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Report Summary

The Lory Student Center (LSC) offers a variety of programs and services to the Colorado State University community. The Council for the Advancement of Standards for College Unions and Student Centers (2009) requires student unions and centers have a clearly articulated assessment plan that documents the achievement of stated goals and outcomes, demonstrate accountability, provide evidence of improvement, and describe resulting changes in programs and services. Further, increased demand for accountability on the part of accreditation agencies, governing bodies, and students have presented institutions with the opportunity to focus on assessment as a part of the organizational culture. To best serve students, student center staff must infuse tracking, documenting, and evaluating into the work they do within the LSC. The APE committee aims to model this work. As a result, an Assessment, Planning, and Effectiveness (APE) committee was formed January 2015 with the goal of addressing assessment efforts throughout the LSC.

The APE Committee was charged to:

- Coordinate all assessment efforts from areas throughout the LSC, seeking efficiencies in data gathering and analysis efforts.
- Coordinate reporting efforts related to CampusLabs “Planning & Effectiveness” reporting website, both short term and longer term.
- In consultation with the LSC Directors’ staff, create a clearly-articulated and dynamic three-year assessment plan which addresses data collection, analysis, reflection, prioritization of challenges, and the development of continuous improvement strategies for the LSC.
- Evaluate our use of learning outcomes for student employees to ensure the student employee experience is connected to students’ persistence and success.
- Provide recommendations for staff training, development, and expanding the use of assessment methods throughout the LSC. How do we make assessment part of our way of life?

The APE Committee is comprised of members from each reporting area within the LSC. Members include:

- Amber Ramoz, Campus Activities
- Donnyale Ambrosine, Marketing
- Deanna Leone, SLiCE (Chair)
- Esther Kemp, Bookstore
- Michael Marr, SLiCE
- Mike Ellis, Executive Director’s Office
- Mohamed Jefri, LSC Governing Board
- Sheena Martinez, Executive Director’s Office
- Sonja Gibbins, Dining Services
- Tamene Abebe, Facilities

The following report outlines the work accomplished by the APE Committee in 2015. It is the goal of this report to detail the scope of assessment, explain how assessment data informs program and services, and make recommendations that expand assessment efforts throughout the LSC.
Lory Student Center Assessment Appraisal

Accountability and assessment efforts are becoming increasingly important among students, staff, institutions, and accrediting agencies. The assessment process seeks to measure 1) satisfaction of, 2) involvement in, and 3) learning outcomes associated with programs and services offered to various constituents of the Lory Student Center (LSC). These constituents might include students, student employees, career staff, and community partners. In an effort to increase accountability and offer high-quality programs and service to constituents, the following document outlines assessment efforts within the LSC.

Skyfactor: ACUI/Benchworks College Union/Student Center Assessment
[Formerly Educational Benchmarking Inc. (EBI)]
1. **Purpose**: ACUI/Benchworks aims to positively impact student retention, success, learning, and satisfaction to improve the overall quality of the college student experience.
2. **Instrument**: Specifically designed for unions/student centers in partnership with to create assessment loop and action plans by measuring factors such as publicity, environment, life and leadership, quality venues, staff, cleanliness, and program effectiveness.
3. **Timeline**: one year cycle/sent annually; preparation in February, students surveyed in late March, reports available July
4. **Participants/Sample Size**: approximately 3500 random sample
5. **Cost**: approximately $2600
6. **CSU participation**: mostly annual since 2001

National Association of College Bookstores (NACS)
(Utilized for both faculty and students)
1. **Purpose**: Assist CSU Bookstore in identifying and measuring factors essential to serving customers. Conducted among students and faculty.
2. **Instrument**: CSU Bookstore administered online Customer Satisfaction Survey which was created by OnCampus Research, a division of indiCo.
3. **Timeline**: three year cycle – early spring semester.
4. **Participants/Sample Size**: 344 random student sample; random sample of faculty (TBD)
5. **Cost**: approximately $870.
6. **CSU participation**: CSU Bookstore.

Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL)
1. **Purpose**: The MSL aims to understand influences of higher education on shaping socially responsible leadership capacity and other leadership related outcomes.
2. **Instrument**: Uses Astin’s (1993) college impact model to measure 400 variables, including complex cognitive skills, leadership efficacy, and social change behaviors.
3. **Survey Type**: Email invitation to participate in an online survey.
4. **Timeline**: three year cycle; preparation in fall, students surveyed February and March, reports available June and July.
5. **Participants/Sample Size**: 4,000 undergraduate random sample and 1,000 purposeful sample of identified campus leaders/program participants.
6. **Cost**: approximately $3,000.
LSC Assessment Appraisal (cont’d.)

Quality of Work Life Survey – Career Staff
1. **Purpose**: The Quality of Work Life Survey assesses job satisfaction of staff members in the Division of Student Affairs at Colorado State University. Conducted among career staff/employees and student employees.
3. **Timeline**: one year cycle/sent annually in March/April, results reported in May and June.
4. **Participants/Sample Size**: Division of Student Affairs Career Staff.
5. **Cost**: in-house ($0 external costs).

Quality of Work Life Survey – Student Staff
1. **Purpose**: To inquire about each student staff member’s work experiences.
2. **Instrument**: 66 short-answer questions.
3. **Timeline**: April and May.
4. **Participants/Sample Size**: Division of Student Affairs Student Employees.
5. **Cost**: in-house ($0 external costs).

Learning Outcomes Assessments – SLiCE, Campus Activities, LSC General
1. **Purpose**: Sample assessment method used in SLiCE, Campus Activities, and LSC General.
2. **Instrument**: Developed in-house (Spring 2015).
3. **Timeline**: program-specific.
4. **Participants/Sample Size**: program-specific.
5. **Cost**: in-house ($0 external costs).

Program Specific Assessments
1. Food Court Survey
   a. **Purpose**: For LSC food court guests to share their ideas on new food venues.
   b. **Instrument**: in-person signage.
   c. **Timeline**: February 2015 (one-time assessment).
   d. **Participants/Sample Size**: 147 responses.
   e. **Cost**: in-house ($0 external costs).
2. Lunch on Us – Lory Student Center Governing Board
   a. **Purpose**: To gauge various aspects and usage of venues in the LSC.
   b. **Instrument**: LSCGB members randomly select one student and buy lunch for them. In exchange for lunch, students are asked to complete a 17-question survey.
   c. **Timeline**: Two times per year.
   d. **Participants/Sample Size**: Average 10 CSU students/year.
   e. **Cost**: Average $250/year to cover the cost of meals for the students.
LSC Assessment Appraisal (cont’d.)

3. President’s Leadership Program – Course Surveys
   a. **Purpose**: Measure learning outcomes based on Council for Advancement of Standards for leadership education programs.
   b. **Instrument**: pre-test, post-test survey developed in-house.
   c. **Timeline**: August, January, and May annual.
   d. **Participants/Sample Size**: Students enrolled in PLP classes; approximately 150
   e. **Cost**: copy costs only.

4. Ram Events Surveys
   a. **Trends**
      i. **Purpose**: To assess CSU student trends.
      ii. **Instrument**: Survey.
      iii. **Timeline**: January to February (bi-annual).
      iv. **Participants/Sample Size**: Random sample of 2500 undergraduate and 500 graduate students.
      v. **Cost**: in-house ($0 external costs).
   b. **Market Research**
      i. **Purpose**: to ensure that RamEvents is consistently meeting its mission, vision, and values.
      ii. **Instrument**: Evaluations, surveys, and student feedback.
      iii. **Timeline**: program-specific.
      iv. **Participants**: Attendees of RamEvents programs.
      v. **Cost**: in-house ($0 external costs).

5. LSC Live (Wednesday Concert Series)

6. Event Satisfaction Surveys

7. Employee Learning Outcomes Assessment
   a. **Purpose**: Pilot survey with LSC student employees taking the REAL workshops based on Council for Advancement of Standards for leadership education programs and social change model of leadership development.
   b. **Instrument**: pre-test, post-test survey developed in-house.
   c. **Timeline**: pilot in spring 2015.
   d. **Participants/Sample Size**: under 50.
   e. **Cost**: copy costs/staff time.
Skyfactor Benchworks/ACUI Assessment 2015 Executive Summary

Introduction
Since 1994, Skyfactor Benchworks has aimed to positively impact student retention, success, learning, and satisfaction to improve the overall quality of the college student experience. In 1994, Dr. Joseph Pica and Glenn Detrick of the Graduate Management Admission Council developed Educational Benchmarks Inc. (EBI), which organized a benchmarking study identifying key analysis factors for MBA programs. Since then, EBI has developed assessments for Student Affairs, nursing and teacher education, and engineering programs. Skyfactor Benchworks and the Association of College Unions International (ACUI) partnered to develop a powerful assessment tool for college unions and student centers.

Instrument
Online survey conducted annually; 117 categorical, scale, or open-ended questions informing 12 factors.

Method
Random sample of 3,498 Colorado State University students were invited to participate; 805 responses (23% response rate) comparable with other institutions within the same Carnegie Class. Factor analysis was utilized to explain more complex phenomena, including college union has a positive environment, aspects of dining services, and union cleanliness. A peer group comparison with six institutions was completed. Given the limitations of institutional participants in the study, CSU chose a comparison group based on institutional size, union/student center size, reputation, and whether the bookstore is located within the union/student center; institutions included:

- New Mexico State University
- University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign
- Washington State University
- Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi
- University of Washington
- Weber State University

Additional benchmarking occurred among CSU’s Carnegie classification, including 24 institutions classified as very high research activity. Institutional results were also compared to 91 total participating institutions.

Results
The goal value, set by Skyfactor, is a value of 5.50 on a seven-point scale or 75% of the performance scale. Based on this scale, Lory Student Center met or exceeded performance on the following factors:

- Factor 10 Union Cleanliness (85.8% performance; mean 6.15)
- Factor 2 College Union has a Positive Environment (81.8% performance; mean 5.91)
- Factor 8 Bookstore Staff (81.2% performance; mean 5.87)
- Factor 3 College Union is Student Oriented (79.0% performance; mean 5.74)
- Factor 11 Union Staff (75.8% performance; mean 5.55)

Note: Factor 7 Aspects of Dining Service (74.8% performance; mean 5.49) and Factor 4 College Union is a Source of Entertainment (72.5% performance; mean 5.35) were near performance expectations.

---

1 See Appendix A for CSU specific supplemental questions
Overall, satisfaction with the “college union” (Lory Student Center) performance score was 74.7% (mean 5.48). This score ranks 2nd among the six comparison institutions, 12/24 within Carnegie Class, and 37/91 among all reporting institutions. Among the selected 6 comparison institutions, CSU ranked 1st on the following factors:

- Factor 2 College Union has a Positive Environment (81.8% performance; mean 5.91)
- Factor 5 College Union Enhances Life and Leadership (55.2% performance; mean 4.31)
- Factor 6 Union Food Variety, Quality, and Price (66.2% performance; mean 4.97)
- Factor 7 Aspects of Dining Service (74.8% performance; mean 5.49)
- Factor 10 Union Cleanliness (85.8% performance; mean: 6.15)

Among the 24 Carnegie Classification, CSU ranked in the top three on the following factors:

- Factor 8 Bookstore Staff (81.2% performance; mean 5.87)
- Factor 10 Union Cleanliness (85.8% performance; mean: 6.15)

Note: As an individual measure, food prices were ranked 2nd in comparison to the 24 participating Carnegie Institutions and 3rd in comparison to all participating institutions.²

Discussion

- In reviewing the last five iterations of the survey, which included 2009, 2010, 2011, 2013, and 2015, the following factors merit further exploration:
  - Factor 8 Bookstore Staff was the highest performing factor until the latest survey in which Factor 10 Union Cleanliness outperformed Factor 8. This is likely due to the opening of the newly renovated student center in 2015.
  - Factor 5 College Union Enhances Life and Leadership consistently reports high impact factor with recommendation that this area could have the greatest impact on performance.

- ‘Provision of a Variety of Services’ was CSU’s highest score related to the factor ‘College Union as a Source of Entertainment’ which ranks 1/7 among select six, 6/24 among Carnegie Class, and 18/91 reporting institutions.
  - Prices for Entertainment Services was the lowest scoring question within this factor.

- Availability of Textbooks was CSU’s highest score related to Bookstore items variety and price; ranks 2/7 among selected six, 2/23 within Carnegie Class, and 33/85 reporting institutions.
  - The question relating to prices for textbooks represents the lowest score on this instrument. Yet, benchmarking scores indicate only a slightly lower performance compared to all institutions (57 out of 85 institutions reporting).
  - Prices for supplies and university logo merchandise were among the lowest scoring questions within this factor. Benchmarking scores reflect that CSU is on-par or slightly below comparison groups for university logo merchandise and on-par or slightly above comparison groups in the area of school supplies pricing.

- Within the overall performance factor, responses to the question about the value of dollar spent, via student fees, on the quality of activities indicated one of the lowest scores throughout the instrument. For this question, CSU ranks 3/7 among selected 6, 16/24 Carnegie Class, and 64/87 reporting institutions.

---

² See Appendix B for Factor Summary Sheet
Introduction
The Colorado State University Bookstore conducted an online customer satisfaction survey created by OnCampus Research, a division of indiCo. The objective of the customer satisfaction survey was to assist CSU in identifying and measuring factors essential to serving customers.

Instrument
This online survey was available from April 3, 2015, through May 1, 2015. Results were compiled and analyzed by OnCampus Research and reported to CSU in July 2015.

Method
3,343 surveys were sent out to students. 344 surveys were completed. This yielded a 10.3% response rate, the majority of respondents identified as female (67.5%), and students’ response rate by class rank is:

- First-year: 13.8%
- Second-year: 17.1%
- Third-year: 24.4%
- Fourth-year: 15.3%
- Fifth-year: 5.3%
- Graduate Student: 23.8%
- Other: 0.3%

Results
- 43.3% purchased or rented digital/electronic textbooks in the past twelve months.
- 39.8% respondents indicated visiting CSU Bookstore once a month and 31.4% indicated visiting the CSU Bookstore at the beginning and end of the semester.
- 54.1% preferred printed textbooks; however, 36.2% indicated preference depends on course.
- 36.5% respondents indicated they purchase or rent course materials the week before classes.
- CSU Bookstore (86.8%) and Amazon (60.9%) were top 2 places for purchasing textbooks.
- CSU Bookstore (73.3%) and Amazon (27.9%) were top 2 places for renting textbooks.
- 23.7% indicated purchasing 100% of course materials at CSU Bookstore (NOTE: n=270).
- 38.8% indicated renting 100% of course materials at CSU Bookstore (NOTE: n=116).
- 58% of respondents sold back to CSU Bookstore and 30.9% indicated they keep their books:
  - 24.9% indicated that they sell back 100% of course materials to CSU.
  - 43.5% indicated that they could get more money someplace else.
  - 38.3% indicated that the CSU Bookstore would not buy back books.
- 35% indicated they never hear about store events/sales, but those who were aware indicated they heard via email (37.4%), word of mouth (25.6%), and in-store signage (24.7%).
- The top three preferred methods of communication include email from store (56.2%), posters/signs/bulletin boards/chalking (35.3%), and social media (20.3%).
- The top three preferred store promotions include dollars off with no minimum purchase (61.4%); percentage off with no minimum purchase (59.6%); and buy one, get one free (57.2%).
- Clothing and accessories followed books and supplies as the types of products purchased at the CSU Bookstore in the last three months.
Importance vs. Satisfaction Ratings

- The **average importance rating** for 44 customer service attributes was 3.95 on a scale of 1-Not at all important to 5-Extremely important. The importance ratings ranged from a high of 4.69 and a low of 2.38.
- The **average satisfaction** rating was 3.74 on a scale of 1-Very dissatisfied to 5-Very satisfied. The satisfaction ratings ranged from a high of 4.42 and a low of 2.60

The following matrix highlights outlying factors and reports results of that factor including reported average importance, satisfaction, and gap as measured for CSU respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Average Importance Rating</th>
<th>Above Average Importance Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below Average Satisfaction Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Above Average Satisfaction Rating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Selection of Gift and Novelty Items</em> (3.02, 3.86, -0.84)</td>
<td><em>Competitively Priced Course Materials</em> (4.69, 2.73, 1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Selection of Apparel and Accessories</em> (3.34, 3.92, -0.58)</td>
<td><em>Textbook Buyback Program</em> (4.44, 2.60, 1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Visually Appealing Displays</em> (3.64, 4.21, -0.57)</td>
<td><em>Availability of Used Textbooks</em> (4.55, 3.30, 1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Selection of Technology Products and Accessories</em> (3.02, 3.86, -0.84)</td>
<td><em>Materials Available at Course Start</em> (4.67, 3.71, 0.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison by Year (scale of 1-very poor, to 5-excellent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Store Evaluation</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Importance Rating</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Satisfaction Rating</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSU Bookstore Customer Survey (cont’d)

Discussion

- Areas of satisfaction that scored above 4 on average rating included correct text editions, clean and organized, quality of service, responsiveness, convenience in location, ease of locating items, helpful and knowledgeable staff, special orders, and overall store appearance.

- Less important, but satisfactory attributes included the value of CSU insignia products, the availability of textbook rentals, bookstore rentals, digital/electronic course materials, and promotional offers.

The following areas are three opportunities for improvement:

- Competitively priced textbooks.
- Students’ expectations are not being met in the areas of pricing, availability when classes start, availability of used books, and textbook buyback.
- Finally, to a lesser degree, students’ expectations are not being met when considering the following attributes: comparing textbook prices on website, ordering texts online, ability to purchase all required materials from the same source, ease of use of website, and usefulness of website.

---

3 Due to concerns related to the small response rates, findings were interpreted with caution.
Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership Survey 2015 Executive Summary

Introduction
The Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL) is a survey instrument examining the influence of higher education on college student leadership development. This instrument was developed by Dr. John P. Dugan of Loyola University of Chicago and Dr. Susan R. Komives of University of Maryland. The National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, led by Dr. Dugan, sponsors the MSL, along with funding from partner schools. The MSL has been conducted since 2006 on a three-year cycle at over 300 institutions with over 30,000 student responses.

Instrument
The framework for this study is based on the Social Change Model of Leadership, focusing on social responsibility and change for the common good. Further, the conceptual framework rests in Astin’s (1993) inputs-environments-outcomes (I-E-O) college impact model. I-E-O model informed the cross-sectional design involving retrospective questions and examining the influence of non-college reference groups. 97 colleges and universities participated in the 2015 MSL; 88 were included in the national benchmark. The survey instrument was developed with a core set of measures derived from the Socially Responsible Leadership Scales (SRLS; Tyree, 1998). The MSL is comprised of 400 variables, including complex cognitive skills, leadership efficacy, and social change behaviors. (Adapted From: 2015 MSL Study Overview)

Method
Date Administered: January – April 2015
Data Collection: Students were invited via email to fill out the survey instrument online.
Participants: 829; 26.2% response rate; 79.2% completion rate
- 62.03% of respondents identified as female
- 78.31% of respondents identified as white
- 27.52% of respondents worked on campus
- 11.74% of respondents held first-generation status
- 15.06% of respondents reported having a disability

Results
Involvement
- 38.66% of respondents have participated in community service
  - 2012 MSL: 43.37%; Carnegie Peers: 42.56%
  - The four settings in which community service is facilitated:
    - student organizations – 22.86%
    - unaffiliated community organizations – 10.33%
    - classroom – 5.01%
    - work-study – 1.87%
  - 20.01% perform community service on their own
- 77.89% of respondents are involved with college organizations to some extent
  - 2012 MSL: 81.17%; Carnegie Peers: 85.33%
Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership Survey (cont’d.)

Leadership

- 39.96% have held a leadership position within a college organization
- 65.94% have engaged in social change behaviors at least once (3.31% stated they engage in social change behaviors often)
  - 2012 MSL: 70.2%; Carnegie Peers: 69.62
- 91.68% engage in socio-cultural conversations at least some of the time (15.51% engage in socio-cultural conversations very often)
- Strong majority of responses show little to no formal leadership training across all indicators

Campus Climate

- 66.87% agree or strongly agree the campus has a belonging climate
  - Up by 4.25% from 2012
- 75.69% agree or strongly agree that the campus has a non-discriminatory climate

Mentorship

- Utilization of mentors – majority (above 50%) identify mentors as faculty, parents/guardians, and other students
  - Lower rates (below 50%) identify academic/student affairs professionals, employers, and community members as mentors
- Majority of respondents (54.73) identified significant on-campus mentors as faculty/instructor and academic/student affairs professional staff
  - 57.9% mentors identified as male
  - 88.5% mentors identified as white/Caucasian

Discussion

- According to Colorado State University Institutional Research (IR), for Spring 2015, the percentage of undergraduate and graduate students identifying as male or female were 48.9% and 51.1% respectively. However, IR ratio data on race/ethnicity of students is comparable to respondents in the survey identifying as a racial minority. Therefore, data from the MSL cannot be generalized among all students at CSU.
- Responses indicate a high level of involvement in on-campus organizations, but many are not holding leadership positions on campus. This could result in the low reporting rate in reference to leadership training.
- Student involvement rate is above 70% and student responses indicate involvement with many different groups on-campus.
- The increase in sense of belonging should be examined in-depth, discerning if students’ sense of belonging has indeed increased since 2012. If this is the case, factors which led to this increase should be examined as well.
- Faculty are viewed as mentors, more so than student affairs professionals; however, both are viewed as significant on-campus mentors.

Student responses indicate that students may have difficulty finding mentors that resemble students’ identities.
Campus Labs Reporting

Campus Labs is utilized by Colorado State University to track achievement of the institution’s strategic goals. The Division of Student Affairs (DSA) and colleges align their goals with the University’s mission and strategic plan. Departments within the Lory Student Center, such as Student, Leadership, Involvement and Community Engagement (SLiCE) and Campus Activities, report progress towards goals put forth by CSU, DSA, and LSC within Campus Labs. Report coincides with each fiscal year.

As a result of findings from this committee, FY16 Campus Labs reporting should include:

1. EBI and MSL data as opposed to departmental reports (which is what is being done in SLiCE and Campus Activities.)
2. Report in the future as demonstrated in FY15, Goal 08, under the Lory Student Center. This was created from the EBI survey data and executive summaries.

---

**Student Voice Funding for 2015-2016**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$23,741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPSA</td>
<td>6,647.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDS</td>
<td>6,647.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>5,221.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC</td>
<td>1,742.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Center</td>
<td>1,742.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Center</td>
<td>1,742.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $23,741.00 (4% increase over the 2014-15 amount)

---

**Student Voice Funding for 2014-2015**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$22,828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPSA</td>
<td>6,391.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDS</td>
<td>6,391.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>5,021.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC</td>
<td>1,675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Center</td>
<td>1,675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec Center</td>
<td>1,675.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $22,828.00

---

4 See Appendix C for FY 14 reporting
5 See Appendix D for FY 15 reporting
Appendix A – Skyfactor Institution Specific Questions

1. What are the best methods to get information about what’s happening in the LSC?

![Bar Chart]

- Word of mouth: 46.20%
- Social media: 41.20%
- Digital screen in the LSC: 32.20%
- Table tents in residence: 16.30%
- Poster on campus: 10.80%
- Collegian: 7.00%
- KCUS: 2.10%
- CTV: 0.00%
- Promotion on plaza: 14.20%
- LSC website: 32.50%

2. If the LSC expands program and service hours during weekday evenings, what night would be most convenient for you to participate in these activities?

![Bar Chart]

- Monday: 16.67%
- Tuesday: 22.45%
- Wednesday: 24.26%
- Thursday: 36.89%
3. When not eating lunch at home, what drives your decision on where to eat?

4. What would drive you to increase use of LSC food venues?
5. How likely are you to order the new pizza available in the Ramskeller?

6. How likely are you to take someone under 21 to the Ramskeller (since all ages are welcome)?
7. How likely are you to use the free laptop checkout in LSC level 100 by the Commons?

8. How likely are you to use free gaming systems available in LSC level 100 by the Commons?
9. How likely are you to apply for an Alternative Spring Break Scholarship?

![Bar chart showing likelihood of applying for an Alternative Spring Break Scholarship.]

10. How likely are you to use the work stations and supplies available for registered student organizations in the Student Organizations Center (SOC)

![Bar chart showing likelihood of using work stations and supplies in the Student Organizations Center.]
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### Appendix B – Skyfactor Survey Results Summary

#### Skyfactor Survey Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Select 6</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Publicizes the Union and Promotes Campus</td>
<td>Q018: Publicizes opportunities to join student organizations</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>12/24</td>
<td>44/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q019: Publicizes activities sponsored by the College Union</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>11/24</td>
<td>53/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: College Union is a Source of Information For Learning About Campus Events</td>
<td>Q028: Is a source of information for learning about campus events</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>6/24</td>
<td>28/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q029: Is a student-oriented facility</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>23/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: College Union is a Source of Entertainment</td>
<td>Q033: Is a source for a wide variety of entertainment</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>15/24</td>
<td>51/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q034: Is a source for reasonably priced entertainment</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>17/24</td>
<td>67/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: College Union Enhances Life and Leadership</td>
<td>Q037: Expand your understanding of others whose backgrounds differ from yours</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>40/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q038: Expand your understanding of your role as a citizen of the college community</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>10/24</td>
<td>38/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: College Union is a Place to Study</td>
<td>Q043: Enhance your appreciation of the arts</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>11/24</td>
<td>29/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q044: Enhance your appreciation of the value of volunteerism</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>9/24</td>
<td>33/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6: Union Food Variety, Quality and Price</td>
<td>Q045: Variety of places to eat</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>9/24</td>
<td>22/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q046: Food prices</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>3/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q047: Food quality</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>20/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7: Aspects of Dining Service</td>
<td>Q049: Food quality</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>21/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q050: Dining room cleanliness</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>24/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 8: Bookstore Staff</td>
<td>Q057: Textbook prices</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>17/23</td>
<td>57/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q058: Variety of school supplies available</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>11/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 9: Bookstore Items Variety and Price</td>
<td>Q059: School supply prices</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>16/23</td>
<td>55/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q062: College/university logo merchandise prices</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>16/23</td>
<td>65/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 10: Union Cleanliness</td>
<td>Q063: Cleanliness of entrances</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q064: Cleanliness of hallways</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>11/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 11: Union Staff</td>
<td>Q065: Cleanliness of restrooms</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>18/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q066: Atmosphere</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>7/24</td>
<td>21/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 12: Overall Program Effectiveness</td>
<td>Q067: Are you satisfied with the Union?</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>11/24</td>
<td>41/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q068: Knowledgeable</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>12/24</td>
<td>42/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q069: Courteous</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2/7</td>
<td>12/24</td>
<td>39/90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Educational Experience

- Q070: To what extent do College Union activities enhance your overall educational experience? | 4.20 | 2/7 | 13/24 | 55/91 |

#### Overall Value

- Q071: When you compare the activity fees you pay to the quality of activities provided, how do you rate the value of the dollars spent? | 3.71 | 3/7 | 16/24 | 64/87 |

#### Overall Program Effectiveness

- Q072: How well does the College Union fulfill its mission as the center of college community life? | 4.70 | 2/7 | 12/24 | 47/91 |
- Q073: What degree would you recommend services and activities provided by the Union to a friend? | 4.69 | 2/7 | 13/24 | 51/91 |
- Q074: Overall, how satisfied are you with the College Union? | 5.48 | 2/7 | 12/24 | 37/91 |
Providing Department: Lory Student Center

Strategic Plan Cycle Start: 7/1/2013  

Strategic Plan Cycle End: 6/30/2014

Goal 06 - Curricular and Co-curricular Engagement

Unit's Role in Achieving Strategic Plan Goal: Initiating a new or modified action plan - complete the remainder of this template.

Unit's Action Plan: Engage students in the planning and construction of the LSC revitalization project.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: Number of students actively involved in the project planning and construction.

Analysis of Achievements: The LSC has continued to involve students in the renovation process, creating direct connections between classroom learning and practical application. Students with specific majors and academic interests were sought out to serve on the master plan committees (seven) and Saunders Construction hired two construction management majors as student interns to assist in project oversight.

As part of Senior Week, the LSC hosted a Senior Signing on May 6. The event provided graduating seniors the opportunity to experience a portion of the renovated LSC prior to their graduation. Each student that participated signed the floor in the new Warren Kindness Lounge (previously known as the Sunken Lounge) and received a token remembrance and an invitation to return campus and see the finished LSC.

Action Plan Progress: Making Progress

Goal 07 - Undergraduate Learning Outcomes

Unit's Action Plan: Develop and agree upon a set of student learning outcomes for the 450 student employees of the Lory Student Center, to be implemented in FY15.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: Development of the learning outcomes.

Analysis of Achievements: The Learning and Developmental Outcomes project was initiated by the LSC Director of Development and the Graduate Assistant for Training and Development. With reference to Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS),
Learning Reconsidered, and the Association of College Unions International (ACUI), LSC staffs have begun to identify learning outcomes for all 450 student employees in the LSC. A pilot project implementing these outcomes is scheduled to occur during the 2014-15 academic year. 

**Action Plan Progress:** Making Progress

**Goal 08 - Undergraduate Student Engagement Outcomes**

**Unit's Action Plan:** The LSC will employ approximately 450 student employees in key leadership /supervisory roles which both support students' persistence toward graduation and enables the LSC to fulfill its mission as the campus community center.

**Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success:** Recognition of graduating student employees.

**Analysis of Achievements:** The LSC hosted its 12th consecutive graduation celebration for student employees, recognizing their contributions to serving the campus community. The celebration included a record high 130 graduating student employees, despite decreased retail operations as a result of the LSC revitalization project.

**Action Plan Progress:** Making Progress

**Goal 35 - Campus Climate Diversity**

**Unit's Action Plan:** Support a broad range of campus diversity events through Lory Dining Services.

**Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success:** Number of campus diversity events supported through Lory Dining Services.

**Analysis of Achievements:** Lory Dining Services continued to provide staff support and use of kitchen facilities to a wide variety of student organizations and Student Diversity Programs and Services offices that showcased their culture and food to the CSU and Fort Collins communities.

**Action Plan Progress:** Making Progress

**Goal 37 - Diversity Among Employees**

**Unit's Action Plan:** Ensure that LSC's 120 career staff feel valued and supported in their roles in meeting the mission of the LSC.
Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: Collect data through the DSA "Quality of Work Life" survey and develop action plans in response to the data.

Analysis of Achievements: LSC employees reported higher than the DSA mean scores for all seven questions under the "Respect and Fairness" category for the "Quality of Work Life" survey results, including:

- I am treated with dignity.
- Different cultures/ethnicity are respected by the department.
- The department ensures equal opportunity at all levels.
- The department treats people as individuals with unique needs.
- The department does not tolerate discrimination and prejudice.
- My co-workers respect personal privacy.
- Employees show respect for each other.

Action Plan Progress: Making Progress
Providing Department: Campus Activities (reported as Lory Student Center)

Strategic Plan Cycle Start: 7/1/2013  \hspace{1cm} Strategic Plan Cycle End: 6/30/2014

Goal 36 - Diversity Among Students

Unit's Action Plan: 1. Evaluate the merger of Campus Activities' ASAP and Diversity and Social Justice programs areas into a single programming board. 2. Continue planning for the co-location of all Student Diversity and Programs Offices within the newly revitalized Lory Student Center.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: 1. Successful merger of the two program boards. 2. Inclusion of the offices within the project.

Analysis of Achievements: 1. Campus Activities’ ASAP and Diversity and Social Justice Programs completed the year-long comprehensive process of merging the two areas together to create the new RamEvents programming board, with the tag line “by students, for students.”

2. In addition the to the five Student Diversity Programs and Services offices that existed in the LSC prior to the revitalization project, including the Asian-Pacific American Cultural Center; Black-African American Cultural Center; El Centro; Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, and Ally Resource Center; Native American Cultural Center; the LSC looks forward to welcoming new satellite offices when the building reopens, including Resources for Disabled Services, the Women and Gender Advocacy Center, and International Programs.

Action Plan Progress: Completed
Goal 06 - Curricular and Co-curricular Engagement

Unit's Role in Achieving Strategic Plan Goal: Sustaining present activities - no further action required.

Unit's Action Plan: CSU/UADY Student Leadership Exchange is an exchange between CSU and UADY which includes a trip to Merida, Mexico, and hosting a UADY student delegation at CSU. The mission of this program is to bring together students from CSU and UADY for a meaningful leadership, service, and language exchange. SLiCE partners with the Office of International Programs to host this event. The goals of the exchange include the following: engage students in experiences of domestic and international diversity; explore and apply the concepts of leadership and service to practical projects; strengthen Spanish language skills; meet authentic community needs in Fort Collins and the Yucatan; and create a sustainable, long-term student exchange between CSU and UADY students.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: Program participation.

Analysis of Achievements: This year there were 10 CSU students participating with three staff members supporting the exchange. Students participated in 2,078 hours of leadership/personal development training, while staff members participated in 1,236 hours of leadership/training.

Goal 07 - Undergraduate Learning Outcomes

Unit's Role in Achieving Strategic Plan Goal: Sustaining present activities - no further action required.

Unit's Action Plan: The Rams Engaging in Active Leadership (REAL) experience completed its 6th year. The REAL Experience allows participants to advance their own knowledge with regard to effective, intellectual, and cultural leadership. REAL provides all interested CSU students with an accessible opportunity to develop and enhance a personal philosophy of leadership that includes an understanding of self, groups, and their community. REAL offers various opportunities for students to reflect upon and develop attitudes, knowledge, and skills related to ethical leadership development and practices. SLiCE partnered with many campus offices to
create this experience. The REAL experience provided numerous on-campus workshops throughout the past academic year. These workshops were provided by the SLiCE office, TILT, International Programs, Student Diversity Programs & Services, and the Career Center.

**Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success:** Program participation.

**Analysis of Achievements:** Students could earn up to seven different leadership certificates, and there were 1,089 attendees at workshops this year (798 – Foundations of Leadership, 174 – Skills and Professional Enhancement, 62 – Social Justice Leadership, 5 – Community Engagement, and 60 – Organizational Leadership). Students were able to learn about practical leadership skills on campus, and learn how to use these skills, both on campus and in the community.

---

### Goal 08 - Undergraduate Student Engagement Outcomes

**Unit's Role in Achieving Strategic Plan Goal:** Sustaining present activities - no further action required.

**Unit's Action Plan:** Alternative Breaks is a program where CSU students complete a week of service over winter, spring, and summer breaks. This year there were 15 alternative break trips, including two international trips to Kenya and Panama. These trips give students the opportunity to learn about cultures and communities that differ from their own. They are able to learn about community needs and issues and are able to provide hands-on service to the community in which they are volunteering.

**Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success:** Alternative Break participants were surveyed on their experience.

**Analysis of Achievements:** This year, alternative breaks successfully completed 15 (13 domestic and 2 international) service trips over winter and spring breaks. There were a total of 141 student participants who provided 7,110 hours of direct community service to 15 non-profit agencies both nationally and internationally. There were 29 student site leaders who spent a total of 957 hours completing leadership training in the alternative break site leader school in order to successfully execute one of the 15 alternative break trips. Remaining participants spent a total of 1,692 hours completing leadership training.

Alternative Break participants were surveyed on their experience. Participants either agreed (18%) or strongly agreed (79%) that their alternative break experience influenced their understanding of people with backgrounds different than their own; and agreed (24%) or
strongly agreed (76%) that their alternative break experience deepened their understanding of complex social/environmental/political issues.

Alternative Break participants also reported in a survey that their experience deepened their commitment to making a positive difference in their community (agreed-16% and strongly agreed-82%).

Goal 10 - Undergraduate Student Success Outcomes–Retention, Persistence, Graduation

Unit's Role in Achieving Strategic Plan Goal: Sustaining present activities - no further action required.

Unit's Action Plan: Students will gain access to education and leadership opportunities, university retention, and overall increased graduation rates through the President's Leadership Program (PLP). PLP is a three-year learning community comprised of two linked courses per year. Students meet weekly for two or three hours (depending on the course) in an academic setting, and participate in co-curricular leadership development experiences focused on service and social change leadership. Students also have the opportunity to engage in leadership experiences at the local and statewide level. Additionally, students can now earn an interdisciplinary minor in leadership studies after completing the core course work offered through PLP.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: PLP utilizes a number of assessment systems to ensure program excellence.

Analysis of Achievements: First-year student participants are surveyed and asked to rank on a scale of 1-5 how critical their admission to PLP was on their decision to attend CSU. Of the 42 respondents, 20 students rated their admission to PLP as “important to their decision” or “critical to their decision” to attend CSU. The aggregate mean score for this response was 3.22.

Learning outcomes survey: Assessment data on learning outcomes was collected at the end of the academic year. PLP students responded that the program developed their skills and abilities related to the following learning outcomes: PLP developed students’ ability to act in accordance with personal values and ethics (94%), understand self and personal societal identities (92%); value social responsibility (92%), understand group dynamics (90%), think about ways to behave in a community or society (90%), enact leadership in specific contexts (90%); accept and appreciate other world views (88%), discover/practice ways to communicate
cross-culturally (88%), discover ways to effect positive change (88%), and develop critical thinking skills (86%). Additionally, through CSU Student Course Surveys, 85% of students found their PLP course to be intellectually challenging.

Teaching and course evaluations: All nine PLP instructors received exemplary feedback. On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) PLP Students rated their instructors in the following areas: prepared for class (4.8 or 96%), effective use of class activities (4.85 or 97%), creating an inclusive and supportive learning environment (4.8 or 96%), challenge growth (4.8 or 96%), connect material to everyday experiences (4.8 or 96%), and enhancing students’ understanding of leadership (4.8 or 96%).

Service weekend survey: A service learning assessment was sent out to PLP Year 1 students who reported service projects increased their understanding of a social issue (97%), increased understanding of how they see their own leadership (94%), and desire to serve community in the future (94%).

Community internship survey: On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree), PLP Year 2 students (21 students) evaluated their internship site as a positive learning environment (4.35 or 87%), allowed observation of leadership in action (4.35 or 87%), and felt prepared for internship experience (4.6 or 92%). 91% of the PLP internship supervisors were satisfied with their PLP student intern experience. This year’s PLP students were 44% first-year students, 25% sophomores, 21% juniors, and 10% seniors. Efforts are made to assist students through various transitions relevant to their development. This includes intentional forms of mentoring and community building activities during the Fall Retreat, PLP Scholars meetings, and fall semester PLP Year 1 curriculum to assist students through the transition from high school to college. The community internship program in PLP’s Year 2 and staff participation in presenting at the Getting to Year 2 conference aim to support the sophomore experience, and begin to prepare students for narrowing their focus towards graduation and career development. Additionally, the PLP Year 3 curriculum incorporates William Bridges’ Transition Model to assist students in better understanding their own transitions and life after graduation.

Leadership Minor: Activated the Leadership and Community Engagement Minor. Gathered student proposals for research, advanced practicum, and/or internship course offerings. Collaborated with faculty and Deans in each of the Colleges. Advised students to completion of coursework. Four students graduated with the interdisciplinary minor in leadership studies. Five
students are anticipated to complete the minor in May 2015. An estimated 85% of 2013-14 PLP students expressed interest in pursuing the minor while at CSU.

**Goal 35 - Campus Climate Diversity**

**Unit's Role in Achieving Strategic Plan Goal:** Sustaining present activities - no further action required.

**Unit's Action Plan:** Campus Step Up is a retreat where CSU students are able to participate in meaningful dialogue about issues of social justice and diversity. This is a three-day, overnight event that brings together students, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds. Campus Step Up’s ultimate goal is to give students the skills to act on the issues and causes that they are most passionate about. This year’s financial partners were SLiCE, Campus Activities, and GUIDE. The planning committee included the Access Center, Associated Students of CSU, Campus Activities, the Career Center, School of Social Work, Asian/Pacific American Cultural Center, Off-Campus Life, GUIDE, Residence Life, SLiCE, and the Women and Gender Advocacy Center.

**Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success:** A new initiative within “A Next Step” was organized. The goals for this initiative include engaging students in reflective work by developing 70 campus opportunities for students to attend and reflect upon.

**Analysis of Achievements:** 71 students and 16 staff members attended the retreat and spent 2,785 hours in training.

**Goal 36 - Diversity among Students**

**Unit's Role in Achieving Strategic Plan Goal:** Sustaining present activities - no further action required.

**Unit's Action Plan:** Registered Student Organizations are a way of accommodating the vast variety of student interests and identities on campus. Registering Student Organizations gives the ability to reserve rooms in the Lory Student Center, access financial support and campus grants, and resources such as computers, printers, markers, laminator, etc.

**Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success:** SLiCE utilizes RamLink, an online portal for student organizations. Through RamLink, we can track the total number of Registered Student Organizations on campus and activities/events within each Organization. Students are able to
register their organization and communicate with current and potential new members. This site serves as a social media site for student organizations that are also able to advertise their events and see events that are being hosted by other organizations.

**Analysis of Achievements:** There were 76,305 unique visitors to the site; there are 635 active organizations; there are 10,949 involved users with 13,837 approved service hours recorded. There were a total of 72 new organizations founded this year. Approximately 800 student organization leaders attended one of 18 officer orientations. SLiCE registered 328 student organizations.

- Academic/Pre-Professional: 119
- Competitive Sport Clubs: 9
- Diversity/International: 36
- Greek Organizations: 35
- Honorary: 19
- Political: 1
- Programming/Service: 19
- Religious: 27
- Representative: 14
- Social: 49
Providing Department: Lory Student Center

Strategic Plan Cycle Start: 7/1/2014  Strategic Plan Cycle End: 6/30/2015

Goal 08 – Undergraduate Student Engagement Outcomes

Unit's Action Plan: The Lory Student Center will engage undergraduate students through quality venues, services, and events.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: 2015 Skyfactor Benchworks/ACUI Assessment (Formerly Educational Benchmarks Inc.) Since 1994, Skyfactor Benchworks has aimed to positively impact student retention, success, learning, and satisfaction to improve the overall quality of the college student experience. In 1994, Dr. Joseph Pica and Glenn Detrick of the Graduate Management Admission Council developed Educational Benchmarks Inc. (EBI) which organized a benchmarking study identifying key analysis factors for MBA programs. Since then, Skyfactor Benchworks and the Association of College Unions International (ACUI) partnered in the development of a powerful assessment tool for college unions and student centers. Online survey with 117 categorical, scaled, or open-ended questions. 46 questions informed 12 factors or categories. Surveys are conducted on an annual basis.

Analysis of Achievements: A Random sample of 3,498 were invited to participate in an online survey. There were 805 responses (23% response rate) which was comparable with other institutions within the same Carnegie Class. Factor analysis was utilized to explain more complex phenomena, including college union environment, aspects of dining services, and union cleanliness. A peer group comparison with 6 institutions included:

- New Mexico State University
- University of Illinois – Urbana Champaign
- Washington State University
- Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi
- University of Washington
- Weber State University

Additionally, benchmarking occurred among CSU’s Carnegie Classification; there are 24 institutions classified as having very high research activity. As a third benchmark, institutional results were compared to 91 total participating institutions.

The goal value, set by Skyfactor, is a value of 5.50 on a 7-point scale or 75% of the performance scale. Based on this scale, Colorado State University met or exceeded performance on the following factors:
• Factor 10 Union Cleanliness (85.8% performance; mean 6.15)
• Factor 2 College Union has a positive environment (81.8% performance; mean 5.91)
• Factor 8 Bookstore Staff (81.2% performance; mean 5.87)
• Factor 3 College Union is Student Oriented (79.0% performance; mean 5.74)
• Factor 11 Union Staff (75.8% performance; mean 5.55)

Note: Factor 7: Aspects of Dining Service (74.8% performance; mean 5.49) and Factor 4: College Union is a source of Entertainment (72.5% performance; mean 5.35) were near performance expectations.

Among the selected 6 comparison institutions, CSU ranked 1st on the following measures:

• ‘College union has a Positive Environment’ [mean: 5.91]
• ‘College union enhances life and leadership’ [mean: 4.31]
• ‘Union food variety, quality, and price’ [mean: 4.97]
• ‘Aspects of dining service ’ [mean: 5.49]
• ‘Union cleanliness ’ [mean: 6.15]

Overall satisfaction with the ‘college union’ (Lory Student Center) scored a mean of 5.48. This score ranks 2nd among the of six comparison institutions, 12/24 within Carnegie Class, and 37/91 among all reporting institutions

Action Plan Progress: Making progress
Providing Department: Lory Student Center (reported from Bookstore)

Goal 31 – Campus Buildings and Grounds

Unit's Action Plan: Continue to be recognized by the CSU Community as an outstanding provider of customer service.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: EBI (Educational Benchmark, Inc.) Survey and NACS (National Association of College Stores) Survey

Analysis of Achievements: NACS Survey reported on Quality of Service a mean score of 4.28 (Scale 1-very poor; 5-excellent).

Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI Survey) reported...
• How satisfied are you with the College Union bookstore regarding: Courteousness of staff: 5.92
• How satisfied are you with the College Union bookstore regarding: Availability of staff to assist you: 5.80 (scale 1-very dissatisfied; 7 very satisfied)

Action Plan Progress: Making Progress
Providing Department: Campus Activities

Strategic Plan Cycle Start: 7/1/2014  
Strategic Plan Cycle End: 6/30/2015

Goal 08 – Undergraduate Student Engagement Outcomes

Unit's Action Plan: Campus Activities will serve a large population of students through events and services.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: post-event surveys.

Analysis of Achievements:

Action Plan Progress:

Goal 35 – Campus Climate Diversity

Unit's Action Plan: Host events that promote and welcome difference amongst communities.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: post-event surveys.

Analysis of Achievements:

Action Plan Progress:
Strategic Plan Cycle Start: 7/1/2014       Strategic Plan Cycle End: 6/30/2015

Goal 07 - Undergraduate Learning Outcomes

Unit's Action Plan: The Interdisciplinary Minor in Leadership Studies builds on foundational courses in the President’s Leadership Program (PLP) to introduce students to pressing social issues and challenge them to create solutions as civically-minded leaders. Students must complete the core curriculum and an integrated internship or supervised research project to earn the minor. Both PLP and the interdisciplinary minor strive to better prepare students to enter the workforce as more socially responsible leaders.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success: Student learning outcomes will be measured by average scores on skills and awareness based on the Council of Assessment Standards for leadership education programs.

Analysis of Achievements: Students who complete at least one year of the program report a greater ability to communicate effectively with others, awareness of personal values, confidence as leaders, ability to work collaboratively, higher sense of social responsibility, greater understanding of a diverse society, and higher critical thinking skills. Assessment data on learning outcomes was collected at the end of the academic year.

PLP students completed a survey based on the Council for the Advancement of Standards for leadership education programs. Using a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) - 5 (Strongly Agree), students responded to statements regarding varying skills and areas of awareness. A pre-test, post-test model was implemented to capture changes in perceptions and potential impact of PLP. Students reported higher average scores in 7 out of 8 areas of skills and awareness after taking PLP than prior. PLP students on average reported greater ability to communicate effectively with others, understand their personal values, possess confidence as a leader, to work collaboratively, to value social responsibility, to understand the advantages and challenges of a diverse society, and critical thinking/problem solving skills.

Pre-/Post- PLP Reported Means:
4.02/4.28...to communicate effectively with others
4.22/4.38...understand their personal values
4.38/4.21...understand the importance of ethics in leadership
3.81/4.14...have confidence as a leader
3.92/4.27...work collaboratively with others
4.42/4.54...value social responsibility and community involvement
4.16/4.59...understand the advantages and challenges of a diverse society
4.00/4.19...have critical thinking and problem solving skills

Action Plan Progress: Making Progress
Goal 10 - Undergraduate Student Success Outcomes – Retention, Persistence, and Graduation

Unit's Action Plan: The Interdisciplinary Minor in Leadership Studies builds on foundational courses in the President’s Leadership Program (PLP) to introduce students to pressing social issues and challenge them to create solutions as civic-minded leaders. Students must complete the core curriculum and an integrated internship or supervised research project to earn the minor. Both PLP and the interdisciplinary minor include high-impact practices such as integrated service-learning projects, supervised undergraduate research, internships, training retreats, small-group facilitated discussions, mentoring groups, international leadership experiences, and experiential classroom activities. Many activities offered through the Interdisciplinary Minor in Leadership Studies and the President's Leadership Program (PLP) supplement classroom instruction. This year's program goals were:

- Manage and expand leadership development opportunities at CSU through the Interdisciplinary Minor in Leadership Studies in an effort to graduate students for leadership in complex contexts.
- Develop cohort lesson plans and advising sessions for more systematic engagement with research, practicums, and internships in persistence to graduation.
- Increase total enrollment in the Interdisciplinary Leadership Studies Minor by 50% with emphasis on diversifying enrollment and retention of students.

Assessment Methods and Criteria for Success:

- Monitor student progress, advising sessions, course surveys, student feedback, course completion and project products;
- Gather student proposals for research, practicum and/or internship;
- Collaborate with campus faculty and staff to expand mentoring and advising;
- Advise students to completion of coursework;
- Development of forms, applications, course materials, and resource manuals that students and staff can utilize through advising;
- Outreach efforts to campus partners, application and selection reports, new partnerships, and expanded course offerings;
- Enrollment numbers and conferred degrees May 2015.

Analysis of Achievements:

Students reported higher average scores on skills and awareness based on the Council of Assessment Standards for leadership education programs. For example, students who complete one year of the program report a greater ability to communicate effectively with others,
awareness of personal values, confidence as leaders, ability to work collaboratively, higher sense of social responsibility, greater understanding of a diverse society, and higher critical thinking skills. Furthermore, 65% of students surveyed state these courses positively affected their decision to attend CSU and 71% reported courses positively affected their decision to stay enrolled at CSU.

Teaching and course evaluations: All nine PLP instructors received exemplary feedback. On a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), PLP students rated their instructors in the following areas: prepared for class (4.6 or 92%), creating an inclusive and supportive learning environment (4.7 or 94%), challenge growth (4.5 or 90%), connect material to everyday experiences (4.6 or 92%), and enhancing students’ understanding of leadership through class activities (4.6 or 92%).

Service weekend survey: In an effort to incorporate opportunities for active and experiential learning, PLP students in IU 170/171 participate in service learning trips. Three successful service-learning trips occurred to Chimayo, NM, Alamosa, CO, and Wellington, CO. Student reflections indicated on average students formed more meaningful relationships with their peers and instructors as a result of the service learning trips. Student reflections after the service learning projects also indicated, on average, students had a deeper understanding of the community issue and deeper awareness of difference after engaging in the service learning trip.

Community internship survey: As part of the IU 270/271: Leadership as Life, students completed internships. At the end of the internships, students report on their overall experience and evaluation of the internship site. 100% of PLP students reported “the internship was a positive learning environment” and the “site allowed them to observe leadership in action.”

Leadership studies interdisciplinary minor: Seven students completed the Interdisciplinary Minor. The number of students more than doubled from last year. The inaugural leadership minor forum occurred where students presented their final leadership minor projects to 20 future minor students. Project topics ranged from dimensions of Mental Health in Leadership, Life and Learning, to creating a collaborative, sustainable, rebranding plan for a small, local business.

Action Plan Progress: Making Progress