

Performance Blueprint
University Housing
5-27-2010

University Housing encompasses 2.2 million square feet, 6,610 residence hall bed spaces, 293 apartments, and classrooms and meeting space. The department employs approximately 370 people, including 235 Resident Mentors (student staff), 24 graduate students, and 111 full-time permanent employees. The budget for University Housing is \$34 million, with \$5 - \$8 million designated for capital improvements annually.

Mission

University Housing creates a sustainable living and learning community that promotes the academic success and personal development of students.

Vision

Sustainable Excellence: Great Today — Greater Tomorrow

Goals

University Housing seeks to provide a meaningful college experience and to that end, we will:

- 1) enhance students' academic and personal development experiences by creating a learning-enriching environment in the residence halls;
- 2) create a rich and rewarding living, learning, and working environment that meets and exceeds student expectations;
- 3) expand current knowledge base to inform practice and to share relevant results with colleagues;
- 4) demonstrate responsible stewardship of fiscal, human, technical, and other resources for delivery of high quality, efficient, and customer-oriented services;
- 5) recognize staff for their outstanding contributions to the department, the division, the university, and their respective professional fields, and
- 6) foster a diverse and vibrant academic environment where all are welcome and all can excel.

Goal #1

Teaching and Learning – Enhance students' academic and personal development experiences by creating a learning-enriching environment in the residence halls. (Contributes to division goal #1/outcome C: SA/AS engages and collaborates with faculty on educationally purposeful activities)

ANALYSIS: GOAL 1 – TEACHING AND LEARNING

- The goal was to enhance students' academic and personal development by creating a learning-enriching environment, and this goal was met.
- National Study on Student Engagement (NSSE) data is available but unanalyzed. Academic Centers for Excellence (ACE) data would indicate that students are satisfied with ACE services (as indicated by 99% of the students either strongly agreeing or agreeing that they were helped by using ACE services), and GPA data is encouraging. 68% of students using ACE services saw some increase in their GPAs, 4% saw no change, and 28% had a decrease in their GPA. Approximately two-thirds of the ACE appointments are with students living in University Housing. We received nearly 2,500 applications for learning communities, increased student participation in learning communities by 133, revitalized three learning communities, and created four new communities. We provide space for students to study and take classes (primarily University 101). Data will be pulled from the Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI) survey relating to "conditions that support academic progress" and the NSSE data related to the number of hours studied per week for the next iteration of this report. Again, the ability to fill our Director of Assessment position will

contribute to the depth of analysis we will be able to provide. While we believe we have met our stated goal, there is always room for progress and improvement in some of our key performance indicators. Since surveys have not been conducted on a consistent basis, comparison to previous years is not possible. Once we have administered the survey for several years, we will begin to report this year's data compared to historical data in each category.

- We have had two positions in Resident Student Learning vacant for the entire year. A second-year graduate student has held that program together for the year, but next year we need to hire the two vacant positions (associate director for resident student learning and coordinator of residential curricular initiatives). These two positions should help improve the academic environment in the residence halls by adding more learning community space, strengthening relationships with faculty associated with the learning communities, and creating linked-course, block scheduling, and co-enrollment options for students. We have also added an interior designer to our staff who will assist us with creating environments most conducive to study, through the use of colors, textures, and furniture styles and layout.
- I believe the goals should be the same from year to year – only our initiatives changing to better support the goal. In light of data collected, we may decide to add an initiative. For example, if we can demonstrate that living in a learning community contributes positively to student retention, then we may create an initiative to place more students in learning communities. Once our Director of Assessment is on hired, we will be able to have data to support (or not) the initiatives we are moving forward.
- Without analysis of the ample data we have collected, we really cannot draw conclusions from the data that inform practice. For example, what if we find that living in a learning community overall *negatively* impacts students' academic progress? While we assume from the national data that living in a learning community has a positive impact, we need to understand the data on our local campus in each of our learning communities.

1) Initiative- Develop programs and services that contribute to institutional retention and student academic performance.

a. KPI – ACE usage and student perception of value of service

i. # of students appointments in ACE

- Academic Coaching appts: 1,013 students, 1,451 appts
 - a. 1878 appt hours/2198 available hours = 85% fill rate
- Math Tutoring: 217 students, 463 appts
 - a. 432.5 appt hours/733 available hours = 59% appt fill rate
- Writing Consultations: 318 students, 558 appts
 - a. 447.6 appt hours/689.7 available hours = 65% appt fill rate
- Totals = 1,548 students, 2,472 appts

ii. Student Survey Feedback on ACE Coaching appointments

- n = 439/1,013 (43% response rate)
- *The ACE coach I met with seemed concerned about my well being:* 95% strongly agree (n= 417), 4.3% agree (n=19)
- *I felt comfortable sharing information with my ACE Coach:* 92% strongly agree, 7% agree
- *With my ACE coach, I developed a clear, detailed plan on how to be academically successful:* 84% strongly agree, 15% agree
- *I learned at least one new skill from my discussions with my ACE Coach:* 78% strongly agree, 20% agree

- *I plan on meeting with my ACE coach again: 53% strongly agree, 36% agree, 9% disagree*
- b. KPI – Report on GPA comparisons and persistence of students using ACE Services.
- i. # of Academic Standards students who attended ACE appointment, including those in compliance
 - 302 first-year students were placed on academic probation after Fall 2009. Of the 302 students, 289 students were registered for Spring 2010 classes, which was the target population for the ACE Academic recovery initiative.
 - 76.8% (or 222 students) were in compliance before the end of the Spring 2010 semester. 64.4% (or 156 students) were in compliance prior to the six week period, which avoided a registration hold.
 - a. Students who had their ACE appt prior to the six week deadline had an average GPA of 1.931 Sp2010 sem GPA.
 - b. Students who had their ACE appt after deadline had an average of a 1.783 Sp2010 sem GPA
 - c. Students who had no ACE appointment had an average of a .914 Sp2010 sem GPA ***
 - ii. GPA incremental progression, of those students who attended an ACE appointment
 - a. 33% students (n=71) increased their semester GPA +1.001 or higher***
 - b. 35.1% students (n=74) increased their semester GPA between + 0.01 – 1.00
 - c. 4% no change in GPA
 - d. 28.4% students (n=60) dropped their semester GPA
 - iii. Frequency of appointments (Average GPA increases between F2009 and Sp2010 of students who had ACE coaching appointments)
 - One Coaching appt = 0.585 semester GPA increase
 - Two Coaching appts = .351 semester GPA increase
 - Three Coaching appts = .787 semester GPA increase***
 - a. i.e. average Fall 2009 semester GPA = 1.041. After three ACE coaching appointments in the Spring semester, average Spring 2010 GPA = 1.828
 - iv. Persistence of Academic recovery students
 - 86 students were removed from probation (29.7%)
 - 75 students continued on probation at the conclusion of Spring 2010 (25.9%)
 - 128 of students suspended after Spring 2010 (or 44% of the 289 students registered for Spring 2010).
 - a. Registration status:
 - 35% of suspended students registered for the summer/fall/both (i.e. these students were planning on returning.)
 - 65% of suspended students were not registered at the end of the Spring semester (i.e. these students were not planning on returning)
 - v. Student Themes of Academic coaching appointments when working with Academic Recovery students
 - Student top self-disclosed reasons for academic difficulty, in order from highest to lowest frequency: (1) difficulty attending class, (2) change in major; (3) transition/adjusting to college life, (4) family problems.

- Topics discussed with ACE Coach, as requested by the student: (1) Academic Plan, 594 requests (2) Grades, 407 requests (3) Procrastination, 329 requests (4) Motivation, 225 requests (5) Concentration, 212 requests
 - c. KPI- Report on the number of residential students/resident status who use ACE services.
 - i. # of students living on-campus/off campus who use ACE Coaching
 - 673 students live on campus, 363 students live off campus, (remainder unknown)
 - ii. Resident SC/Non-Resident status
 - 723 students were residents of South Carolina, 285 students were non-residents, 16 students were international (remainder unknown)
 - d. KPI – Most requested topics of all ACE coaching appointments
 - i. Test Preparation (requested 1151 times)
 - ii. Grades (requested 1098 times)
 - iii. Time management (requested 816 times)
 - e. KPI – Utilizing the National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE), report on the number of students interacting with a faculty member outside the classroom compared to off campus students.
 - i. Unavailable until assessment position is filled
 - f. KPI –Report on the number of students participating in sponsored Living and Learning Communities (LLC’s) compared to previous year.
 - i. Approximately 2,473 applications received for the Fall 2009 term. During the 2009/2010 reporting year, student participation in LLC’s increased by 133 students. Learning Communities account for 37% of all undergraduate housing beds. There is room for growth, and we continue to seek ways to encourage growth by partnering with faculty to develop strategic marketing plans.
 - g. KPI – Report on the number of current Living and Learning Communities (LLC’s) revitalized during the year compared to previous year.
 - i. Engineering and Computing
 - ii. Capstone Scholars
 - iii. Honors
 - iv. These three communities were revitalized as the result of stronger partnerships with staff in each area. The opening of the Honors Residence provided ample collaborative options, Capstone Scholars continues to expand and grow, and Engineering has developed plans for expansion over the next year.
 - h. KPI – Report the number of new partnerships with academic departments established during the academic year.
 - i. Healthy Carolina (led by Dr. Michelle Burcin)
 - ii. Honors (led by Dr. Baird)
 - iii. Journalism Community (led by Lauren Welch)
 - iv. Magellan Explorers Community (Undergraduate Research, led by Dr. Jimmie Gahagan and Julie Morris)
- 2) Initiative - Create learning environments in ALL residence hall space, not only sponsored learning communities
- a. KPI – Report on the percentage residence halls with charters that include learning outcomes.
 - i. 90%. Of the 90%, all are utilizing the Resident Student Learning Model learning goals, a foundational document that provides direction to staff when addressing student issues. The 10% not falling into this area are apartment style facilities. With a new learning model (described as in development in goal #4, 1A of this document), all students will participate in programmatic efforts that include charters with learning outcomes.
 - b. KPI –Report on the number of spaces used to support the academic progress of students.

- i. 77. Space included in the above number represent ACE locations, classrooms, spaces utilized for group meetings as well as space for individual study. A review of the usefulness of these spaces is underway and will be completed summer 2010.
- c. KPI – Utilizing the Educational Benchmarking Inc., report on a comparison of responses by students on conditions that support academic progress.
 - i. Unavailable until assessment position is filled
- d. KPI – Utilizing the National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE), report on the number of hours/week students study compared to off campus students.
 - i. Unavailable until assessment position is filled

Goal #2

Quality of Life – Create a rich and rewarding living, learning, and working environment that meets and exceeds student expectations. (Contributes to division goal #2/outcome E: Facilities, programs and services meet the needs and expectations of students and other constituents.)

ANALYSIS: GOAL 2 – QUALITY OF LIFE

- The goal was to create a rich and rewarding living, learning, and working environment that meets and exceeds student expectations. This goal can be met by the creating a safe, secure, and inviting physical environment, the focus of this goal. We did not meet this goal. While we were able to continue our efforts to have a fire suppression system installed in every University Housing building, we have not yet met the goal of 100% sprinkled. We responded to 3.3% MORE calls for Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) complaints, despite a concerted effort of upgrading mechanical rooms, fan coil units, and dehumidification systems that would prevent mold growth. We did see a reduction in HVAC calls in Preston, the most recent hall to receive a mechanical upgrade. We submitted a plan to have a University Housing Master Plan study conducted, but it was pulled from the Board of Trustees agenda due to institutional budget concerns. This plan would have conducted a market and demand analysis, a facilities condition audit, and created a 15 to 20 year financial plan. Absent that document, we have been attempting to fix what breaks and plan facilities projects that address the highest student complaint issues (i.e. HVAC and mold reduction, water quality, water infiltration, general “freshness” of our spaces, etc.). What should not be lost is the competition we are facing from the off campus market for returning students and family/graduate students. Our facilities provide the basics, but competing with new or nearly-new is difficult. While we continue to have a waiting list for returning students, we may not always have that luxury, especially as off-campus facilities reduce their rental fees and provide amenities that we cannot. Vacancies in family and graduate housing are extraordinarily high, and anecdotal evidence (from students and from our English Proficiency for Internationals (EPI) partners) would suggest that the lower occupancy rates is the result of perceived lower quality of our family/graduate units. Carolina Gardens is in the worst shape, and we will request a study be conducted on that facility’s long-term viability, and we will explore public-private partnerships in this area.
- Occupancy management has been difficult, given the uncertainty of the freshman class size. We lost over \$1 million in revenue in 09-10 because we were told to anticipate a freshman class size of 4,100, and it turned out to be 3,900. We reserved 200 spaces for those freshmen (and turned away upper class students on a waiting list) that were never filled. We mitigated the financial impact of those vacancies by converting double occupancy rooms to singles where we were able, and that generated \$222,665 in additional revenue.
- We did well in the area of sustainability, including supporting a green learning community, hiring a sustainability coordinator, utilizing green cleaning methods, achieving LEED certification on renovation and construction projects, implementing green printing solutions, etc. We also did well in increasing safety

on campus, as demonstrated by continuing to install fire suppression systems, adding cameras, providing emergency notification boards, etc. The cameras, in conjunction with University of South Carolina Police Department (USCPD), assist us in identifying vandals and thieves. Ultimately, identifying the culprit of vandalism lowers student fees for residential students. The emergency notification boards are crucial in notifying students of emergency situations on campus. When not being utilized for that purpose, a myriad of institutional messages can be displayed, and can become a small source of revenue. We have switched to using soy ink in our printers. Our publications use recycled paper and soy ink.

- We have again, been told to expect a large freshman class size, somewhere between 4,200 and 4,300 students. We will try to hedge our vacancies by using historical data on the number of returning students who cancel their contracts and use that trend as a way to accommodate the “extra” freshmen students.
- Recommendations to the division include providing the range of possible new freshmen to expect. While 4,300 may be the “stretch” goal, we need to know how many students enrollment management realistically expects to enroll.

1) Initiative – Be attentive to facilities issues, particularly life-safety

- a. KPI – Report on the percentage of university housing (including Greek Village) with sprinkler projects initiated or continued during the year
 - i. 75.8% of Housing Residence Halls are now sprinkled with a total of 6,802 beds. Buildings that will be sprinkled for Fall 2010 include: Bates House, Bates West, Capstone, Columbia, East Quad, Greek Village, Harper/Elliott, Honors Residence, McBryde, Rutledge, Sims, South Quad, South Tower, Thornwell, & West Quad. Total of 5,221 beds
- b. KPI – Report on the number of un-sprinkled buildings and the projections for completion dates
 - i. 12.8% of university housing is in the *construction phase* of sprinkler installation (DeSaussure, NADA, Patterson Hall, and Preston,) 945 beds
 - ii. 6.5% of university housing is in the *design phase* of sprinkler installation (McClintock, Pinckney LeGare, Wade Hampton, and Woodrow) 465 beds
 - iii. 5.2% of university housing is *unsprinkled* (Carolina Gardens, Cliff Apartments, and Roost) 384 beds
- c. KPI – Report on the results of the market demand analysis
 - i. The University Housing’s master plan has been placed on hold so there is no information to report at this time.
- d. KPI – Report on the results of the facilities analysis
 - i. The University Housing’s master plan has been placed on hold so there is no information to report at this time.
- e. KPI – Report on the results of the financial pro forma
 - i. The University Housing’s master plan has been placed on hold so there is no information to report at this time.
- f. KPI – Report on the percentage of buildings with special Heating, Ventilation, and Air conditioning (HVAC) projects initiated and submitted for the Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Process (CPIP)
 - i. 16% of the buildings have HVAC projects initiated and submitted for CPIP
 - ii. CPIP Project include Fan coil Unit replacement, Air Handler replacement, and steam trap and actuator work.
 - iii. KPI – Report on number of maintenance requests for HVAC by building compared to previous year

<u>Building</u>	<u>2008- 2009</u>	<u>2009- 2010</u>	<u>Percentage Difference</u>
Bates House	343	410	19.5%
Bates West	110	274	149.1%
Capstone	117	120	2.6%
Carolina Gardens	146	138	-5.5%
Cliff	174	105	-39.7%
Columbia hall	184	146	-20.7%
DeSaussure	72	46	-36.1%
East Quad	151	194	28.5%
Harper Elliott	43	52	20.9%
Honors Residence		44	
Maxcy	128	125	-2.3%
McBryde A	43	53	23.3%
McBryde B	43	16	-62.8%
McBryde C	52	33	-36.5%
McBryde F	41	25	-39.0%
McBryde G	39	21	-46.2%
McClintock	145	149	2.8%
NADA	12	15	25.0%
Patterson hall	170	91	-46.5%
Pinckney LeGare	62	67	8.1%
Preston	48	36	-25.0%
Roost	90	63	-30.0%
Rutledge	57	59	3.5%
Sims	114	97	-14.9%
South Quad	261	267	2.3%
South Tower	163	220	35.0%
Thornwell	60	34	-43.3%
Woodrow	102	100	-2.0%
Wade Hampton	73	132	80.8%
West Quad	161	179	11.2%
	3204	3311	3.3%

- 2) Initiative - Establish an occupancy management plan for housing single undergraduate students, taking into consideration the departmental renovation schedule
- a. KPI – Report on the number of spaces allocated for first-year students living in the residence halls.
 - i. The Columbia campus reserved 4,100 beds for the Fall 2009 class. The current financial climate made living on campus a hardship for 242 families. For this reason, the yield rate from the 3,917 enrolled was only 3,675 students.
 - ii. Requests for first-year exemptions were up this year (approximately 95) from last year’s high of 30. We are monitoring requests closely to avoid as many vacancies as possible.
 - b. KPI – Report on the percentage of freshmen class housed in the residence halls.

- i. Residence halls housed 93% of the freshmen class. We are working with Undergraduate Admissions to foster ways to yield a larger and stronger class of applicants with more emphasis on Living and Learning Communities.
- c. KPI – Report on the number of students on the wait list for on campus housing.
 - i. On March 1, the current student wait list was 763. With the University requirement for all new freshmen to live on campus, 400 additional spaces were reserved for the anticipated class of 4,100. We are taking steps to narrow the demand gap for all students.
- d. KPI – Report on the number of vacancies and paid singles by building.

Building	# of Vacancies	Paid Private	Revenue Generated
820 Henderson	0	0	
Bates House	24	31	\$56,935
Bates West	18	0	
Capstone	5	5	\$6,150
Columbia Hall	5	1	\$4,100
Desaussure	0	0	
East Quad	6	0	
Harper-Elliot	3	0	
Legare-Pinckney	0	0	
Maxcy	4	3	\$4,100
McBryde	11	15	\$27,020
McClintock	48	9	\$26,055
Honors Residence	3	0	
Patterson	48	15	\$30,880
Preston	4	0	\$2,050
Roost	48	8	\$6,150
Rutledge	2	0	
Sims	9	0	
South Quad	1	0	
South Tower	71	19	\$43,425
Thornwell	0	0	
Wade Hampton	17	4	\$9,650
West Quad	9	0	
Woodrow	3	0	
Total	339	110	\$222,665

- i. In Family and Graduate Housing, we had a drop in the occupancy rate for both complexes. In Carolina Gardens, we dropped from 98.76% occupied to 93.47%. In Cliff Apartments, we dropped from 95.41% occupied to 91.19%.
 - e. KPI – Report on the buildings re-allocated for first year students based on demand for spaces.
 - i. For Fall 2009, the freshmen bed inventory increased as follows: New Honors Residence: 300; South Tower: 100; Campus total: 400. With completion of the new residence and a bad economy, bed spaces were left unfilled. We remain confident that through better forecasting occupancy percentages will rise close to 100% in the coming year.
- 3) Initiative - Continue as a national leader in sustainability in construction, cleaning, and maintenance practices, as well as educating students on the importance of sustainable lifestyles.
- a. KPI – Report on Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification achievements for the Honors Residence
 - i. A Gold status has been achieved for the Honors Residence
 - b. KPI – Report on the actions initiated and completed to seek silver LEED certification for Paterson Hall renovation
 - i. Patterson Hall has been registered with United States Green Buildings Council (USGBC).
 - c. KPI – Report on the progress to re-commission West Quad

- i. Housing Facility is addressing issues with the Solar Thermal Domestic Hot Water System prior to seeking re-commission for West Quad.
 - d. KPI – Report on the progress updates to implement Dashboard for energy utilization across campus
 - i. Dashboard has been installed in Honors Residence. Plans are to expand to West Quad in the near future.
 - e. KPI – Report on the number of students participating in the Residence Hall Association (RHA) Eco-Reps program.
 - i. 14 eco-reps, 3 of the representatives received 3 academic credits for a course offered by Dr. Whiteman
 - f. KPI – Report on the number of pounds recycled compared to previous year.
 - i. For 2008 the number of pounds recycled was 33 tons.
 - ii. For 2009 the number of pounds recycled was 37 tons.
 - iii. For 2010 the number of pounds recycled was 33 tons, plus bulk wood that is not yet calculated.
 - g. KPI – Report on the number of pounds collected through the Recyclemania program.
 - i. RecycleMania collected 4,088 pounds of Recycle in 2009
 - ii. RecycleMania has collected 310,460 pounds of Recycle in 2010
 - iii. NOTE: In 2009 RecycleMania only lasted for 4 weeks. RecycleMania in 2010 lasted 10 weeks.
 - h. KPI – Report on the percentage of halls participating in the green cleaning program.
 - i. Facilities Management implemented green cleaning in all residence halls to meet the standards of the United States Green Buildings Council (USGBC)
 - i. KPI – Report on the percentage of recycled paper content (in paper towels, toilet tissue, copier paper, trash bags) used within the department.
 - i. Consolidated Services is now stocking various green cleaning products selected for use in residence and will be coordinating with Facilities Management to incorporate more items and equipment supplies in routine inventory.
 - j. KPI – Report on the number of publications utilizing soy ink.
 - i. Since June 2009, the department has printed 54 publications using soy-based ink. The department also has 53 out of 111 printers that use soy toner cartridges.
 - k. KPI – Report on the percentage of publications that had greater than 30% recycled content in paper
 - i. Since June 2009, the department has printed 71 publications using 100% post-consumer recycled paper.
- 4) Initiative - Enhance residence hall building security practices and procedures
 - a. KPI – Report on the feasibility study conducted for the card access program (analyzing capabilities to display photo IDs as students swipe their ID cards for building entry)
 - i. Housing has implemented an automated process to import student ID photos from the Carolina Card Office into the Access Control system. The next step in this project will be to purchase and install computers at the front desk of the 10 residence halls which require students to swipe their ID cards for building entry and to train desk assistants and security staff on logging into the application so that they can view photos as cards are swiped.
 - b. KPI – Report on the number of buildings with cameras, those without cameras, costs associated with installations, and the schedule for future installations of cameras
 - i. There are 19 buildings with cameras already installed
 - ii. 5 buildings with some cameras installed
 - i. 5 buildings that do not have cameras
 - ii. The cost of installation of each camera is approximately \$500.00
 - iii. South Quad will have cameras installed during the summer of 2010

- iv. Thornwell will have cameras installed in 2012
- v. Wade Hampton will have cameras installed in 2012 after upgrade
- vi. NADA (French House) only has one door – not sure if camera is needed
- c. KPI – Report on the number of buildings with flat screen information units, number of buildings projected to have flat screen information units installed , costs associated with installations, and the schedule for future installations of flat screen information units
 - i. Housing has installed three digital information screens (all 40” flat screen TV units) in one residence hall. Approval has recently been received to proceed with the purchase and installation of 29 additional units to be installed in 20 residence halls by the Fall 2010 opening. The estimated purchase cost for the 29 additional units (flat screen TV and required digital media player) is \$44,000 with an annual maintenance fee to UTS of \$6,000 for the 29 displays.
- d. KPI – Report on study conducted to consider implications of housing students who are identified as felons, in conjunction with Enrollment Management
 - i. Worked with Enrollment Management to develop a system for addressing students who have been identified as felons (either self-identified or through media reports) and have not yet enrolled. The conclusion was that students who fall into this category should be treated just as an actively enrolled student. Students will have their cases adjudicated by the Office of Student Judicial Programs, with significant input from the Director of University Housing.
- e. KPI – Utilizing the Educational Benchmarking Inc., report on the number of students that positively responded that they feel safe in their residence hall.
 - i. Unavailable until assessment position is filled

Goal #3

Research, Scholarship and Creative Achievement – Expand current knowledge base to inform practice and to share relevant results with colleagues. (Contributes to division goal #3/outcome D: Staff engagement in scholarly activities advances the academy and knowledge base)

ANALYSIS: GOAL 3 – RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENT

- This goal was to expand current knowledge base to inform practice and to share relevant results with colleagues, and we have met this goal. We have made a concerted effort to have more employees take the WorkKeys Assessments (the screening tool to establish eligibility in the apprenticeship program), and to have more employees participate in the apprenticeship program. We created a graduation ceremony for the successful apprenticeship employees. We also provided support for those employees who did not pass the WorkKeys Assessment so that they could increase their chances of passing the test the next time it was offered. Staff are making concerted efforts to learn in order to do their jobs better. There is a cost to the department (\$70,000 for the apprenticeship program); however, the increased skills obtained through the program result in better service to our students. We have been encouraging staff to attend training sessions to be competent with new systems. Professional staff training was adjusted so that it was not a duplication of Graduate Assistant training. Instead of focusing on the operational aspects of running a building, professional staff training focused on developing leadership skills. All of the management staff read the book Five Dysfunctions of a Team, and various other books and articles were read by different segments of the department. Sixty-five percent of the graduate students reported being more competent as a result of the Friday Morning Professional Development series.
- For University Housing, the Division does an excellent job at providing professional development opportunities for those who have been trained (or are being trained) in student affairs. University Housing has to provide the professional development opportunities and specific training for our maintenance and custodial staff. They seem to be forgotten at the division level. While we can rely on the division for my

student affairs professional, we must make certain that we are providing similar types of opportunities for our maintenance and custodial staff.

- Based on the data, we need to do a better job of connecting readings and discussions to staff's daily activities. A 65% rate of "approval" in that area should be higher, and we will investigate the reasons for the low score. This score only represents our graduate students, and next year we will also assess the professional staff who participate in those meetings. Our feedback on the diversity readings was also less than desired. Anecdotal evidence would suggest that staff did not consider poverty a diversity issue.

1) Initiative - Expand our knowledge/expertise within the housing field

- a. KPI – Report on a comparison study of recruitment publications from SEC and other select benchmarking institutions.
 - i. The comparative study of recruitment publications from the SEC institutions was started, but not completed. The information will be reported by the end of the summer 2010.
- b. KPI – Report on a comparison study of housing websites from SEC and other select benchmarking institutions.
 - i. A committee was formed in 2009 to review the current Housing web site and make suggestions for changes. As part of this process, the Web Site Review Committee is in the process of reviewing the web pages of SEC and other similar research-based public institutions. The Committee has reviewed 12 different institutions to date and found that our web site is aesthetically on par with the institutions we have reviewed. We have identified some features we would like to implement on our web site (such as student testimonials and streaming video) and will include these features in the redesign of our Housing web page. We will continue our efforts to comply with ADA requirements.
- c. KPI – Report the number of research projects conducted and increase the number from previous year.
 - i. This information was not obtained from the Professional Development Program survey as expected. There were 12 employees that published an article, chapter, or manuscript during the year.
- d. KPI – Report and publish results of research projects with staff through departmental intranet depository.
 - i. The department was not able to obtain this information since it was not included in the Professional Development Program survey as expected.
- e. KPI – Report on the number of articles published by departmental staff (utilizing the division's professional development database).
 - i. Twelve employees published an article, chapter, or manuscript during the year.
- f. KPI – Percentage of staff members that positively report that they were more competent and informed as a student affairs professional as a result of participating in professional staff development programs.
 - i. Ninety-four percent of professional staff members reported that they were more competent and informed as a student affairs professional as a result of participating in professional staff training conducted in July 2009.

2) Initiative – Become a learning organization

- a. KPI – Report on the number of books and articles read by departmental leadership.
 - i. The book *Speak Up* was read by 245 resident mentors, 24 graduate assistants and 10 professional staff
 - ii. The book *Grown Up Leadership* was read by 18 professional staff members
 - iii. The book *Branded* was ready by 18 professional staff members and 24 graduate assistants

- iv. The book *5 Dysfunctions of a Team* was read by the Departmental Leadership numbering 56.
- v. The professional and graduate staff in Residence Life numbering 40 read the following 20 articles.
 - 1. Defining Spiritual Development- A missing Consideration for Student Affairs
 - 2. Spirituality, liberal learning and college student engagement
 - 3. Why spirituality deserves a central place in liberal education
 - 4. Fowler's Stages of Faith Summary
 - 5. First Year of College Revisited
 - 6. Kolb's Learning Theory
 - 7. Kolb learning process graph
 - 8. Learning at any time supporting Student Learning Where Ever it happens
 - 9. Reflections of a profession of 9 years of living in a dorm... I mean Residence Halls.
 - 10. What Student Affairs Professionals Need to Know About Student Engagement
 - 11. Engagement vs Participation
 - 12. Encouraging Student Engagement
 - 13. The Chronicle of Higher Education- Free-Speech Group Accuses University of Delaware of 'thought Reform'
 - 14. Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning
 - 15. The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs
 - 16. The Politics and Policies of Parental Involvement
 - 17. Human Potential Untangled
 - 18. The Educational Potential of Residence Halls
 - 19. How Campus Environments Influence Student Outcomes
 - 20. The Importance of the Sense of Place and Sense of Self in Residence Hall Room Design
- b. KPI – Report on the number of monthly discussion sessions conducted with key departmental leadership.
 - i. 14 sessions were held for graduate assistants and professional staff within residence life
 - ii. 9 sessions were held for professional staff through the Leadership Development Meetings
- c. KPI – Percentage of staff members that positively report that they were more competent and informed as a student affairs professional as a result of participating in the program.
 - i. 65% of graduate assistants reported being more competent as a result of participating in the Friday Developments.
- d. KPI – Report on the number of a new custodial class employees and zone maintenance class employees.
 - i. 6 new custodial employees began technical classes on 9/1/09
 - ii. 3 new maintenance employees began technical classes on 9/9/09
 - 1. One maintenance employee voluntarily resigned from the program for personal seasons. Another employee was put in place on October 27, 2009. To date, we have been able to place all temporary employees in permanent positions before they enter the program or shortly after entering the program.
- e. KPI – Administer and report on the Work Keys test, the entrance exam to establish eligibility for the apprenticeship program.
 - i. Work Keys Assessments were administered to 17 employees (12 custodial, 5 maintenance) on November 12, 2009.
 - ii. 8 employees passed (4 custodial, 4 maintenance)
 - iii. 9 employees did not meet the required skill levels in one or more components of the assessment

1. Of the 5 employees requiring assistance and retesting in Applied Math, 3 passed
 2. Of the 6 employees requiring assistance in Locating Information, 4 passed
 3. The employee who did not pass will be retested at the next testing date
- f. KPI – Report on the funding level for the apprenticeship program.
- i. The program has been designated with \$70,000 per year to cover the costs of ongoing training and assessments
- g. KPI – Report on the number of staff participating in the apprenticeship graduation ceremony.
- i. 7 employees graduated on May 20, 2009 (2 maintenance, 5 custodial)
 - ii. 6 custodial employees graduated on May 3, 2010.

Goal #4

Service Excellence – Demonstrate responsible stewardship of fiscal, human, technical, and other resources for delivery of high quality, efficient, and customer-oriented services. (Contributes to division goal #4/outcome E: SA/AS units provide excellent service to its constituents)

ANALYSIS: GOAL 4 – SERVICE EXCELLENCE

- The purpose of this goal was to demonstrate responsible stewardship of fiscal, human, technical, and other resources for delivery of high quality, efficient, and customer-oriented services. Based on the available data, this goal was met. The department completed reviewing or is in the process of reviewing fourteen departmental processes, all using data to inform their reviews. We can demonstrate eight instances of using existing data to inform our practice, and we are tracking demographic characteristics of the applicants in our search process. As we accumulate data over the years, we can begin to identify and address anomalies in the data and make realistic targets. Overall, the department is using data to inform decisions and improve practice. Paying attention to true “key indicators” of performance, such as the 30 day aging report of incomplete work orders and maintenance response time is helping us improve service to students. Additionally, we are using national databases that can help us benchmark our performance to like-institutions. We are paying attention to the smaller details through the mystery shopper program.
 - In the professional staff recruitment category, the position band will not allow us to list Master’s preferred, and we receive many applicants without a master’s degree. Because of the timing of the professional staff vacancies and the shallowness of the applicant pool, we made a decision to leave two Residence Life Coordinators vacant, rather than fill them with less qualified people. Recruiting from national conferences should assist in deepening the applicant pool. For the Resident Mentor recruitment process, we increased our male applicants from the previous year, and we maintained gender and ethnicity percentages. However, the increased Grade Point Average requirement has made fewer males even eligible for the process. In particular, we are having difficulty recruiting from some of the more difficult majors (i.e. Engineering).
 - The key performance indicators in this section need to accumulate longitudinal data in order to determine which direction the service indicators are heading. We also need to incorporate financial information into this section with benchmarks such as operating cost per student, operating cost per foot, percentage of operating cost compared to student room fee revenue, etc. Not only will this provide a comparison of our operation from year to year, it will also allow us to benchmark ourselves with other institutions (particularly the operating cost per square foot). We also need to align our maintenance and custodial staffing structures with the Association of Physical Plant Administrators of Universities and Colleges (APPA) standards. These standards can identify areas of over- and under-staffing.
- 1) Initiative - Review and improve major departmental programs
- a. KPI – Report on the results of the review process with recommend revisions, implementation timeline, and a projected budget for a **review of the Resident Student Learning Model**

(RSLM); the Student Success Initiative (SSI); The Sophomore Initiative (TSI); Resident Mentor (RM) job description & performance evaluation; programming model; and Residence Hall Association (RHA) programming

- i. University Housing promotes student learning through an environment that motivates and inspires students to devote time and energy to educationally purposeful activities. Our communities are characterized by empowered, informed, and responsible life-long learners. These communities emphasize student involvement, inclusion, service, and appreciation of the diversity at the University of South Carolina. Complementing the academic mission of the institution and “Carolina Core”, the staff of University Housing developed a new learning model (tentatively named the A-Frame) that will actively support students in their academic progress, awareness of self, and awareness of their responsibilities to others. Staff continue to work on the development of programs, services, and assessment activities that will support these three learning objectives. Work continues on the ripple effects of this new model (those other processes described above).
- b. KPI – Report on the results of the recommendations, an implementation timeline, and a projected budget for the **Facilities Administration Management Information System (FAMIS), concentrating on how to most fully utilize its capabilities, especially hand-held personal digital assistants, the new version of FAMIS with work order updates, and standardized reports that are analyzed on a consistent basis for continual improvement.**
 - i. A Maximizing FAMIS Committee began meeting in October 2009 and is in the process of reviewing all areas of work related to FAMIS. The Committee has identified and implemented some changes which will improve the handling of work orders that should, in turn, have a positive impact on the accuracy level of staff efficiency and work order reporting. Part of this review will include identification of standard reports that can be analyzed for continued improvements. A new student self-service web portal (FIXX On-line) is in the final stages of development and will be implemented prior to the Fall 2010 opening. This application will allow students to enter maintenance requests directly into the FAMIS system via the web. Cost for this application was \$19,000 with an annual ongoing maintenance fee of \$2,700. The possible implementation of hand-held personal digital assistants will be reviewed after the Fall 2010 opening. The cost to implement this functionality has not been identified.
- c. KPI - Report on the results of the recommendations, an implementation timeline, and a projected budget for **the Student Room Electronic Door Access system.**
 - i. A consultant has been hired. Housing Facilities staff have requested for a proposal to help in the designing of the system Nader prototype.
- d. KPI - Report on the results of the recommendations, an implementation timeline, and a projected budget for an **Occupancy Management Software system.**
 - i. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was developed for a new Housing Assignment and Conference Management system. Responses were received from a number of vendors. A committee made up of Housing representatives from USC Columbia and two other campuses is in the process of reviewing the responses received and making a selection. Once the procurement process is completed, implementation meetings will begin with the selected vendor. The planned date for going into production use of the new application is December 2010 for Fall 2011 assignments. A total cost will not be known until the RFP is awarded and a contract is finalized.
- e. KPI – Report on the number of standard operating procedures for the department reviewed and revised for the year.
 - i. The department has created an audit program for Conferences, Family and Grad. Future plans are to have facility work orders audited on a regular basis. Specifically, 17 procedures/policies have been created or reviewed and revised this year.

- f. KPI – Report on the number of centralized business functions initiated for the department.
 - i. The department created an audit program for Conferences, Family and Graduate Housing. Plans are to have facility work orders audited in the future.
 - g. KPI – Report on the number of tour guides that participate in a training program who learn how to clearly articulate the importance and benefits of living on campus.
 - i. There are seventy university ambassadors and six housing student employees trained to conduct tours for visitors and prospective students. With the impending creation of a new marketing and communications office, we will continue to look for ways to put students in direct contact with learning community mentors and faculty principals.
 - h. KPI – Report on the results of a program analysis of the departmental virtual tour program.
 - i. A small workgroup was convened during the Fall 2009 term to determine the effectiveness of the current site. In light of the changing technological environment for the Housing Management System (IMS), it was decided to delay any major changes until December 2010. The workgroup did address the needs to add new properties (Honors Residence, etc.) and compliance issues for students with disabilities.
 - i. KPI – Report on the number of participants that positively responded to the tour program on the Summer Orientation and Testing Study.
 - i. Orientation and Testing has been nonresponsive to our requests for this data.
 - j. KPI – Report on the number of participants that positively responded to the tour program on the Visitor Center Campus Tour Program Survey.
 - i. The Visitor Center Survey does not ask any specific questions related to housing visits. We will work with the director to add questions for future surveys.
 - k. KPI – Report on the results of an audit of adaptive spaces on campus in collaboration with the Office of Student Disability Services.
 - i. A space audit of 36 rooms/apartments was completed in August 2009. During the past year we developed a new approach to the assignment process that addresses both room resources and roommate matching for prospective students.
 - l. KPI – Report on the number of handicap accessible construction and/or renovation projects for the year.
 - i. Facilities completed three projects to assist students. Projects ranged from building a special desk to installing additional electronic door openers for improved access
 - Pinckney / Legare had a handicap door replaced
 - Patterson Hall will be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.
 - All entrance doors in every building have ADA equipment and devices. Housing Facilities is to do one improvement or upgrade a year.
 - m. KPI – Report on an audit of disability accessible spaces in the living and learning communities.
 - i. The original audit did not include a review of specifics related to learning communities. We have existing systems in place to address the needs of participants with special needs.
- 2) Initiative – Utilize survey and secondary data to improve departmental performance.
- a. KPI – Report on the a study conducted to calculate average work order response time compared to stated response time of 24 hours
 - i. Third Quarter of 08/09, when we first started tracking average work order response time, was 7.20
 - ii. Fourth Quarter of 08/09 the average days to complete a work order was 4.10
 - iii. First Quarter of 09/10 the average days to complete a work order was 4.10 days.
 - iv. Second Quarter of 09/10 the average days to complete a work order was 4.63 days.
 - v. Third Quarter of 09/10 the average days to complete a work order was 5.48 days.
 - b. KPI – Report on the number of work orders on 30 day aging report
 - i. Housing Facilities has 166 work orders that are over 30 days old.
 - c. KPI – Report on the number of work orders submitted online

- i. For the year 09/10 the number of work orders issued is 18,187.
 - ii. For the year 08/09 the number of work orders issued is 16,346.
 - d. KPI - Analyze and report on the results of the housing items included in the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)
 - i. Unavailable until assessment position is filled
 - e. KPI – Administer, analyze and report results on the National Study of Living Learning Programs (NSLLP)
 - i. Unavailable until assessment position is filled
 - f. KPI – Analyze and report on the results of the Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI) surveys
 - i. Unavailable until assessment position is filled
 - g. KPI – Analyze and report on the results of the housing items included on the National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE)
 - i. Unavailable until assessment position is filled
 - h. KPI – Administer and report on the Mystery Shopper program
 - i. During the months of October and November 2009, a series of building inspections were conducted by students to get their impressions of safety, cleanliness, attractiveness, and usefulness of all residence hall buildings. In addition, the Mystery Shopper program was administered in November. Reports were generated for both activities. Information is used to make first impression improvements. Administrative support staff will be attending a day long training program on quality service during the spring 2010 semester and desk and office staff attended customer service training in January.
- 3) Initiative – Recruit, hire, and professionally develop employees.
 - a. KPI – Report on the recruitment processes completed and costs associated with the process
 - March to June RLC Search.
 - 129 candidates,
 - 75 minimally qualified and were paper screened
 - 34 received first round phone interview
 - 23 recommended for second round phone interview
 - 16 accepted second round phone interview
 - 9 recommended for campus interview
 - 2 candidates withdrew
 - 2 declined campus interview
 - 2 we declined to bring to campus
 - 2 we brought to campus but did not offer
 - 2 hired
 - 1 offered and declined position
 - June to September RLC Search
 - 120 candidates
 - 35 minimally qualified and were paper screened
 - 12 received phone interview
 - 6 recommended to bring to campus
 - 1 declined campus interview
 - 1 we declined to bring to campus
 - 3 were brought to campus but not offered position
 - Total cost was approximately \$4650
 - Spring 2010 (Searches are not yet complete, so data not available)
 - Residence Life Coordinator (2 positions)
 - Assistant Director for North Area

