



The University of
Montana

Division of Student Affairs

**Student Affairs Assessment Council
2005-2006 Assessment Reports**

August 2008



Assessment in the Division of Student Affairs	2
Student Affairs Assessment Council	3
American Indian Student Services	4
Campus Recreation.....	9
Career Services	14
Curry Health Center	19
Disability Services for Students	24
Enrollment Services	30
Foreign Student and Scholar Services	37
Griz Card Center	42
Residence Life	47
University Center.....	54
University Dining Services.....	57

Assessment in the Division of Student Affairs

Background

The Division of Student Affairs mission is to facilitate student learning by providing high-quality programs, services, and developmental opportunities while fostering an inclusive campus community in support of the educational mission of The University of Montana.

In our 2004-2009 Strategic Plan, we discussed how continuous improvement in service delivery is essential to the effectiveness of our services and programs. One-third of our customer base is new each year, and the competition to attract and retain these student customers is increasingly intense. Therefore, assessment of our services is an especially critical step in fulfilling our mission. Our Strategic Plan articulates the importance of implementing an assessment methodology for the Division of Student Affairs and its component units. The Division has implemented such a methodology and our 11 units have been re-evaluating, developing, and refining their assessment plans and procedures.

Assessment Council

To assist units in assessment of their programs and services and to evaluate how well the Division of Student Affairs is fulfilling its mission, the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) instituted an Assessment Council. The Council, which meets monthly, is comprised of one representative from each unit in Student Affairs and the VPSA. Collaborative members include Susan Wallwork and Will Innes from Institutional Research and David Strobel, our faculty representative. The Council discusses and reviews the assessment projects and procedures of individual units, facilitates collaboration on projects, and serves as a forum in which units can share ideas to improve their assessment process. The meetings help units stay on task with assessment and keep the VPSA informed of assessment projects and outcomes.

Types of Assessment

Student Affairs assessments fall into three categories: (1) collection and analysis of retention data, statistics, and demographic information; (2) student satisfaction surveys; and (3) program evaluations. Some units utilize national assessment tools that allow them to compare the effectiveness of their programs and services with peer institutions. Other units also assess employee satisfaction.

Assessment Plans and Reports

Each unit is required to maintain a formal, individualized assessment plan. The Division has on file up-to-date assessment plans from every unit in Student Affairs. The Division also requires assessment reports from all Student Affairs units, which are compiled by the VPSA office and published in an annual assessment report. Our first Division-wide assessment report (2003-2004) was published January 2005. Our second report (2004-2005) was published December 2005. These reports serve as a resource within our Division and provide evidence of assessment for review by the Accreditation Committee. Hard copies are available from the VPSA office. Assessment abstracts can also be found online.

Student Affairs Assessment Council

AISS	Patrick Weasel Head
Campus Recreation	Dudley Improta
Career Services	Rowan Conrad
Curry Health Center	Julee Stearns
Dean, Graduate School	David Strobel
Disability Services for Students	Dan Burke
Enrollment Services/Admissions	Amy Zinne
Foreign Student and Scholar Services	Mona Mondava
Griz Card	Jorrun Liston
Planning, Budget & Analysis	Susan Wallwork
Planning, Budget & Analysis	Will Innes
Residence Life/University Villages	Kelly Magnuson
University Center	Lee Clark
University Dining Services	Byron Drake
Vice President for Student Affairs	Teresa Branch

American Indian Student Services

Assessment of:

- *the academic success of American Indian students*
- *the peer mentoring program*
- *and student satisfaction with AISS facilities, staff, and services*



Submitted by Patrick Weasel Head, Director of American Indian Student Services

American Indian Student Services

Assessment of: 1) the retention and academic success of American Indian first-time students and transfers; 2) the Peer Mentoring Program; and 3) student satisfaction

Abstract

American Indian Student Services (AISS) continued to assess three aspects of our program: 1) the academic achievement of first-time, American Indian (AI) students and tribal college first-time transfer students; 2) the Peer Mentoring Program; and 3) student satisfaction as reported on AISS Student Satisfaction Surveys.

Results were mixed. Though students are generally satisfied with our services, they are being placed on academic probation and suspension at a high rate. Intervention through our program seems to be working, though minimally. Too many students are dropping out and stopping out from one year to the next. One idea for improvement is to create a more academic environment through the Peer Mentoring program, instead of offering primarily meet-and-greet activities.

Background

The mission of AISS is: to facilitate American Indian (AI) enrollment and success at The University of Montana by providing specialized services; to establish and maintain effective communication links between AI students and University personnel; to identify and implement intervention strategies that help American Indian students achieve their academic objectives; and to promote a more accommodating institution of higher education. The staff is culturally sensitive and professionally trained to meet the needs of American Indian students.

For our first assessment, we looked at data on incoming, first-time, AI freshman and first-time tribal college transfer students to see how AISS might have impacted the retention and academic success of these students. For our second assessment, we looked at the Peer Mentoring Program, which provides new and transfer students with role models who help them adjust to life at The University of Montana. Essentially, we wanted to see whether the program, by creating opportunities for social interaction and program participation, helped students adapt to life on campus. Finally, we reviewed the results of the AISS Student Satisfaction Survey to determine whether our office is meeting the needs of students and to identify opportunities for improvement.

Assessment Procedure

We looked at the GPAs of all AI freshmen and first-time tribal college transfer students and compared data between different semesters. We also wanted to find out if students were following financial aid guidelines and meeting financial aid requirements.

The AISS coordinator reviewed the Peer Mentoring program data and used a tracking mechanism to determine how these students fared from one semester to the

next and what the retention rates were, reporting on students' academic successes and credit completion for each semester. We also looked at the tasks performed by office staff.

Findings

Academic achievement

Table A represents numbers of students who were suspended and placed on probation from spring 2005 to spring 2006. Results were mixed. Table B represents retention numbers.

Table A: Probation and Suspension

Criteria	Spring 2005		Spring 2006		% Change	
	Entering Freshmen	TC Transfers	Entering Freshmen	TC Transfers	Entering Freshmen	TC Transfers
Academic Probation	4	10	2	4	-50%	-60%
Academic Suspension	5	5	2	0	-60%	-100%
Withdrawal	1	0	2	0	100%	0
Financial Aid Probation	3	0	3	7	0	700%
Financial Aid Suspension	9	11	4	4	-44%	-63%

Table B: Retention from Fall 2004 to Spring 2006

Student Category	Entering Fall 2004	Returned Spring 2005	Returned Fall 2005	Returned Spring 2006
First-time Freshmen	41	35 (85%)	25(60%)	22(53%)
TC Transfers	41	35(85%)	19(46%)	17(41%)
Peer Mentees	30	24(80%)	11(36%)	13(43%)*

*3 students returned after being away for fall 2005

As shown in Table B, all first-time AI freshmen who enrolled in fall 2004 did not come back for the spring session. Only 60 percent of them returned in fall 2005. (This number would be 71 percent not counting the students who transferred to another institution.) This cohort took an average of 11.44 semester hours and earned an average 2.31 GPA.

As for tribal transfer students, 6 failed to return from fall 2004 to spring 2005, and 22, or 53 percent, failed to return in fall 2005. Those who did return for fall 2005 took an average of 10.73 credits and earned an average 2.17 GPA.

In summary, first-time AI students did much better academically than tribal college transfer students, as shown by higher GPAs and return rates.

We would like to know how students do *after* their first year, so we have put a tracking system in place that will help determine how each cohort does in subsequent

years. Initial findings show that students who only take 12 semester hours are at greater risk of being put on academic or financial aid probation.

The Peer Mentoring Program

Although the Peer Mentoring Program is not an academic program, per se, we thought it would be a good idea to see how the students fared after they were active in the program. Of the 30 students in the program in fall 2004, 80 percent came back in the spring 2005, 36 percent came back in fall 2005 and 43 percent were still on campus for spring 2006 (a 57 percent drop/stop out rate). Of the fall 2004 cohort, 17 of 30 earned over 12 semester hours and had a cumulative 1.70 GPA. Three students withdrew during the fall term (two for medical reasons and one for personal reasons). The spring 2005 cohort of 24 students completed an average of 12.53 semester hours with an average 1.69 GPA for the spring term. However, 72 percent of these students were on financial aid probation for not meeting the requirements of 12 completed semester hours and maintaining at least a 2.00 GPA. On a positive note, 68 percent of this group was considered to be in good academic standing. Thirty-six percent of the fall 2004 cohort returned in fall 2005 and took an average of 14.11 credits.

