion of each item. With the hiring of Ashley Wendler, Director of Housing Operations, further advancement of these initiatives will fall under her charge. This audit is showing result of a more user friendly system, further automated processes, and student facing processes that are more easily understood and operated by students. A copy of the audit is attached (Appendix I).

**Service Contract Review Task Force:** The Cable contract was reviewed and data around cable usage was utilized to make the determination that cable in each student room was not being utilized by students and could be discontinued. The number of cable drops will be decreased significantly during the summer of 2020 resulting in a significant cost savings.

**Base Level Service Agreement Task Force:** This group reviewed the current base level service agreement with facilities and identified several areas for exploration. In addition, this group benchmarked other institutions for similar documents. A model was identified, presented to facilities and there is agreement to work together to develop a similar more comprehensive agreement for facilities and RLSH that can better serve our students and provide clarity for those that work consistently with the document.
Use of Consistent Terminology Task Force: Preliminary discussions began in the Fall semester and through March, 2020 with OIT and facilities planning related to the implementation of the new work order system (Plannon). This group is making sure all building, RC, and room names are consistent across all university systems.

University Commitment to the RC Model/Campus Buy-In Task Force: This group continued with assignment of each member of the Division of Student Affairs as a Staff Affiliate. Established three teams including: presence and storytelling, road show, and symbols and ceremonies. Hired, trained, and designed a six-student Street Team to advance marketing and communication efforts of the Residential Commons and RLSH. Proposed that the Residential Commons crests be added to the HTSC renovation and the RCs be represented in Baccalaureate and SMU Graduation.

Recognition Committee: Created and adapted a Professional Achievements and Nomination form sent quarterly to staff. Designed artwork for 6 recognition tokens related to the Division of Student Affairs commitment statements. Produced a video to thank and recognize the work of RLSH student staff.

FiR Job Description and Evaluation (Began Fall 2019): Completed and proposed updates to the FiR Position Description (PD). Facilitated review of the PD and appointment process by Human Resources and Legal. Developing a 5-component evaluation process for the Faculty-in-Residence Position and modification to the review period.

RC Definition and Tenets Task Force (Began Spring 2020): Created a charge for the Task Force derived from the “Impact of the RC Model on Students, Faculty, and Staff” Research Project. Formed the Task Force and began work in May 2020.

Faculty Affiliate Revitalization Task Force (Began Spring 2020): Collected feedback from current and former Faculty Affiliates via meetings and email. Hosted 2 Task Force meetings to further develop a new Faculty Affiliate experience. Began developing a set of recommendations from the data and feedback from the Task Force.

Fraternity Lease & Sublease Process Review Task Force: Some chapters have already transitioned the Subleases to DocuSign. Amidst Covid-19 challenges, the Master Lease has also been approved to be uploaded to DocuSign. Some chapters have already utilized this option as well. Effective 2020 fiscal year Student damages will now be posted directly to my.smu from StarRez.

Constituent Outcomes Task Force (Began Summer 2019): Completed work; proposal was accepted in November 2019. The constituent outcomes are reflected in the annual report.

Residential Student Experience for Marginalized Students Task Force: Began work in January 2020, and convened in April with findings to be compiled in one document. Determined six groups of students that were directly impacted by living in the Residential Commons and UDH

- International Students
- LGBTQIA Students
- Non Traditional Students
- Students with Disabilities
- Students of Color
- Transfer Students

Utilized a challenges and opportunities framework to determine what could be done to assist these students within both of our systems.
**Furniture Inventory and Life-Cycle Planning Task Force:** Began work in November 2019 for furniture replacement orders for student rooms. McElvaney and Moore to receive new mattress. Morrison McGinnis and Cockrell McIntosh receive new bed ends and mattress. Committee worked with purchasing to repurpose furniture from Hughes-Trigg Student Center for the Service House and Boaz. Committee started planning for 1st floor lobby replacement furniture for McElvaney with vendor—this has been placed on hold.

The following committees continue to provide exceptional outcomes as evidenced by the sections of this report that show learning through RA training:

- Student Leader Training
- Professional Staff Development and Recruitment
- RA Development and Recruitment

Significant work will be done over the course of the 2020-2021 academic year to advance our most critical work. With a full leadership team and defined roles and responsibilities, RLSH is well positioned to continue our forward momentum.

**X-B. Initiative of Interest**—Please indicate the initiative(s) identified as underperforming through your assessment efforts this year. It is recommended that you develop your planned course of action (remove or revamp) as part of your upcoming summer strategic planning. —Strategic Plan Objective 5.6—

It is a priority for RLSH to identify several items throughout the course of the 20-21 year to sunset particularly as the RC program is further defined and developed.

One area of change that is of note is the decision to eliminate the double and sometimes triple staffing at the two service desks (one in Virginia Snider Commons and one in Armstrong Commons). Student staff were hired for those desks. There was a high absenteeism rate that related in a double and sometimes triple scheduling to ensure desks were open and functional during all scheduled operational hours. This was not an effective or efficient way forward.

RLSH completed a benchmarking of the RA (Resident Assistant) role and identified that the majority of the RAs at our comparator institutions as well as most regional institutions include a limited number of hours at a service or welcome desk as an additional way to connect with students and to contribute to the administrative needs of the department. For the 2020-2021 academic year, RAs will staff the service desks at 2 hours (maximum) each week. This will result in a cost savings for the department. More importantly, this change will insure we have a knowledgeable and well-trained student staff member at the desk to provide the best service to students in addition to providing RAs the opportunity to connect with a broader student population.
X-C. Priorities for 2020-2021—Outside of any tasks related to your department’s Program Review 5-Year Action Plan, what overarching departmental priorities has your department identified for the upcoming academic year as a result of participating in the exercise of completing this report? Focus on general themes, but give specific examples if/where possible (250 words or less).

Residential Commons Definition and Tenets: After an extensive research process that included analyzing historical data, facilitation of focus groups utilizing robust qualitative analysis techniques, review of an international benchmarking survey (SkyFactor), individual interviews and document analysis we will finalize the Residential Commons definition and tenets to guide our practice and further contribute to our mission. We will build upon the work done in evaluating the Faculty in Residence (FiR) position description and evaluation metrics for the FiR role. This will allow us to better understand and quantify the FiR impact on the RC community. In addition, we will continue our work to develop a comprehensive affiliate program (faculty and staff) as well as the work exploring how to best support marginalized identities in an RC (Residential Commons) model.

Use of SMU Connect: We will focus on better encouraging the use of SMU Connect for events hosted by RLSH. This will include work to optimize the reporting functions so that we can make data informed decisions around events and student attended initiatives.

StarRez Functionality and Maximization: We will focus on transforming the ways in which StarRez is utilized to capture business operations data. The platform has been used as a room management and assignments tool almost exclusively. If we maximize our utilization of the platform we will be able to capture and share critical data that will support not only RLSH in our efforts to contribute to the success and retention of our students, but broader, University initiatives as well.

Section XI. Addendum Reporting (leave blank on May 1)
The Division recognizes that, for many functional units, May 1 is not a representative end-date for the academic year as it relates to program offerings and utilize reporting. In an effort to address this issue, this section of the Annual Departmental Assessment Report provides a reporting avenue for departments to amend data previously submitted on May 1 if it represented a partial representation of that department’s full scope of work through May 31.

(If applicable) By no later than August 31, please resubmit this annual report document in its entirety with the following adaptations from the original May 1 submission:

- All additions/revisions to Sections I-X inserted above and highlighted in yellow.
- A brief summary of all additions/revisions made: