Initiative Name:	Residential Life	Behavioral Expectations	Date: <u>August, 2013</u>			
Goal #	_1	Goal Chair(s)	Beacon/Tillery/Powers			
Initiative #	_1	Initiative Chair(s) _Bierly/Pe	earcy			
Thesis Statement: <u>Providing constant reminders (posters, table tents, newsletters, etc) of</u> <u>expected student behavior in the residence halls will inform and assist with the establishment of</u>						
an educational	<u>environment</u>					

1. Introduction/Background - What?

Residing in a residence hall during the first year of college is truly an experience unlike any other. Students must adjust to significant personal and academic changes in a relatively short amount of time. Although behavioral expectations are shared with first year students during summer orientation and during floor meetings at the start of the new academic year, it is oftentimes forgot due to the large amount of information being shared.

2. Proposal/Purpose/Justification – Why?

Residential Life is proposing an on-going communication campaign to remind students of their behavioral expectations. The posters/table-tents/emails/media advertisements, etc... will be developed and distributed throughout the academic year. The justification for the initiative is to remind students of their behavioral obligations to self; but also to the community they live in.

3. Discussion of Past Years Results – Benchmark Successes?

(This section needs to be as long as is necessary to assess whether funding should be continued.)
Leadership upheavals in the Residential Life office caused us to get a late start on the development of our Community Standards. We have developed the standards and are currently working on the wording, marketing, and staff training around using a Community Standards Model of behavior management.

4. Work Plan, Next Fiscal Year - Action Steps - Process - How?

Residential Life staff members are currently developing posters, emails, text, table-tents and media advertisements to be distributed to students starting in August. In addition to Res Life, faculty from academic units with Academic Theme Communities will be included in the final development as soon as they return in August; along with faculty and staff from other Divisions within the University.

5. Reporting and Deliverable Schedule – When?

The communication is scheduled for distribution throughout the 12-13 academic year.

6. Budget – How Much, a General Discussion of Funds Use?

Goal Chairs are requesting \$3,000.00 for the implementation of the Student Behavior Expectation initiative.

7. Stakeholders and Management Plan – Who?

Area Director staff, Assistant Hall Director Staff, Resident Assistant Staff, Academic Peer Advocate Staff, Selected Faculty and Staff from other areas within Academic Affairs, selected staff from other Divisions outside of Academic Affairs and Marketing & Communications.

8. Outcome Assessment & Future Testing

(How will we know that we were successful?)

Historical data will be used to compare conduct violations on specific floors and within halls with the current year of implementation.

9. Line Item Budget Discussion that tracks Budget Templates ...

(These sections also need to be as long as is necessary to articulate ach of the budget line items.)

Since we got a late start on the development of these standards/expectations we did not use any of our FY12-13 budget and would like to roll over the original amount allotted for this purpose.



Initiative Name Sopnomore Experience Program Date: Fail 13/Spring 14
Goal #One Goal Chair(s)Beacon/Tillery/Powers
Initiative #One Initiative Chair(s)Bierly/Pearcy
Thesis Statement: Since the second major attrition point for a college student is after their second year of college, we would like to develop a Sophomore Experience program to continue the work we begin
their first year with Academic Themed
•
Communities

1. Introduction/Background – What?

Sophomore Programs focus on career and professional development. We have developed a first year program to focus on engaging students in their major and with faculty. We want to continue that development to focus more on developing career goals, setting a career path, and developing attitudes and behaviors that will assist students in creating successful work and life habits. The goal is that an earlier focus on career and personal development will assist students in developing self-efficacy in a variety of areas to aid in success.

2. Proposal/Purpose/Justification – Why?

We have traditionally focused our housing program around the first year experience. However, after the first year we do not put as much focus on the sophomore year. Students are left to sink or swim on their own fortitude. What we've found is that they aren't quite prepared to swim after their first year. Their first year is so focused on adjusting to college, that they do not have the resources to focus on stepping in to the world with confidence. The Sophomore Program will be developed to assist in that transition into their career with confidence and poise.

3. Discussion of Past Years Results – Benchmark Successes?

(This section needs to be as long as is necessary to assess whether funding should be continued.)

In AY2012-2013, we formed an Exploratory Committee on the Sophomore Experience comprised of Residential Life Staff, Associate Deans of the Colleges of Arts/Sciences and Technology, faculty members from the College of Business and NHHS, and student leaders. We purchased a four week web conference on the Sophomore Experience to learn more on Sophomore success theories and prevalent issues in the Sophomore Year. From this we were able to identify three sub-categories of ISU Sophomore Students. The committee made three major recommendations listed below:

 Targeted programming for each of the three sub-categories of the ISU Sophomore including Career Exploration, Identity Development, mentor programs, targeted communications and social marketing, Programming from each of the Academic colleges targeted toward each of the three categories, conference travel for sophomores, and development of more honorary organizations for sophomore students.

- 2. Programming Support for the Academic Colleges: Two recommendations were submitted to either hire a contingent of Graduate or Undergraduate students to serve as programming leads for each of the colleges to partner with the Associate Dean's office, department chairs, Residential Life, and other campus entities to provide major/program based sophomore programming.
- 3. Unifying Procedures and Structures across academic units including the process for changing a major and the transition out of the University College into their program/major advising unit.

The committee recommendations were things that could be quickly implemented or needed to be further developed throughout AY2013-14.

4. Work Plan, Next Fiscal Year - Action Steps - Process - How?

- 1. Initiate MAP-Works Sophomore Survey to gather data. (Completed)
- 2. Research Sophomore Experience trends and methods. (Completed)
- 3. Attend a conference to gather additional information and network with others with similar goals who are at different stages in their experience development to identify best practices. (Completed)
- 4. Develop an oversight committee and work on a vision. (Completed/In Progress)
- 5. Focus group with employers to find out what skills and information they would like to see students already possess when they are hired.
- 6. Hire Undergraduate students to work with partners to develop workshops and resources geared toward Sophomore student development.
- 7. Marketing
- 8. Develop assessment to assist students in their development.

5. Reporting and Deliverable Schedule - When?

Year One (2012 – 2013): Roll out MAP-Works Sophomore Survey to gather data. Research programs and best practices, attend conference, begin recruiting faculty and other partner support,

Year Two (2013-2014): Develop learning outcomes and assessment rubric, market program to parents and students, hire student staff, begin recruiting for the next academic year. Include as a housing option for the following academic year.

Year Three (2014 - 2015): Implement workshops and programs for the Sophomore Experience and assess.

6. Budget – How Much, a General Discussion of Funds Use?

Student Employees, Marketing Materials, Programming Supplies: \$15,000

7. Stakeholders and Management Plan – Who?

Residential Life housekeeping staff, Resident Assistants, Academic Peer Advocates, Assistant Hall Directors, Area Directors, Assistant Directors, Associate Director of Res Life, Director of Res Life, faculty, academic advisors, other administrators, future employers, Alumni, students, parents, and families.

8. Outcome Assessment & Future Testing

(How will we know that we were successful?)

Develop a rubric in each of the factors addressed to assess how the student is reacting to each initiative. Conduct focus groups on their reactions to the various methods of outreach and referral at all levels. Develop survey/program review form for each of the major programs offered by the colleges.

9. Line Item Budget Discussion that tracks Budget Templates ...

(These sections also need to be as long as is necessary to articulate ach of the budget line items.)

Requesting \$12,000 for student wages to employ four student workers to work with the academic colleges to create sophomore focused programming. These individuals will partner Academic Unit Associate Deans, department chairs, and individual faculty members with Career Services, Health Promotions, and residential life to create programs, workshops, and resources for sophomore (second year) students based on the recommendations of the oversight committee. We will also require approximately \$3,000 to spend on programming supplies and marketing materials.