Student Satisfaction

In fall 2004, the few student satisfaction surveys returned indicated that AISS met the needs of the students in a professional and personable manner. The students thought the office could be improved with more space and amenities. They requested enhanced advising services and more information on financial aid and admissions. Most of the students indicated that their primary reason for utilizing AISS services was to “be around friendly faces.”

During spring 2005 more students filled out the satisfaction survey, and responses reflected a larger cross-section of AI students on campus. Most students said they visited AISS to be around familiar faces, and to seek advising, personal counseling, and class information. Students thought that office staff met their needs and reiterated the desire for more office space and amenities (a couch, vending machines, a refrigerator, and a microwave). Overall, students indicated the office provided a “warm and inviting” place for students to meet.

Recommendations

The academic achievement and retention of AI students remains a top concern. A special effort will be made to find out what is creating the most hardship for students; is it their academic program, specific classes, lack of academic preparation, or other issues? AISS will investigate these issues during the spring semester to find out how we can better meet the needs of students. We might start suggesting that students take at least 14 hours. Other suggestions for improvement will be submitted to the Advisory Board.

We will also consider modifications to the Peer Mentoring program. It should be more than a social program for students. Advisors in the Educational Opportunity

Program (EOP), Native American Studies (NAS), and American Indian Student Services (AISS) will meet to address this topic. The best ideas for strategies will be incorporated into the program. Staff will follow-up on students that drop out or stop out by making personal phone calls to learn why students left.

As the number of AI students on campus increases, we will need to expand office space to accommodate these students. We intend to seek additional office space during spring semester and plan to submit a proposal to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Our program will try to connect with incoming, first-time AI students, emphasizing advising services in our outreach.

Campus Recreation

Assessment of Campus Recreation in comparison with Peer Programs and Organizations



Submitted by Dudley Improta, Assistant Director of Programs, Campus Recreation

Campus Recreation

Assessment of Peer Programs and Organizations

Abstract

Campus Recreation staff visited businesses and other universities to learn about the recreation and fitness programs they offer and the systems they use. We came away with some new ideas, concerning class offerings, intramural scheduling, and teaching methods, which have already helped us improve our recreation and fitness programs.

Background

The mission of Campus Recreation is to provide an active environment for social interaction. Campus Recreation provides facilities and programs for recreation, personal fitness, personal edification, and education. It also offers opportunities for students to improve their social and leadership skills through employment. The Fitness Recreation Center (FRC) offers: full-service recreational facilities; a diverse array of fitness classes, consultations, fitness assessments, and equipment orientations; and free fitness- and health-related lectures and seminars. The goal of FRC is to provide excellent fitness facilities, services, and programs to the University community.

The purpose of this year's assessment was to compare our programs, facilities, and management practices with those of other organizations. Staff members visited businesses and other universities and gave notes and observations to management. We researched outdoor programs, fitness programs and intramural sports, and came away with new ideas about rental systems, current trends in programming, and flag football.

Assessment Procedure

Campus Recreation staff members who participated in this assessment are listed below, followed by the programs and organizations they visited:

Natalie Hiller, Intramural Manager - BYU Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State, Washington State University, Washington University, Western Washington University

Elizabeth Fricke, Outdoor Program Manager - BYU Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State, Washington State University, Washington University, Western Washington University, National Outdoor Leadership School

Sonja Tysk, Fitness Manager - BYU Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State, Women's Club (Missoula), Rancho La Puerta (fitness resort in Mexico)

Dudley Improta, Assistant Director - BYU Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State University, Mesa State University

Each staff member met with his or her counterpart at the organization. For example, Elizabeth Fricke met with the Outdoor Program Manager at each organization she visited. We gathered information through clinical observation and interview, using the following procedure:

1. We scheduled a meeting with a director or manager at each organization and toured the facility with a representative from the organization.
2. During meetings with directors and/or managers, we asked specific questions about numbers of participants, computer software, rules, intramural sports, why certain procedures are or are not used, etc.
3. During tours, we asked general questions about facility management, staffing, hours of operation, policies, computer systems and programming.
4. We took notes and wrote an overall assessment based on information collected.
5. Full-time Campus Recreation staff met to discuss findings and recommendations.

Findings

Fitness Programs

The Women's Club in Missoula offers eight different types of fitness classes (not including yoga and Pilates). Campus Recreation currently offers a more diverse array of fitness classes and has a more diverse group of potential participants than the Women's Club. Yoga is the most popular fitness class at both the Women's Club and Campus Recreation. Both organizations offer mat and reformer Pilates, but the Women's Club offers more Pilates classes, including a Pilates circuit class, which Campus Recreation might consider offering. Our staff discovered new Pilates teaching methods by observing other instructors and discovered Gyrotonics, exercise movements derived from a combination of yoga, dance, swimming and gymnastics. Gyrotonics might be worth offering, if it becomes more popular, but a special apparatus would be required, which would be a significant investment.

Outdoor Programs

Washington State University's outdoor program, which was located in the field house, not in the fitness center, offered a good mix of classes and trips and had a great resource center, with maps and books available for reference and check-out.

The software used to rent outdoor equipment varied from place to place. Western Washington used a Microsoft Access program developed by one of their students. Every rental shop we visited used computers instead of handwritten documents, because they provide for a "cleaner" rental sheet, but there was no

evidence that these systems made it easier to take inventory or make reservations. Computer reservations do not provide the same level of visibility as the big charts used by Campus Recreation, which allow the employee to see availability at a glance.

Some outdoor programs pass out information sheets for rentals, which list everything the renter is responsible for returning. Idaho State University uses large bags to protect rafts during transport.

Idaho State University's (ISU) outdoor program is not integrated with ISU's rental program. The ISU Outdoor Program has an excellent resource center and is very involved in the Outdoor Education minor and major, which are offered through the Health and Physical Education Departments.

Intramurals

Intramural programs at BYU-Idaho and Western Washington University provide internship and management positions for student employees. Intramural programs at BYU-Idaho and Washington State University use slogans to create excitement and motivate staff.

Lights at the BYU intramural fields allow for later games and extended seasons. This was an important observation: Four o'clock games are not popular among UM students. Campus Recreation has had to wrestle with the semester system in the past, changing Spring Break dates to allow a reasonable length of time for intramural league play.

We learned about a new way of scheduling that allows competitive games to be played at all skill levels and reduces the number of forfeits. We also gleaned important tips about flag football rules, policies, training, and equipment that will help us institute a league here at UM.

Recommendations

As a result of our research, the following changes have been made or are underway:

1. Pilates instructors began using new teaching methods in spring 2006.
2. Student intramural officials were allowed to start leading training sessions for other staff in spring 2006.
3. We are developing a resource area with couches, books, maps, and magazines in the Outdoor Program area. This should be finished by fall 2006.

We have made the following plans for future action items:

1. The Women's Club recommends that participants pay for private sessions before joining group classes, so we decided to offer private sessions at the FRC in fall 2006. This will diversify our offerings without requiring us to purchase more equipment.
2. We will discuss the possibility of purchasing lights for the River Bowl intramural field (intramural participation justifies the cost).

3. We will implement competitive scheduling again, but for the “no-champs” league only. (We tried this in fall 2005, but it was time-consuming and unnecessary for all but the “no-champs” league.)
4. We will institute a flag football league in fall 2006.
5. Natalie Hiller and her staff have created a slogan for intramurals which to help convey the spirit in which the games should be played:
 - Play Loud
 - on time
 - Play Loud
 - assertively
 - Play Loud
 - professionally
 - Play Loud
 - to keep it safe
 - Play Loud
 - while supporting each other
6. We will make wallet-sized cards with intramural event timelines for fall 2006.

