

# CSUEB Student Affairs Assessment Report Template

*Name of Dept/Program*

Houpi3.7TjETEMC B24 160.14aMC Bnd RTjEeMC BEMC B24

|

2)

3) **SIGNATURE PROGRAMS or SERVICES**

*i.e., what are the department's key programs or services? Complete the chart below by giving a short description of each signature program or service, and then indicate which of the departmental outcomes identified in prompt #2 align with the program or service.*

| <b>Name of Signature Program or Service</b> |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <i>Housing Weeks of Welcome</i>             | Series of different co-curricular activities aimed to help welcome and transition residents into the new academic season and living on-campus. Events can include campus tours, meet and greet with campus resources, to more social engagements of “friend speed dating” and pool party. |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b><i>RA Guided Conversations</i></b></p> | <p>RAs have intentional conversations with the residents in their communities. Conversation with residents will vary on a variety of topics to help encourage conversation. Themes/topics are specifically identified by Housing Residence Life Staff as guided by common needs of students in that period, such as earlier in term focuses on community welcome and check-in about support networks, versus later in term focuses on academic success/challenges and intended efforts for retention into next term. All conversations are documented in Housing resident engagement software and tabulated for themes and needed intervention for the student population by the department.</p> |  |
| <p><b><i>Community Meetings</i></b></p>      | <p>Hosted at the beginning of each term with focus on welcome residents to the community as it relates to introduction of other peers, introduction of Housing resources, safety/evacuation routes, expectations of living on own and within a shared community, and resources of the department and campus such as on the residential Counselor and Residence Life On-Call Staff.</p>   |  |

***Campus Take To Programs***

RA Student Leaders market and engage their residents to events on CSUEB campus (beyond Housing premise)



roommate or general peer conflicts, support groups for transition, and more.



|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Fire Drills</i></p>                             | <p>Fire Drills are conducted in collaboration with University Police, Hayward Fire Department, and Campus Emergency Coordinator to ensure community members are aware of evacuation routes and safety procedures.</p>  |  |
| <p><i>On-Call Rotations</i></p>                       | <p>The Housing On-Call program is comprised of three layers of staff members from student leadership to professional staff aimed at supporting after-hours emergency including but not limited to student in crisis, natural disasters, unsafe situations, and more. All incidents follow-up include efforts to support students, engage in learned lessons and resources,</p> |  |
| <p><i>Alternative Thanksgiving Special Dinner</i></p> | <p>Annual event hosted during fall dining closure dates to ensure residents have food security, and opportunity to engage in with others in the lens of celebration of cultural diversity.</p>   |  |



4) **ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY/DATA ANALYSIS**

*i.e., how has the department evaluated its effectiveness (e.g., surveys, dashboards, other assessment methods) in meeting the stated outcomes in #2? Please attach or link to the assessment activity/data analysis.*

| Type of Assessment   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p><i><b>Pioneer Insights Housing Dashboard</b></i><br/><i>(retention/graduation outcomes for frosh)</i></p> | <p>Pioneer Insights highlights both retention and graduation outcomes for Housing and Residence life since the 2016 frosh cohort. Data are disaggregated by race, Pell, and first-generation status.</p> |  | <p>Retention of first-year frosh tends to be lower than non-resident first-year frosh. For the past five years:</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> year frosh retention</b><br/> <b>Fall 22:</b> 81% vs. 83% (non-housing frosh)<br/> <b>Fall 21:</b> 85% vs. 87% (non-housing frosh)<br/> <b>Fall 20:</b> 95% vs. 92% (non-housing frosh)<br/> <b>Fall 19:</b> 79% vs. 87% (non-housing frosh)<br/> <b>Fall 18:</b> 78% vs. 87% (non-housing frosh)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>When data are disaggregated by race, Black frosh have the highest first-year retention rate relative to their non-housing comparison group. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year retention also tends to be higher for Black frosh</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> year Black frosh retention</b><br/> <b>Fall 22:</b> 72% vs. 63% (non-</p> |

*Pioneer Insights Housing  
Dashboard*



|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>'22-'23 survey responses. This was true across almost every racial group.</p> <p>Black residents were the racial group that saw a decline across areas. The statements of enhancing sense of belonging and enhancing community/connections both decreased this year by -17% and -4% respectively.</p> <p>Black and Latinx residents cited the highest impact amongst racial groups related to belonging and community connections in the 22-23 survey, but they cited the lowest percentages amongst racial groups related to those statements in this cycle.</p> <p>The statement "Living on campus has not helped increase my campus engagement" had a higher percentage of respondents agreeing with this item across all racial groups but it was especially high amongst Latinx respondents (20% of Latinx respondents agreed with this statement).</p> <p>86% of respondents in 2023 agreed that RA's developed a safe and welcoming residential community. This is slightly down from the 91% of respondents who agreed in 2022.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

5) **CONTRIBUTION TO DIVERSITY/EQUITY/INCLUSION**

*i.e., how does the department/program contribute to enhancing a culture of DEI at CSUEB and what data have been collected/assessed related to advancing DEI?*

| Contribution to/Impact on DEI |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
|-------------------------------|--|

**Fall 18:** 76% vs. 60% (non-housing Black frosh)

**1<sup>st</sup> year Latinx transfer retention**

**Fall 22:** 88% vs. 88% (non-housing Latinx transfers)

**Fall 21:** 89% vs. 84% (non-housing Latinx transfers)

**Fall 20:** 96% vs. 87% (non-housing Latinx transfers)

**Fall 19:** 92% vs. 90% (non-housing Latinx transfers)

**Fall 18:** 87% vs. 85% (non-housing Latinx transfers)

**In the most recent ('23-'24) RA and Housing Experience survey:**

*Living on campus has positive impacts for the racially diverse student population including increased belonging and access to campus resources/connections.*

6) **ACTION PLANNING**

*(List at least 3 takeaways related to your department's effectiveness or areas of growth that will inform continuous improvement. Identify the assessment findings that justify your effectiveness or areas of growth, and then indicate an action plan (e.g., changes to your practice, audiences to share findings, etc.) you will take as your next steps.*

|                             |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <p><b>Key Takeaways</b></p> |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|

*Overall retention of frosh students who live in Housing continues to be less than non-Housing students. Housing serves a higher proportion of URM, Pell, and out-of-area students who tend to*