Initiative Name:_	Project Dine-In	Date: Fall 13/Spring 14
Goal #1	Goal Chair(s)	Beacon/Tillery/Powers
Initiative #	1 Initiative Chair(s)	Bierly/Pearcy
	•	and Staff outside the classroom have a stronger are more successful; academically and socially.

1. Introduction/Background – What?

Traditionally we have provide opportunity for ISU Faculty to interact with first-year students in an environment outside the classroom. Specifically, faculty were partnered with a Residential Life Staff member in an effort to introduce faculty to students in the residence hall and dining hall environment. We are reformatting this program because we are finding that faculty are not interested in eating in the dining halls, but will attend a casual catered luncheon in the residence halls.

2. Proposal/Purpose/Justification – Why?

Data suggests that students that make personal connections with faculty and staff on campus are more engaged in University life and more likely to be successful; returning for second and ensuing years of study.

3. Discussion of Past Years Results – Benchmark Successes?

(This section needs to be as long as is necessary to assess whether funding should be continued.) In the past we have offered faculty partners a meal card to use at their convenience to eat meals with students. What we've found is that faculty are not comfortable with just dropping in on students and eating with them. We are moving to a faculty dining structure by inviting faculty into the residence halls for a light catered luncheon with students in our academic theme units. This has previously been a separate program from our dining partners program, but feedback from faculty and students is that they like this setting much more because conversation is easier than in a noisy dining hall.

4. Work Plan, Next Fiscal Year – Action Steps – Process – How?

Residential Life staff will work with faculty partners for each of our thirteen academic themed communities to schedule luncheons in the halls around faculty schedules. Students in first year courses in their major along with our faculty partner will invite faculty connected to that theme unit/major to the luncheon. We will have one in the fall semester and one in the spring semester.

5. Reporting and Deliverable Schedule - When?

The Residential Life Dining Partners program will be implemented in late September/October it the fall and in late January/February in the spring. The late September/January start date was selected for faculty and students to get acquainted in the classroom prior to faculty appearing in their place of residence.

6. Budget – How Much, a General Discussion of Funds Use?

Total Cost for the Residential Life Dining Partners will be \$6,000.

7. Stakeholders and Management Plan – Who?

Greg Bierly, Stephanie Pearcy chair the Strategic Plan initiative. Stephanie Pearcy and selected Residential Life staff will be directly involved with the selection, training and follow-up of the program and participants.

8. Outcome Assessment & Future Testing

(How will we know that we were successful?) Anecdotal information, provided by

faculty, indicates uneasiness by some faculty participants in the Academic Theme Community areas to engage students in a residence hall or dining hall.

Pre and Post-test surveys will be distributed to determine program success.

9. Line Item Budget Discussion that tracks Budget Templates ...

(These sections also need to be as long as is necessary to articulate ach of the budget line items.)

Faculty expressed a discomfort in actually going into the dining halls so we did not use much of this money during AY2012-13. We would like to roll over the \$4,000 originally requested and because catering is more expensive than eating in the dining halls and we expect higher participation in events such as this we are requesting an additional \$2,000 to fund this program at a total expense of \$6,000.

Initiative NameFall Housecalls		DateSeptember 2013	
Goal #1	Goal Chair(s)	Beacon/Powers/Tillery	
student success strategy.	t/Faculty interac As we move forv	ative Chair(s) Greg Bierly and Stephanie Pearcy tion is one of the key components of a successful vard with intrusive outreach strategies, bringing faculty remains a vital component of the residence hall	
experience.			

1. Introduction/Background – What?

In Spring 2013, Residential Life piloted a small version of a Housecall program. Thirty-six administrators, deans, and other faculty partners were invited to a dinner and then joined Residence Hall Staff in going door-to-door to check on residents in three of the eleven residence halls – two first-year and one upper-class residence halls. We surveyed both the students and the staff/faculty who participated about their thoughts on the program. Unanimously, faculty and staff felt the program was worthwhile and enjoyed the chance to interact with students in a structured way, in their living space. Additionally, the students who were home and participated overwhelmingly felt, some for the first time, that Indiana State University cared about them and their experience.