Career Services

Assessment of Career Services using NACE standards



Submitted by Rowan Conrad, Career Counselor, Career Services

Career Services

Assessment of Career Services using NACE standards

Abstract

The Office of Career Services (OCS) performed a self-study in the spring of 2006. Our goal was to find out if OCS meets the standards set forth by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), which is the national professional association for Career Services offices.

The overall conclusion was that OCS is a competent and effective unit that meets national standards, an office in which the University can take pride. Three percent of the NACE standards were not met, so we plan to address every deficiency in the coming year. The full self-evaluation with complete details is available from OCS (OCS Evaluation Report OCS-2006-01).

Background

The mission of Career Services is to provide quality educational, career and life planning services to help all students and alumni of the University achieve their personal and professional goals. Toward this end, Career Services provides an array of services designed to support the academic mission of the University, while also providing students opportunities to develop themselves outside the classroom, prepare for the workforce, and define and attain career and life goals.

Seven operational areas carry out the mission: Career Counseling, Employer Relations, Testing Services, Student Employment, Credential Files, Alumni Mentoring, and Technical Support.

We used the professional standards of NACE (*Professional Standards for College and University Career Services*, National Association for Colleges and Employers, 1998) as the criteria for assessment. The NACE sets 213 standards for 12 career services program areas. These standards are published in the form of questions, which OCS had to answer.

There were eight specific goals of the assessment:

1. To understand how well the OCS mission statement aligned with the mission statements of The University of Montana and the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs.
2. To discover areas where OCS can make improvements that would allow us to better serve students and achieve our goals.
3. To attain a better understanding of the professional standards in our field.
4. To identify NACE standards that we do not meet as well as areas where we could increase our level of compliance.
5. To learn what resources an outside evaluator would need to effectively assess OCS.
6. To assemble resources identified in goal number five (above) to prepare for future "outside" panel members and external evaluators.

7. To document our professional competency so that we can credibly talk about our effectiveness to uninformed third parties.
8. To perform an annual special research or evaluation study to meet a requirement of the Division of Student Affairs.

Assessment Procedure

The Director of OCS, Mike Heuring, assembled and chaired the self-study panel. He chose people who, in his opinion, had valuable expertise, would provide an important perspective, and would be willing to commit the necessary time and energy to the project. The following people comprised the panel:

Michael Heuring, M.S., Director, Office of Career Services and Committee Chair
Jorrun Liston, Director, Griz Card Center
Lee Clark, Associate Director, University Center
Rowan Conrad, Ph.D., Career Counselor, Office of Career Services
Laurie Fisher, M.A., Career Counselor, Office of Career Services
Mona Mondava, Program Coordinator, Office of Foreign Student and Scholar Services
Annelies Pedersen, M.A. student, School of Education, and Intern, Office of Career Services

The panel consisted of two career counselors, one student (an OCS intern at the time), two Student Affairs Directors from other departments, and one Program Coordinator from a third Student Affairs department. The panel 1) reviewed the entire operation of OCS, 2) assessed overall compliance with professional standards, 3) contributed to the findings and recommendations, and 4) helped write this assessment report.

The panel held a total of seven 90-minute meetings during spring of 2006. The Chair assigned a section from the NACE standards to be covered at each meeting. Each panel member had reviewed the standards and rated OCS independently prior to the meeting, basing their ratings on direct experience, consultation with OCS, overall University Web site(s), and a notebook of resources assembled by OCS. At the meeting, any standard which had been given a different score (1, 2, or 3) by different members was discussed until consensus on the score was reached. When useful information emerged from the discussion, the information was recorded and the issues discussed. This information is available in the full report.

Findings

OCS met minimum requirements for 97% of NACE standards (or questions) and met full requirements for 83% (or 176). On a three-point scale (1 = does not meet, 2 = meets partially, 3 = meets fully), OCS did not receive an overall of score less than 2 (meets partially) for any of the 12 program areas. In four important program areas, those relating to Program Components, Employment Services, Organization, and Ethics, OCS received a "perfect" score of 3.0.

Three percent of the 213 relevant standards were not met, because in six sub-sections compliance was absent, questionable or outdated. OCS will take action to bring OCS into full compliance, and the actions we plan to take are listed under “Recommendations” (below). Two of the deficiencies were related to strategic planning. This explains why there were six standards that were not completely met but only five resulting action statements.

We found that the Career Services mission statement does complement the mission statements of both Student Affairs and The University of Montana, and we believe our operations do contribute to the success of the University as a whole. We also came away with a comprehensive understanding of the professional standards in our field.

Our understanding was enriched by our colleagues’ participation and perspectives, especially those of colleagues from outside OCS (Foreign Student Services, Griz Card Services, and the University Center). Members of the review panel who were not a part of OCS reported positive perceptions of our programs, and their anecdotal evidence supported our findings that OCS is competent and effective in its operations. They also helped us identify resources that would be needed by external evaluators. Because so much insight was gained by including “outsiders” on the panel, we believe it would be beneficial to invite faculty members in the future and undergo an external evaluation.

We have improved our ability to document and demonstrate the strength of our operations to third parties and are in the process of creating a resource book for future external evaluators to use.

Recommendations

1. Implement a formal ongoing strategic planning process. Several standards, specifically NACE standard 60 under “Management,” call for a strategic planning process. The Career Services Director and the panel agreed that OCS would benefit from such a process. Thus, we recommend that OCS re-develop and re-implement a more formal strategic plan.
2. Explore whether it would be valuable to formally assess the needs of our students and employers instead of continuing with simple spot surveys and informal assessments. If we decide to do formal assessments, OCS will develop and implement assessment procedures and processes. If not, OCS will review the informal ways we currently determine the needs of our customers. We will look at how these perceived needs guide our program planning, development, and implementation, for instance, by creating “paper trails” at meetings that deal with such issues.
3. Explore the possibility of bringing all major campus activities that relate to careers under the umbrella of Career Services.
4. Work with University Human Resources to try to bring the salaries of professional counseling staff up to regional and national standards and make

the job description and categorization of the Career Counselor position more accurate.

5. Investigate which follow-up studies, besides the annual employment and salary studies, might be valuable and cost-effective.
6. After we have addressed the above five items, Identify how we could improve areas of our operation that received a score of “2” (“partially meets”) rather than a score of “3” (“meets fully”).

In conclusion, OCS has completed an extensive, comprehensive, and valuable self-study. We have assessed our compliance with NACE standards and have taken steps toward fixing deficiencies that were revealed. After a program development cycle is completed (estimated time is one year), we will pay an external evaluator to assess our programs, hoping to discover additional insights that a third party professional who is not associated with The University of Montana might be able to offer. The complete self-study report, *Office of Career Services Self Study, Spring 2006/Evaluation report OCS 2006-01*, can be obtained from OCS.

Curry Health Center

AAAHC Accreditation Assessment



Submitted by Rick Curtis, Administrator and Dave Bell, Director of Curry Health Center

Curry Health Center

AAAHC Accreditation Assessment

Abstract

This year, CHC measured the quality of our services and our level of performance against nationally recognized standards by seeking accreditation from the Accreditation Association of Ambulatory Healthcare (AAAHC). In March, AAAHC awarded Curry Health Center accreditation for a three-year term.

Background

Curry Health Center provides affordable, accessible, high-quality, student-centered health services to University of Montana students to enhance student learning, promote personal health and development and teach important life skills. Curry Health Center strives to meet and exceed national standards of quality health care put forth by AAAHC.

To receive accreditation by AAAHC, health care organizations must first conduct a self-assessment and submit it with their application; then, they are reviewed by AAAHC expert surveyors, who have extensive experience in ambulatory healthcare. AAAHC reviewed sixteen areas of service and evaluated them against set standards. Areas of service included: Rights of Patients; Governance; Administration; Quality of Care Provided; Quality Management and Improvement; Clinical Records and Health Information; and Facilities and Environment.

The AAAHC awards an organization accreditation for three years if it concludes that the organization is in substantial compliance with the standards, if the committee has no reservations about the accuracy of the findings, and if the committee is assured of the organization's commitment to continue providing high-quality care and services that meet their standards. In March, AAAHC awarded Curry Health Center accreditation for a three-year term. The accreditation certificate symbolizes CHC's commitment to providing high quality health care and demonstrates that we meet the high standards of the AAAHC.

Assessment Procedure

To begin the process of accreditation, CHC submitted an application to AAAHC that included a comprehensive self-assessment survey. The Director of Curry Health Center, Dr. David Bell, coordinated the self-assessment, delegating various parts of the survey to appropriate department managers. The survey provided the AAAHC with a description of CHC and covered the following areas:

- Introductory information

- Rights of patients
- Governance and administration
- Quality of care provided
- Quality management and improvement
- Clinical records and health information
- Facilities and environment
- Anesthesia services
- Surgical and related services
- Overnight care and services
- Dental services
- Emergency services
- Immediate/urgent care services
- Pharmaceutical services
- Pathology and medical laboratory services
- Diagnostic imaging services
- Radiation oncology treatment services
- Occupational health services
- Other professional and technical services
- Teaching and publication activities
- Research activities
- Managed care professional delivery organization
- Health education and wellness services
- General information

The following information and supplementary documents were also provided as part of the self-assessment:

- Mission statement, goals and objectives
- Description of ownership
- Medical bylaws
- Committee structure
- Governing body structure
- Descriptive summary or table of the organization
- Marketing materials
- Health education materials offered by CHC
- Minutes from governing body meetings
- CLIA certificate or waiver
- Emergency plan
- Results of patient satisfaction survey
- Statement of patient's rights and responsibilities
- Examples of patient handouts
- Report from the most recent Medicare survey
- Reports of inspections by state and local fire marshals, state or local health departments or other code enforcement agencies

- Facility license

After AAHC received the self-assessment and application, two of their expert surveyors visited CHC and conducted a two-day review. They toured facilities and met with our governing body and each department individually. They also reviewed medical records and record handling procedures. Before departing, the surveyors met with CHC staff, discussed their findings, and provided positive and constructive feedback.

AAHC reviewed the application materials along with the surveyors' report to determine the term of accreditation. The options for accreditation are:

- denied
- revoked
- deferred
- granted for six months
- granted for one year
- granted for three years

CHC was granted accreditation for three years.

Findings

AAHC rates each area of service in the following terms: Substantial Compliance (SC), Partial Compliance (PC), Non-Compliance (NC) or Not Applicable (NA). Results for CHC are shown in the graph below.

	<u>SC</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>NA</u>
1. Rights of Patients	X			
2. Governance	X			
I. General Requirements	X			
II. Credentialing and Privileging	X			
3. Administration	X			
4. Quality of Care Provided	X			
5. Quality Management and Improvement	X			
I. Peer Review	X			
II. Quality Improvement Program	X			
III. Risk Management	X			
6. Clinical Records and Health Information	X			
7. Previously Professional Improvement*				
8. Facilities and Environment	X			
9. Anesthesia Services	X			
10. Surgical and Related Services	X			
11. Overnight Care and Services	X			
12. Dental Services	X			
13. Emergency Services				X
14. Immediate/Urgent Care Services	X			
15. Pharmaceutical Services	X			
16. Pathology and Medical Laboratory Services	X			
I. CLIA-Waived Tests				X

II. CLIA Laboratories	X			
17. Diagnostic Imaging Services	X			
18. Radiation Oncology Treatment Services				X
19. Employee and Occupational Health Services	X			
20. Other Professional & Technical Services	X			
21. Teaching & Publication Activities	X			
22. Research Activities				X
23. Managed Care Professional Services Delivery Organization**				
24. Health Education and Wellness Services	X			

* The AAAHC report explains: “The standards for Previously Professional Improvement have been moved to other chapters in the Handbook, including Governance, Administration, and Quality Management and Improvement, where they are more consistent with the requirement of these areas.”

** This section was not part of the AAAHC report, as CHC is not a managed care organization.

Recommendations

None of CHC’s areas of service were deemed to be in less than substantial compliance; nonetheless, AAAHC did offer some consultative comments. We will pay special attention to the following areas in the year ahead:

- Update health center hours on website (done)
- Increase availability of psychiatrist (done)
- Review the anesthesia permit process (in process)
- Review retirement policy for medical records with special circumstances, such as medical records relating to Workman’s Compensation, summer programs, or entering freshman under the age of 18 (in process)
- Review structure of governing body
- Make additions to performance evaluations used for provider
- Take first steps toward digitizing medical records
- Provide additional staff education on quality improvement activities
- Consider surveying parents and students who do not use CHC
- Enhance benchmarking
- Consider a numbering system for complaint cards
- Reconsider referral process
- Consider additional curtains for exam rooms
- Change ear scope cleaning procedure
- Consolidate consent form to one page
- Review informed consent procedure list
- Partner with Dining Services to provide meals with special dietary restrictions
- Do a time study to quantify wait times for walk-ins

We plan to go through this process at least once every three years to avoid a lapse in accreditation status.

Disability Services for Students

Assessment of Accessibility on Campus



Submitted by Dan Burke, Assistant Director of Disability Services for Students

Disability Services for Students

Assessment of Accessibility on Campus

Abstract

Disability Services for Students (DSS) created an online “Report Barrier” form as a way to continually assess accessibility on campus. The form proved to be an effective way for students, employees, and visitors to notify us about difficulties they encountered when attempting to access University programs and ultimately made DSS more effective in serving students.

Background

Disability Services for Students (DSS) assures that University of Montana programs are as accessible to and usable by students with disabilities as they are for any other student. We must constantly assess factors that affect accessibility, and our ongoing assessment efforts must be meticulous and broad in scope. During summer 2005, the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights (OCR) visited campus to conduct a campus-wide accessibility compliance review. It used very restrictive guidelines when measuring accessibility tolerances, sometimes measuring to within one-quarter of an inch. We are awaiting the results. In past years, DSS has surveyed faculty and students and performed self-evaluations that were required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (these required us to take measurements as precise as those taken by the OCR).

In 2004, we launched the online “Report Barriers” form, which provides people on campus with a way to inform DSS about malfunctioning accessibility features on campus and barriers to access, whether longstanding, temporary or unexpected. The Web page where the form can be found informs potential “reporters” about options for making complaints, maintenance processes, and due process. Users also have the option to file complaints about any program or service on campus, including DSS. Links to the “Report Barriers” form are identified by an icon and an “alt-tag” in the HTML code and are part of the template of all DSS Web pages; therefore they appear on every DSS Web page. In addition, these links appear on the Accessibility Resources page, which is linked from the University’s home page, and on every page associated with the online Access Map, which is maintained on the main UM server in coordination with the Information Technology Office.

Assessment Procedure

Step 1: Reporting

A student, employee, or visitor goes online and follows links to the “Report Barriers” page. They must complete two required fields: They must check a radio button indicating whether they are a student, an employee, or a visitor; and then they must fill in the reporting field with information about the barrier encountered.

The next three fields are marked optional. The reporter can choose whether to supply name, phone number, and/or e-mail address. The report is delivered to the DSS email address (dss@umontana.edu) when the reporter clicks the "Send" button.

The DSS inbox is checked three times every work day, and all reports are forwarded to the Disability Services Director.

Step 2: Investigation

The Director conducts the investigation or assigns the duty to a Disability Services Coordinator. If the reporter is a student served by DSS and identifies him or herself in the report, the case is usually investigated by the Disability Services Coordinator who currently serves that student.

If contact information is available, then the investigator contacts the individual to gather more information. After the individual is contacted, or if no contact information is provided, the investigator focuses on the problem reported.

If a Disability Services Coordinator is the subject of a barrier report, the Director conducts the investigation.

Step 3: Resolution

In all cases, we try to remove the barrier or resolve the problem as soon as possible. Resolution is accomplished by:

- a. Relaying information about the barrier to the appropriate campus entity and advocating and negotiating for its prompt removal; or
- b. If prompt removal cannot be accomplished, referring the matter to appropriate campus entities, such as the ADA-Section 504 Committee, and following due process procedures in order to assure that the issue receives long-term attention.

Findings

The "Report Barrier" form generated six reports over the course of academic year 2004-05. In AY 2005-06, the number of reports jumped to 49, an eight-fold increase. There are 30 weeks of academic session in the regular school year, plus 10 weeks of summer sessions, so we received and investigated an average of 1.225 reports per week. Forty-two of the reports were resolved by promptly removing the barrier, and two issues went to due process.

Barrier Reports Received by DSS during AY 2005-2006

Total Reports Received: 49

1. Surcharge for Adams Center Assistive Listening Devices
2. Poor ergonomics at DSS Test Accommodation Workstations
3. Not enough keys to Mansfield Library Access Center

4. Academic unfairness in Computer Science
5. Extended testing time not enough to accommodate impact of disability
6. Coordinator not responding to student request to meet
7. Student taking Mansfield Library Access Center Key from building
8. Urey Hall Assistive Listening Device failure
9. ASUM Park & Ride Bus wheelchair lift failure
10. Inadequate Disability Services at the COT
11. Music Choir Room accessibility
12. Problems with Diagnostic Report Requirements
13. Music Choir Room wheelchair lift failure
14. Music Choir Room wheelchair lift failure
15. Miller Hall elevator failure
16. Advertisement for Assistive Technology
17. Miller Hall egress problems during fire alarm drill
18. Mansfield Library restroom and elevator accessibility
19. Automatic Door Opener problems in Miller, Pantzer, and University Center
20. Miller Hall elevator failure
21. Access to tutoring from Educational Opportunity Program in Miller Hall
22. Lack of bathtubs in Miller Hall
23. Failure to remove snow from Disability Parking
24. Recommendation to change DSS name to something more politically correct
25. Surcharge for Accessible Dormitory Room
26. Snow not being removed from Priority Snow Routes
27. ASUM Park & Ride Bus signage for lift capacity incorrect and Intimidating
28. Route of travel problems from Lot P to Law School
29. Snow removal from Campus
30. No elevator in University Hall
31. Request to waive statistics requirement for blind Environmental studies major
32. Mansfield Library Access Center closed when Library is open
33. Barriers to Schreiber Gym Theater Room
34. ASUM Park & Ride Bus wheelchair lift failures
35. Lommasson stairs too dark
36. Student harassing other students in Mansfield Library Access Center
37. Student injured in accident on ASUM Park & Ride Bus
38. Too noisy at DSS Test Accommodation Rooms
39. General dissatisfaction with Disability Services
40. Campus Security delay in assisting stranded wheelchair user
41. Notice of sidewalk closure from Facility Services
42. Scheduling problems for Coordinator Meeting
43. Music Choir Room lift failure
44. University Center elevator closed for event
45. Test Taker at DSS interrupted by DSS student employee using cell phone
46. Class registration blocked due to academic suspension
47. Inadequate Disability Parking at Lommasson
48. Request to re-print article published by DSS
49. Professor inquiry about Test Accommodation procedures

Forty-one reports, or 84 percent, were submitted by students, eight percent by campus visitors. Four reports, or eight percent, were miscellaneous requests or comments that did not refer to barriers. (See Table 1)

Table 1

Reports by Type of Reporter	
Student	41
Visitor	4
Employee	1
Not Reports	3

Ten reports (20 percent) related to general DSS accommodations or services, such as difficulty meeting with coordinators. Eleven reports (22 percent) referenced elevator, lift or other mechanical access device breakdowns. Six reports (12 percent) pointed out accessibility difficulties with ASUM transportation buses and lifts, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Subjects of Reports	
DSS coordinators, policy or other accommodations	10
College of Technology	1
ASUM Transportation	6
Parking	2
Surcharge for Access	2
Elevator, lift or automatic door opener malfunction	11
Snow Removal (late or inadequate)	4
Academic	3
Mansfield Access Center	4
Physical	5
Campus Security/Building Egress	2
Assistive Technology Failure	1

Recommendations

We resolved all barrier problems that were reported in AY 2004-2005. The vast majority were resolved quickly, except for two that were eventually referred to the ADA-Section 504 Committee for longer-term resolutions. One of these was eventually resolved by the EEO/AA Officer, and the other (the ongoing issue with the inadequate chair lift to the choir room) was resolved by the ADA-Section 504 Committee. The lift was replaced and fully functional by early spring 2006. One report called our attention to the fact that

the Adams Center was charging for use of an assistive listening device (ALD), a practice which was in clear violation of the ADA. Because of DSS intervention, the Adams Center quickly put an end to this practice.

In summary, the Report Barrier form on the Web has become a critical tool in assessing accessibility on campus by allowing us to identify barriers and remove them promptly. The increased usage might be due to better presentation of the Web links (the icon was revamped and renamed in 2004) or to greater general use of the Web by students with disabilities, but we must consider the possibility that the jump in reports could be attributed to an increase in actual barriers on campus, either of a physical or attitudinal nature. We must be vigilant in maintaining the highest levels of accessibility on our campus and assuring that information about barriers can be communicated to us in a timely and effective manner.

Enrollment Services

Assessment of:

- ***Orientation***
- ***Admissions Open House Events***



Submitted by Molly Molloy, Director of Orientation and Amy Zinne, Operations Manager,
Enrollment Services

Enrollment Services

Assessment of Orientation

Abstract

Orientation programs at The University of Montana (UM) are designed to provide students and their families the information they need to become active and successful participants in the UM community and to facilitate a smooth transition to college life. To assess student and parent satisfaction with the summer orientation programs, Enrollment Services distributed participant surveys.

Overall, evaluations revealed that participants were very satisfied with the program. As a result of orientation, students felt better informed about The University of Montana and parents felt more comfortable with the decision to send their students to UM. Survey respondents also provided useful suggestions for improvement.

Background

Enrollment Services attracts, supports, and enhances student enrollment at The University of Montana by providing quality information, services, and complete financial options to make the college enrollment process efficient, accessible, and student-centered.

Orientation programs are designed to provide new undergraduate students and their families with a structured, comprehensive introduction to the variety of opportunities and services at The University of Montana, to assist new students in their transition to the University, and to integrate students into University life. Orientation facilitates initial academic advising, placement testing, course selection, and registration; promotes awareness of campus life, through formal and informal non-classroom activities; familiarizes students with the campus environment and physical facilities; promotes an atmosphere which supports diversity; provides appropriate information on health, personal and property safety, and security; and provides opportunities for new students and their families to meet faculty, staff, continuing students, and other new students. By providing all of these services, we aim to help stabilize enrollment through improved student retention.

Assessment Procedure

We provided each student and parent who attended our orientation with an evaluation in their information packet. We have a unique evaluation for each of the three summer programs: freshman orientation, transfer student orientation, and family orientation. By filling out evaluations, participants provide feedback on individual workshops and meetings, and we use that feedback to generate ideas for improving orientation.

This year, we added some new questions to more accurately assess how prepared students felt and how comfortable their parents felt after attending orientation. We also asked students what concerns they still had, if any, about attending UM, and we asked parents if they felt their student was prepared to attend.

Findings

The freshmen orientation program yielded a 28% evaluation response rate. The transfer student orientation yielded a 20% response rate, and the family orientation yielded a 35% response rate (we typically have the greatest response rate from the family program).

The freshmen evaluations show that we have good participation in the main sessions and in the smaller group sessions, whereas the optional workshops do not have as many participants. Transfer students seem to attend only a minimal number of events, primarily the opening meeting and advising. As for parents, participation numbers drop slightly on Friday, as they prefer to attend departmental meetings and advising appointments with their students.

Student Evaluations: Overall Themes

In general, students who attend orientation are very pleased and feel better prepared to study at The University of Montana. Most students find orientation to be a helpful stepping stone to their college career. They like working in small groups with the Advocates, receiving personal attention, getting their questions answered, and hearing what current students have to say about their UM experience. Students also enjoy the social events such as the carnival and ultimate Frisbee game, which allow them to meet other new students.

Student complaints usually center around the early morning meetings, particularly the “Job Description as a UM student” meeting, which is very important. Several different speakers talk about academic opportunities and the Cyberbear registration process. While most students find this information beneficial, they find the session long and/or confusing.

Some students also complained about advisors not being as helpful as they wished and about having been placed in the wrong small group for their major.

Family Evaluations: Overall Themes

The family orientation provides parents with a large amount of detailed information from many different departments and offices on campus. Overwhelmingly, parents are pleased with their experience and the experience of their students. Parents compliment the friendliness of the staff, the well-organized nature of the program, the comprehensive information supplied, the Advocates, and the input from current students. Parents generally felt more comfortable with their decision to send their student to UM after attending. They appreciated the opportunity to interact with department heads and “those in charge” and thought the carnival was a nice break from taking in all the information.

Parents would have liked more information about the Missoula community, crime, student clubs and organizations, and they wished they had been given a list of things to bring for their stay in the dorms (sheets, towels, etc.). They also requested information about undeclared majors and a “frequently asked questions” sheet. Parents also wished that the most relevant information was provided first: financial aid and registration.

As in the past, parents desire more joint meetings with students and shorter programs. Parents this year also seemed to be very concerned with their students’ CyberBear accounts, and many were unhappy to hear that they would not automatically be given log-in information to check up on bill payment and grades. Parents complained about the hectic schedule, the lines, overcrowding, and hot and uncomfortable dorm rooms.

Recommendations

Crowds and long lines proved to be an issue this year, and this is something that will need to be addressed in the future if orientation programming (especially the family program) continues to be popular. Many parents signed up for the family program, many more than in years past, and we had to find alternate locations to host meetings at the last minute. In the future, we will have to schedule new venues for the family program events, and for those events that both parents and students attend together, such as the Slice of Campus Life skits. We will have to work with Dining Services and Catering to find space for everyone to eat comfortably (there was not enough room at meal times during the June sessions).

An “Orientation Passport” program was implemented this year, and this might account for increased student attendance at the events. Increased attendance means that students are getting more of the information they need, so we hope to continue issuing passports in the future. We need to think about different ways to boost non-traditional student and transfer student participation; their needs and the events they attend are different from traditional freshmen.

The “Job Description” session is the most important session, as we talk about the differences between high school and college, class registration and fee payment. However, the students continually complain about the time slot. The students also go over all of this information in a smaller group with their Advocate, but it is important that students pay attention as the information is being provided by those staff members who are involved with the registration process. We will continue to discuss different ways to present the information.

We would like to solicit information from the Health Enhancement office to enhance the Slice of Campus Life skits, as the skits address key issues and teach students about important resources.

We will probably not be able to shorten the programs unless we stop requiring assessments at orientation. However, by posting the orientation registration forms online, we did make it easier for participants to make reservations and payments. Online forms will streamline the process, more than likely reducing data entry problems and possibly eliminating the need for two Orientation Assistants. Enrollment Services

plans to make online registration available by using one of the contact management systems that are currently being considered.

Overall, the orientation programs were successful. We did an excellent job providing students and their families the information they need to become successful and informed members of the UM community. Finally, we believe we could see a higher evaluation response rate, especially from students, if we made evaluations available online and emailed a link to them shortly after orientation.

Enrollment Services

Assessment of Admissions Open Houses

Abstract

In the spring, Enrollment Services held a series of open houses for prospective students and their parents and asked each participant to complete an evaluation. Overall, the comments were positive, but there were some suggestions regarding campus tours, schedules, and academic department meetings that will help us with planning in the future.

Background

Enrollment Services attracts, supports, and enhances student enrollment at The University of Montana by providing quality information, services, and complete financial options to make the college enrollment process efficient, accessible, and student-centered. Every spring, hundreds of prospective students and their families visit the campus. This year, to accommodate the large number of visitors, Enrollment Services hosted open houses on six Fridays in March and April. These open houses gave visitors the opportunity to tour the campus grounds and residence halls, have lunch in the Food Zoo, attend presentations, and interact with a student panel.

By hosting open houses, Enrollment Services aims to: (1) encourage prospective students to visit campus; (2) minimize disruption for faculty and other departments; (3) give visitors an all-around great experience and a comprehensive understanding of the programs and services available at UM; (4) demonstrate excellent customer service for potential future customers.

Attendance this year far exceeded expectations: five of the open houses attracted between 60 and 90 students each (the sixth open house, which was held during UM spring break, only attracted about 25 students).

Assessment Procedure

We gave each attendee an evaluation form and offered prizes for each one that was completed and returned. Evaluations instructed participants to rate various aspects of the open house program on a scale of 1-5 (1 = "least satisfied", 5 = "most satisfied"). We also encouraged attendees to provide other feedback.

Out of 712 total attendees, 90 completed evaluation forms. However, not all respondents answered every question or participated in every aspect of the open house.

Findings

Overall, attendees who completed the evaluations were very pleased with the open houses. We grouped ratings of 4 or 5 together as “satisfied” and found the following (“n”= total number of responses to each question):

- 96% were satisfied with the location and ease of check-in (n=78)
- 97% were satisfied with the campus tour (n=61)
- 95% were satisfied with lunch (n=78)
- 91% were satisfied with the residence hall tour (n=46)
- 98% were satisfied with academic department meetings (n=40)
- 96% were satisfied with the open house confirmation materials (n=74)
- 96% were satisfied with the student services presentations (n=76)
- 99% were satisfied with the student panel (n=71)

Participants appreciated the comprehensive nature of the open houses and the large amount of information presented. The following comments showed up more than once:

- “Lunch was great, but the Food Zoo was a little confusing.”
- “My tour guide needed to speak up a little.”
- “Some of the student services presentations were rushed.”
- “My campus tour was rushed. We needed more time.”
- “Academic department meetings should be at a specific time.”

Recommendations

Because of the success of the spring 2006 open houses, Enrollment Services is planning six more for spring 2007, but we might start the series one week earlier to avoid Spring Break (attendance at that time was low and some academic departments and residence halls were unavailable). We plan to lengthen the campus tours and provide more tours earlier in the day, because early tours are more popular. We will also continue to work with academic departments, soliciting their participation and establishing better meeting times.

Foreign Student and Scholar Services

Foreign Student Satisfaction Survey



Submitted by Effie Koehn, Director of Foreign Student and Scholar Services

Foreign Student and Scholar Services

Foreign Student Satisfaction Survey

Abstract

Foreign Student and Scholar Services (FSSS) provides information, advising, programs and services designed to make the foreign student experience as positive and productive as possible. FSSS administered two surveys this year: (1) a general survey of the foreign student population that gauged satisfaction with opportunities, programs, services, on-campus facilities, and the FSSS office; and (2) an assessment of a one-day fieldtrip to Glacier National Park for new foreign students.

Overall, findings indicated that the majority of students who took the survey are satisfied. Availability of financial aid elicited the lowest scores (34% satisfied; 27% dissatisfied; 40% N/A), however, and many students expressed a desire to go on a longer field trip to Glacier National Park.

Background

FSSS assumes responsibility for the general welfare of foreign students at The University of Montana, from admission to graduation to post-completion practical training. The office also assists departments in bringing international scholars (researchers and faculty) to campus. FSSS provides support and consultation services to help students and scholars achieve their educational and professional goals. In addition, the office promotes meaningful and positive cross-cultural experiences by sponsoring campus and community activities.

Our general goals are to serve the needs of international students and scholars and their families, to assist students and scholars in understanding and complying with government policies and regulations, and to collaborate with UM departments and community groups in order to foster cross-cultural understanding and goodwill.

At the beginning of each academic term, FSSS offers a specialized orientation program for all new foreign students with the help of other University personnel and conducts a personalized orientation for new scholars (on-going orientation sessions throughout the semester augment the initial orientation programs).

During the 2005-06 academic year, Foreign Student and Scholar Services (FSSS) served over 400 foreign students and approximately 80 scholars from 76 different countries. In fall 2005, Campus Recreation Outdoor Programs was contracted to provide a one-day fieldtrip to Glacier National Park for new foreign students. Our assessments this year focused on the field trip as well as our students' overall attitudes toward the University and FSSS.

Assessment Procedure

This past year, FSSS evaluated two things: 1) general services offered by the University and FSSS, and 2) a fieldtrip to Glacier National Park that is offered in conjunction with Campus Recreation as part of fall semester orientation.