- Associate Director of Residential Learning
- Coordinator of Curricular Initiatives
- Director of Assessment
- Resident Mentor Process
 - 295 candidates applied within a 10 day period
 - 113 Male , 183 Female
 - MALE #'s: 17 African-Americans, 2 American Indian-Alaskan, 4 Hispanic students, 7 Asian-Pacific Islanders, 6 non responses, 2 other ethnicities, 76 Caucasians (self reported data from application process)
 - FEMALE #'s: 39 African-Americans, 0 American Indian-Alaskan, 5 Hispanic students, 6 Asian-Pacific Islanders, 8 non responses, 3 other ethnicities, 122 Caucasians (self reported data from application process)
 - Interviewed 242 candidates
 - 126 current staff accepted to return, 5 declined
 - 87 new applicants were originally offered, 7 declined
 - Total cost is approximately \$3,000.

Goal #5

Recognition and Visibility – Recognize staff for their outstanding contributions to the department, the division, the University, and their respective professional fields. (Contributes to division goal #5/outcome A: SA/AS supports and encourages development toward campus and national visibility and expertise)

ANALYSIS: GOAL 5 – RECOGNITION AND VISIBILITY

- This goal was to recognize staff for their outstanding contributions to the department, the division, the University, and their respective professional fields. We have eliminated the take-home pay reduction that custodial staff moving from temporary to permanent status has experienced. We are hopeful that the change will encourage more custodians to switch to permanent status when the opportunity is offered. All of the eleven employees offered permanent employment were temporary employees. Ideally, we would like to have two-thirds of our custodial staff in permanent status. This would allow us to have a stable work-force and have flexibility in difficult budget times. The department has recognized staff publicly on a consistent basis (28 awards presented) through a variety of methods (employee of the quarter, employee of the year and the Southeast Association of Housing Officers (SEAHO) award). The “of the quarter” and “of the year” awards have a monetary award as well. The recognition programs have served as motivators for our staff, and now the employees are able to influence recognition through a newly formed departmental recognition committee. The Recognition Committee determined that the information would be best utilized by individual supervisors with their employees to recognize them for their performances. The committee will encourage the utilization of the survey beginning Fall 2010. We created an employee of the year award that was presented to Dewey Wigington at the end-of-year breakfast in May.
- Our ability to recognize and financially reward our custodial and maintenance staff for completion of the apprenticeship program has been a key component to the apprenticeship program’s success. Campus Facilities has not been able to retain their funding for their side of the program, but we will continue our partnership with Midlands Tech as long as is possible.
- We have been successful at recognizing and rewarding staff within our departmental structures, but we would like to see more regional and national professional organization nominations made.

1) Initiative – Recognize staff for outstanding performance

- a. KPI – Report on the number of departmental staff nominated and awarded for local, state, regional, and national awards
 - i. Four staff members were nominated and/or awarded local, state, regional or national awards during the year.
 - b. KPI – Report on the number of departmental staff nominated and awarded for division and University awards.
 - i. Eleven employees were nominated and/or awarded division and University awards.
 - c. KPI – Report on the number of employees awarded the employee of the month and of the year in maintenance, custodial, coordinator, and office support staff categories
 - i. The department has awarded a total of 28 awards to staff members during the 2009-2010 year. Staff members are recognized for their outstanding efforts on a quarterly basis. At the end of the year, in May, the department conducts a recognition event to award special yearly awards.
 - d. KPI – Report on the number of nominations for “of-the-month” awards for NRHH (National Residence Hall Honorary)
 - i. For 2009-2010, six “of-the-month” nominations have been submitted nationally since September 2009.
 - ii. We need to work on our overall number and frequency of “Of the Month” submissions.
 - e. KPI - Report on the percentage of EPMS completed compared to the previous year
 - i. Sixty-seven percent of EPMS were completed for the entire year of 2008-2009. As of March 2010, 66% of EPMS reviews have been completed. The department expects to exceed the previous year’s percentage of completions.
 - f. KPI - Report on the number of supervisors recognized for 100% completion of EPMS reviews
 - i. 14 Supervisors had 100% completion
 - g. KPI - Report on the percentage of new supervisors that complete the EPMS training
 - i. Five (5) supervisors attended EPMS training in 2009/2010
 - h. KPI – Report on the number of employees with more than 3 years of temporary status converted to permanent status
 - i. Since May 2009 Housing Facilities Custodial Services have hired eleven permanent employees.
 - ii. Nine of the eleven employees hired had three or more temporary service.
 - iii. One had two and a half years temporary service.
 - iv. One had less than a year temporary service.
- 2) Initiative – Participate in national recognition days and establish recognition days for others
- a. KPI – Report on the number of methods used to recognize staff during National Housekeeping week and Administrative Professionals week
 - i. The department sponsored an overall appreciation luncheon for all custodial and maintenance staff. There were over 20 other methods of recognitions utilized to recognize these staff members for their outstanding contributions to the department. The department also sponsored an appreciation luncheon with the administrative professional support staff.
 - b. KPI – Report on the recommendations offered by departmental staff on how they prefer to be recognized for outstanding efforts.
 - i. The Recognition Committee developed two surveys and posted them on the departmental website and on the departmental intranet to encourage supervisors to complete beginning in the Fall 2010.

Goal #6

Diversity – foster a diverse and vibrant academic environment where all are welcome and all can excel. (Contributes to division goal #6/outcome B: SA/AS facilitates an environment that attracts and welcomes diverse students)

ANALYSIS: GOAL 6 - DIVERSITY

- The goal was to foster a diverse and vibrant academic environment where all are welcome and all can excel. The data shows that we have met this goal. We can attract a diverse applicant pool (3 of 12 (25%) for the Information Resource Consultant were minorities, and a minority was hired; 44 of 127 (34.6%) for the first RLC search, and 24 of 57 (42.1%) for the second RLC search). Overall we had twelve positions open this past year, and we hired five minorities into those positions. This does translate into a diverse departmental staff, including 36.2% of the full-time staff identifying as minority. However, we continue to be concerned about the number of minorities we hire into management-level positions. The bulk of our diversity is concentrated in our custodial staff. Our training programs had positive impacts across all employee levels (RMs, graduate students, and professional staff); however initiatives that included reading and discussion seemed not to have occurred as they were envisioned.
- Next year we will continue with our training efforts, but we will place more emphasis on the year-long reading program related to diversity to ensure that the discussions are occurring. The books have the potential to be an effective teaching tool but right now, it is not used to its full potential in all areas of the department.
- It would be helpful if the Division expressed its commitment to diversity perhaps through a division meeting.
 - 1) Initiative – Create and maintain an inclusive culture of fairness and respect.
 - a. KPI – Report on the results and recommendations acquired from focus groups on issues of diversity conducted with full-time, graduate, and undergraduate staff members.
 - i. Focus groups have been conducted with the following groups of staff: Graduate Assistants, Resident Mentors, Residence Life Coordinators, Assistant Directors, Administrative Assistants, and Housekeeping/Maintenance. Transcripts of each are being transcribed and a final report will be completed Summer 2010.
 - b. KPI – Report on the number of staff recruited and hired at senior levels, consistent with the available pool.
 - i. No senior level positions were in the search process for this time period.
 - c. KPI – Report on the race and gender of applicant pool for full time vacant professional positions hired for the year.