2. Proposal/Purpose/Justification – Why?

It was the universal feeling of students and res hall staff that we implement this program within the first six weeks of the academic year in all of our first year halls (and upper-class halls if we have enough faculty participation). This will give our new students the opportunity to interact with faculty/administrators early in the academic year and gives them the opportunity to ask questions and resolve issues that they normally would not if left to their own devices. This gives our faculty and administrators the opportunity to really hear from the students what their early issues and concerns are and perhaps by intrusively going into their living environment we can address those issues and help students find resources that would otherwise be missed.

3. Discussion of Past Years Results – Benchmark Successes?

(This section needs to be as long as is necessary to assess whether funding should be continued.) In our initial pilot program, we invited thirty-six administrators to participated and had 100% attendance. WE were able to visit 29 residence hall floors and talk with approximately 500 students who were present at the time of the housecalls.

4. Work Plan, Next Fiscal Year - Action Steps - Process - How?

Invite all first year course faculty and any campus staff that contributes to student success from
academic advisors, program directors, associate deans, deans, key student offices (financial aid, ORR,
SAO, Greek Life, SGA, RHA, Student Affairs, Student Success, AVPs, VPS, Dr. Bradley, themed
community faculty partners, and any administrative assistant level who have a desire to reach out to
students).

 Tour all six all-first-year halls, the two half-first year halls, and if we have enough faculty our tradntional halls that house sophomores/juniors/seniors to reach out primarily to the sophomore students.

5. Reporting and Deliverable Schedule – When?

Mid-late September

Mid-week

Day 1: Evening

- Dinner
- Instructions
- HOusecalling

Day 2: Morning

- Follow up meeting with key offices to discuss issues brought up by students during house calls
- Action plans developed for addressing issues.

6. Budget - How Much, a General Discussion of Funds Use?

We are requesting \$7,000 for printed materials to promote the program to faculty, staff, and students, purchase incentive items for students to participate by making sure to be home when the callers come, educational materials and student info sheets for house callers, and the dinner.

7. Stakeholders and Management Plan – Who?

Residential Life, University College, Administration, Colleges, and Student Support Offices (Especially Sycamore Express Offices). In addition, students and parents will also be affected by this program.

Residential Life and the Faculty Initiatives team will be the main managers/planners/implementers of this program.

8. Outcome Assessment & Future Testing

(How will we know that we were successful?)

Faculty/Staff/Student participation is one way – the contact in itself will point toward success. As part of the program we collect 991 numbers. Surveys after the program to determine how both groups felt it went from the caller perspective and their conversations with students and from the student perspective on how the program make them feel as part of the ISU Community. The third and final measure of assessment will be the in tracking, over time, the types of issues that are discussed and how we go about addressing them. We can send an additional survey to students with issues to see if they were addressed to their satisfaction. All of this will aid in the student feeling as part of the ISU community and as if ISU cares.

9. Line Item Budget Discussion that tracks Budget Templates ... (These sections also need to be as long as is necessary to articulate ach of the budget line items.)

Marketing Materials, Caller Supplies, and Incentives: We are requesting \$2,500 for supplies. We expect to spend \$200 on fliers, mailbox stuffers, and other reminders to students to be home when the House Caller come calling and to the campus community to explain the program and the importance of faculty/staff

participation. In addition, we expect to spend \$300 on the materials we give to the house call teams which include folders, pens, name badges, rosters of the floors they are calling on, including student names, room numbers, home towns, majors, ect. A MAP-Works profile of the floor with key issues and potential discussion points, and a resource guide for the key factors students struggle with in their first semester. Finally, we plan to purchase incentives for student participation. All students who are home when the callers come will have their name placed in a drawing for a variety of prizes at a variety of level. Including two – three large prizes, three – five medium prizes and ten -- fifteen smaller prizes. Students indicated that they were very motivated by the prizes and the announcement of the prizes on the Res Life website the following day. We expect to spend \$4,500 on the kickoff meal.