In April 2006, we sent an electronic survey to 375 international students enrolled in degree programs; we gathered information about the students' personal backgrounds and their opinions on services and programs offered at The University of Montana. With the exception of demographic information, almost all answers were given on a 5-point scale, ranging from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied." The last section of the questionnaire asked students to evaluate FSSS by agreeing or disagreeing with several statements about the staff and the services they provide. The survey also solicited feedback on what the students perceived to be attractions and drawbacks of UM.

To assess the fieldtrip, we held a roundtable meeting with Campus Recreation/Outdoor Programs, which has organized and run the fieldtrip for the last 3-4 years. They imparted to us information they had gathered from students who participated. Information was gathered informally; no written survey was administered.

Findings

Data indicated that there were two subsets of students who went on the Glacier trip, both with different needs and expectations. Some students said they wanted a longer trip to Glacier National Park (a two-day camping trip with an overnight stay instead of a one-day road trip), and they wanted to see the park on foot at a more leisurely pace instead of driving. This would, naturally, increase the cost substantially. The other group preferred a one-day, roundtrip tour.

A total of 63 students (17% of the foreign student population) participated in the general survey: 43 females; 20 males; 33 undergraduates; and 30 graduate students. Respondents hailed from Africa (6%), Asia (41%), Oceania (2%), Europe (33%), Central/South America and Caribbean (6%), Middle East (2%), and North America (10%). The proportions of our surveyed group, in terms of geographic distribution, roughly mimicked that of the larger foreign student population at UM. Sixty-six percent of respondents lived in campus housing (Residence Halls - 32%; University Villages - 11%; Lewis & Clark Village - 24%) and 33% lived off-campus. Forty-nine percent of the respondents had been students at UM for more than one year, while 51% came to UM during the 2005-06 academic year. Sixty-two percent were here on an F-1 student visa, 33% on a J-1 exchange visitor visa, and 3% on another type of visa.

Most questions that asked about level of satisfaction with services were answered. Responses marked "very satisfied" or "satisfied" are described as "satisfied" and responses marked as "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" are described as "dissatisfied." "Non-applicable" responses account for any discrepancies in percentages.

Transition Services

FSSS offers pre-arrival and arrival services to new incoming foreign students to aid in their transition to a new academic and cultural environment.

Pre-arrival information, reception upon arrival, and orientation programs:
70% satisfied; 11% dissatisfied; 19% N/A

Basic Needs

Campus housing arrangements: 71% satisfied; 14% dissatisfied; 15% N/A
Campus dining services: 57% satisfied; 24% dissatisfied; 19% N/A
Campus health services: 69% satisfied; 25% dissatisfied; 5% N/A
Counseling: 47% satisfied; 6% dissatisfied; 48% N/A
Immigration issues: 71% satisfied; 19% dissatisfied; 10% N/A

Academic Needs

Academic advising: 77% satisfied; 10% dissatisfied; 14% N/A
Student-faculty relations: 95% satisfied; 5% dissatisfied
Relevance of courses: 85% satisfied; 13% dissatisfied; 2% N/A
Library resources: 92% satisfied; 6% dissatisfied; 2% N/A
Opportunities to improve English: 67% satisfied; 8% dissatisfied; 25% N/A
Career counseling: 48% satisfied; 14% dissatisfied; 38% N/A
Graduate assistant experience: 39% satisfied; 8% dissatisfied; 52% N/A

Financial Needs

As with all students, in addition to paying tuition and fees, foreign students must also pay for their living expenses. When financial aid resources are limited, there are alternatives to parental support or personal savings. At UM these alternatives include employment opportunities, financial aid programs such as scholarships and loans, and emergency financial support. When asked about these options, respondents answered as follows:

Campus employment opportunities: 46% satisfied; 26% dissatisfied; 29% N/A
Availability of financial aid programs: 34% satisfied; 27% dissatisfied; 40% N/A
Financial support in emergencies: 32% satisfied; 8% dissatisfied; 60% N/A

Social Needs

FSSS tries to facilitate social interaction among foreign students and among foreign students, scholars and the greater community. Respondents answered as follows to questions about social needs:

Opportunities for involvement in campus/community life:
70% satisfied; 20% dissatisfied; 10% N/A
Opportunities to let Americans know about your country/perspective:
76% satisfied; 16% dissatisfied; 8% N/A
Missoula International Friendship Program:
58% satisfied; 8% dissatisfied; 35% N/A

Recreational activities: 78% satisfied; 14% dissatisfied; 8% N/A
Relations with American roommates: 54% satisfied; 16% dissatisfied; 30% N/A
Experience with peer assistant: 27% satisfied; 22% dissatisfied; 50% N/A
Quality of life of accompanying dependents (spouse and children):
36% satisfied; 3% dissatisfied; 60% N/A
Relations with other foreign students: 93% satisfied; 3% dissatisfied; 3% N/A
Community services (banks, restaurants, etc.): 90% satisfied; 10% dissatisfied

FSSS Overall

Respondents were asked to rate the following seven statements:

- “FSSS employees are available to help me.”
- “The staff is friendly and courteous.”
- “The staff is knowledgeable about services available to me.”
- “They provide useful information.”
- “The FSSS office is able to meet my needs effectively.”
- “The staff makes me feel comfortable in seeking help.”
- “Overall, I am pleased with the service I receive at the FSSS.”

Students gave consistently favorable responses, with 93% to 100% of them answering “satisfied” for each question.

Finally, 98% of respondents ranked their overall experience at UM as satisfactory. When asked about UM’s main attractions, most respondents pointed to attributes associated with the beauty of the natural environment, the quality of the education, and the friendly and supportive community.

Recommendations

FSSS and Campus Recreation determined that the Glacier National Park field trip was popular enough to warrant two separate trips. In the future, Campus Recreation will organize a two-day camping trip, and FSSS will organize a one-day tourism trip with the help of Glacier’s internal tour buses. This new plan will be implemented in fall 2006 and evaluated as part of Foreign Student Orientation.

Although a majority of survey respondents were satisfied with FSSS services and programs, we are paying close attention to the areas where students expressed dissatisfaction. As in the past, financial aid elicited the lowest ratings. One way to fix this might be to increase the number of non-work study positions on campus as well as the number and amount of scholarships available.

It is important to note that the data collected do not represent a random sample of UM’s foreign student population. We sent surveys to all 375 registered foreign students. The 63 students who responded did so voluntarily, so these respondents were self-selected, and this might have impacted our data. In the future, we would like to use a statistical sampling procedure, as this will allow us to determine if there is significant variation among the responses.

Griz Card Center

Assessment of UMoney Program and Merchant Relations



Submitted by Jörrun Liston, Director of Griz Card Center

Griz Card Center

Assessment of UMoney Program and Merchant Relations

Abstract

The Griz Card UMoney account system provides students, their parents, faculty, and staff with a safe, secure, cashless and convenient way to transact business on- and off-campus. Since its inception in 2001, the Griz Card UMoney program has investigated the current and prospective student markets and attempted to measure current customer satisfaction.

In May 2006, a situational analysis revealed that the Griz Card Center (GCC) had not reached its internal goal of signing up 50 merchants for the off-campus merchant program and was unable to provide reliable, off-campus service to existing merchants. The GCC therefore confronted the challenge of expanding and improving the program with limited and restricted resources.

Background

The mission of the GCC is to maintain the reliability and integrity of the Griz Card system by ensuring that every card works where and when it should. In addition, GCC administers UMoney, a debit account that is offered to students, faculty, and staff at The University of Montana. The Griz Card UMoney account provides a safe, secure, cashless and convenient way to transact business on- and off-campus, while assuring parents that their funds will be spent within a university-approved merchant system.

In May 2006, due to staff constraints and insufficient resources, we only signed 35 merchants after setting a goal in 2005 to sign 50, and we did not feel we were as responsive as we should have been to merchant requests for information, training and marketing. An article in the March 2006 issue of the *Kaimin* quoted one merchant who was unhappy that he received UMoney customers before GCC had installed the system. Another merchant had experienced a problem with tips accepted via UMoney.

As per last year's assessment plan recommendations, we renamed the debit program "UMoney," implemented online deposits and statements, and set a goal to sign 55 merchants by December 2006.