Affirmative Action Report for Building/Grounds Specialist II

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Male	19	0	0	0	29	67	10	116
Female	6	0	2	0	2	37	0	47
Total	27	0	2	0	31	105	10	166

Affirmative Action Report for Evening Services

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Male	6	1	1	0	17	17	1	43
Female	15	3	3	1	23	61	0	106
Total	26	4	4	1	40	78	1	154

Affirmative Action Report for Administrative Specialist (North Campus)

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Male	1	0	0	0	4	6	0	11
Female	5	0	0	0	27	38	1	71
Total	7	0	0	0	31	44	1	83

Affirmative Action Report for Administrative Specialist (Facilities Management)

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Male	4	0	0	0	11	7	0	22
Female	14	2	6	0	43	49	1	115
Total	20	2	6	0	54	56	1	139

Affirmative Action Report for Carpenter

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Male	3	0	0	0	10	1	0	14
Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	3	0	0	0	10	1	0	15

Affirmative Action Report for Zone Maintenance (South Zone)

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Male	2	0	0	0	13	5	0	20
Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	0	0	0	13	5	0	20

Affirmative Action Report for Administrative Specialist (South)

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Male	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	4
Female	5	0	1	0	9	12	0	27
Total	6	0	1	0	12	12	0	31

Affirmative Action Report for HVAC

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Male	2	0	0	0	18	3	0	23
Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	2	0	0	0	18	4	0	24

Affirmative Action Report for Custodians

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/ Non Hispanic	Black/ Non Hispanic	Two or more	Total
Not Disclosed	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Male	4	0	0	0	10	29	0	43
Female	3	0	1	0	4	13	0	21
Total	8	0	1	0	14	43	0	66

Affirmative Action Report for Information Resource Consultant I

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/Non Hispanic	Black/Non Hispanic	Total
Not Disclosed	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Male	0	0	0	0	7	2	9
Female	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Total	0	0	0	0	9	3	12

Affirmative Action Report for 1st RLC search Total Applicant pool sent to us

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/Non Hispanic	Black/Non Hispanic	Total
Not Disclosed	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
Male	4	0	3	1	29	15	52
Female	2	0	1	3	44	21	71
Total	9	0	4	4	74	36	127

Affirmative Action report for 2nd RLC search. Total Applicant pool sent to us

	Not Disclosed	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	White/Non Hispanic	Black/Non Hispanic	Total
Not Disclosed	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Male	2	0	0	0	14	6	22
Female	2	0	1	0	13	17	33
Total	6	0	1	0	27	23	57

- d. KPI – Report on the number of staff within the department by race, gender, and ethnicity for full-time permanent, graduate, and Resident Mentor positions.

Gender	Permanent Full-Time	Graduate Students	Resident Mentors	Total	Percentage Of Total
Male	52	11	102	165	44.6%
Female	59	13	133	205	55.4%
	111	24	235	370	

Race	Permanent Full-Time	Graduate Students	Resident Mentors	Total	Percentage Of Total
Caucasian	51	21	159	231	62.4%
African-American	59	3	58	120	32.4%
Hispanic	0	0	5	6	1.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	3	3	0.8%
No Response	0	0	5	5	1.4%
Multi/Other	0	0	5	5	1.4%
	111	24	235	370	

- 2) Initiative – Increase knowledge level of graduate and full time staff in Residence Life for issues of diversity.

- a. KPI – Report on the number of books and/or articles read by departmental staff during the year.
 - i. RM staff
 - 235 Resident Mentor staff were given “Speak up” book at the beginning of Fall 2009 Training.
 - ii. Res Life GA and Professional Staff
 - The book “Branded” was purchased for all GA and full time staff for the fall of 2009.
- b. KPI - Report on the percentage of staff members that positively respond that they were more competent and informed as a result of participating in the program.
 - i. 30% of the GA staff reported they were more competent as a result of reading this book.

- 3) Initiative – Increase knowledge of issues of diversity for departmental staff members through training initiatives.
- a. KPI – Report on the percentage of staff members that positively respond that they were more competent and informed as a result of participating in the diversity training program.
 - i. Fall Professional Staff Training
 - 44% of the staff reported they were more competent as a result of this program.
 - This was a 2 hour session during a weeklong training. I believe it was not the focus of the entire week thus resulting in lower scores
 - ii. Fall GA Training
 - 88% of the staff reported they were more competent as a result of this program.
 - Analysis: This is a good indication that we are meeting our goals of training staff in the area of diversity. We always want to achieve higher results and as such used this information to create January training
 - iii. Mid Year Training Graduate Assistants
 - 100% of staff who completed the training assessment showed a higher shift from pre to post test results with statements regarding their experience. In every question the post test results showed higher numbers in the strongly agreed category.
 - The evidence shows that we made significant improvement in diversity training this spring.
 - b. KPI – Report on the percentage of staff members that positively respond that they were more competent and informed as a result of participating in the diversity training program.
 - i. Fall RM Training
 - ii. 74% of returning RM and 13% of new RM reported they were more competent as a result of this program.
 - iii. Mid Year Training for Resident Mentors
 - iv. 100% of staff who completed the training assessment showed a higher shift from pre to post test results with statements regarding their experience. In every question the post test results showed higher numbers in the strongly agreed category.
 - c. KPI – Report on the number of students sponsored by University Housing.
 - i. RHA allocated \$4,500 for the Diversity Retreat, Retreat to occur March 19-21. 11 residential students and 1 housing professional participated in this retreat.
- 4) Initiative – Increase collaborative relationships with other University offices to support diversity initiatives.
- a. KPI – Report on the number of speakers brought to campus.
 - i. Contributed \$1,500 for diversity speaker Maura Cullen
 - b. KPI – Report on the number of on-campus residents participating in the diversity dialogues.
 - i. RHA allocated \$2,400 for monthly Diversity Dialogues , \$663.14 spent up to 2/26/10 with the rest earmarked for two more Diversity Dialogues and a Keynote Speaker for 3/25/10
 - ii. 124 students signed in to six different Diversity Dialogues
 - c. KPI – Report on the number of departmental staff participating in the Martin Luther King Breakfast
 - i. The department sponsored 80 staff members to attend this program. The event is one method the department institutes to recognize staff for their outstanding performances.

The program serves to expose staff members to issues of diversity and challenge them to analyze how the department addresses issues of diversity.