As with any re-branding effort, we wanted to inform UMoney account holders and existing merchants about the name change, the online options and the expanding UMoney merchant network. Thus, we developed a student marketing internship position to address merchant relations, service, recruitment and co-marketing. The student created a list of assessable objectives, based upon the situational analysis, that would allow us to gauge whether we were improving service and relations and expanding the off-campus merchant cohort.

Assessment Procedure

The GCC identified eight merchants who had signed with a third party merchant program in 2004, were unhappy with the experience, and had mistakenly associated this experience with UM. We attempted to bring as many of them as possible over to the UMoney program. Also, we had received numerous requests for new merchants from students, parents, staff and faculty, which were communicated to us through surveys, focus groups, and presentation feedback. The GCC developed a list of the most requested merchants and targeted the “top ten.”

We set up a process for running merchant focus groups and soliciting direct feedback, and used this feedback to court new merchants. We also developed a plan to respond to merchant requests within 48 hours, created new signage with the “UMoney” name to be used by all merchants, and improved our training materials.

Findings

By December 2006, the off-campus UMoney network was 62 merchants strong, a 77 percent increase from May 2005. We exceeded our goal by 24%. The student intern was able to sign up 15 of the top 20 requested merchants. The remaining four are still considering UMoney.

Of the eight merchants who had originally signed on with a third party, seven have joined the UMoney network. Five of the seven reported that the UMoney program is working well for them; they are pleased with the program to date. The two merchants that were not fully satisfied were confused about the differences between the third party program and the UMoney program and will need further follow-up. We have approved the application of the eighth and final merchant and given them a contract to sign.

In the past, response to merchant requests for information, re-programming, and training was sporadic and inconsistent, because of 1) staff shortages, 2) the need to focus on maintaining on-campus system integrity, and 3) erratic merchant retail schedules. Instead of conducting off-campus visits after business hours or on personal time, we sent our new student intern to visit merchants, both on and off campus. As a result, we were able to help merchants who signed with UMoney to get the program up and running within 24 hours of receiving their equipment and/or phone lines. The marketing intern was able to personally meet with the merchant who had complained to the *Kaimin*, retrain that merchant’s staff, and follow up with other merchants. The intern distributed written directions on “How to Run a Tip” and encouraged merchants to embrace the new name “UMoney” and display the new signage. Some merchants have been slow to update and train cashiers.

We run statements now on a monthly basis and email them to merchants who want sales information. Some of them would also like direct deposit of their settlement, and we are working on this with Business Services.

We gave merchants white boards that featured the UMoney logo and advertised discounts offered to UMoney customers. These boards can be seen in many retail windows around town.

Because our first intern was so helpful, we added a second intern to pursue our co-marketing and on-campus objectives and serve as a back up for the first intern to ensure quick response to merchant needs. Marketing initiatives included:

- A merchant newsletter including a column praising merchants who used the UMoney logo in their ads.
- Collaboration with Northwinds Publishing: The GCC advertised Griz Card Services and UMoney merchants on free pages in the campus directory. The publishing company worked with UMoney merchants to expand their ads, add the UMoney logo and tie in their ads with GCC ads.
- UMoney logo: Of 10 full-page menu ads in the campus directory, seven are UMoney merchants, six of which prominently feature the UMoney logo (the seventh merchant was Dining Services, who told the publishing company that UMoney was a competitor). We are pursuing the other three merchants and trying to get them to join the UMoney network.
- *Kaimin* Discount: We collaborated with the *Kaimin* advertising staff to offer a discount to merchants who use the UMoney logo in their ads.
- Merchants of the Month: One of six merchants is selected each month in rotation to be featured in advertisements in the *Kaimin* and on the GCC Web site. We inform the community about specials and a monthly contest offering the winner \$20 in UMoney.
- Summer Orientation Carnival Night punch cards: Each student or parent was given a punch card listing all UMoney on-campus merchants. If they received a punch from each merchant, they could be entered in a drawing to win \$100 in UMoney. The merchants appreciated the opportunity to engage with the students and their families and were very appreciative of our efforts to cross-market their programs.
- UMoney Bingo: This game was a hit at Parents' Weekend. Bingo sheets featured UMoney merchants. The Bingo caller called out merchant names, and those who won the game were given coupons and entered in a drawing. There were no empty seats all evening. Students and parents had the opportunity to learn about the many merchants accepting UMoney.
- Welcome Feast: UMoney prizes and merchant coupons were awarded during the Welcome Feast celebration
- Online account deposits and statements: We set up several laptops at Orientation to provide information for students and their parents. We gave them a tour of our Web site and let them create online accounts.

Recommendations

We would like to evaluate at least two of our co-marketing merchant plans as well as our marketing strategy (signage, advertising and orientation/campus event programming).

We hope to continue recruiting exceptional students for marketing internships and sending them out to program the merchant's equipment. They will also continue to train operators, because the marketing interns, unlike technical folks, already have relationships with the merchants. We also want to continue incorporating our interns into the Orientation programming, because they are so approachable and engaging. The marketing students discussed the UMoney program and Griz Card services and

showed students and their parents how to sign up, make deposits online and check their statements.

The Director will develop a form for GCC students and staff to use when visiting merchants. The form will assess merchants' knowledge of the UMoney program, their ability to process a payment, their use of UMoney signage, discounts offered, etc. We plan to follow-up when necessary, if merchants show signs that they need help integrating UMoney with their business practices.

We would also like to allow at least one student intern to receive course credit and a tuition waiver; the work provides them with hands-on marketing experience and helps GCC tremendously.

Residence Life

Assessment of:

- *Student Satisfaction Survey*
- *University Villages Tenant Satisfaction Survey*



Submitted by Kelly Magnuson, Community Affairs Coordinator, University Villages

Residence Life

Student Satisfaction Survey

Abstract

Residence Life provides comfortable, competitively priced housing and facilities for University students that meet all health and safety codes. Additionally, Residence Life supports the educational mission of The University of Montana by providing instructive, co-curricular opportunities and programs for students. We strive to create an environment that promotes academic learning and engenders the positive aspects of community living.

Residence Life strives to respond to the ever-changing needs of today's students. We conduct annual surveys to assess perceived needs and our ability to meet them. We adjust and improve our services continually in response to survey findings. This year, survey results indicated that most students residing in the dormitories are satisfied with the overall facilities and programs provided by our hall staff and campus community. Suggestions for improvement were related to laundry services, technology, and customer service.

Background

Residence Life, University Villages, and Lewis and Clark Villages provide facilities that serve as an integral component of the academic program at the University of Montana, providing living/learning environments for students and their families and nurturing the spirit and principles of community living. We provide housing facilities at a competitive market price that are healthy, safe and student-preferred.

Residence Life also promotes and facilitates prominent co-curricular activities and programs with faculty, staff and students, which take place within campus-based housing. We encourage students to engage in their residential community and take pride in and ownership of their residential environment. We promote a "Community Living Model" that provides opportunities for students to learn healthy values, behaviors and choices essential to a successful college career, such as fostering interpersonal relationships and developing personal integrity and self-reliance. We encourage residents to celebrate diversity and to appreciate the differences in their fellow residents' ethnic, socioeconomic, and family backgrounds.

Assessment Procedure

The Residence Life Office distributed surveys to all residents living in University housing facilities. These surveys were hand-delivered by staff, then collected and tabulated by the Residence Life Office. The residents were asked to evaluate current services offered, to provide suggestions for improvement, and to return their completed surveys to the appropriate housing office within a week.

Other comments have been noted by the people working at our front desks, who receive feedback as students are applying for housing and paying for services (Internet, bed lofts, etc.).

Findings

Of the 2,275 surveys distributed, 1,166 (51 percent) were returned. Respondents were asked to rate certain aspects of residence life on a scale of 1-5 (1 = very low, 5 = very high) and to provide thoughts and feedback via open-ended questions. Results indicated that the vast majority of respondents were satisfied with the services, facilities, and programs provided by Residence Life. Some respondents provided suggestions for improvement, mostly in the area of customer service.

Eighty-five percent of the students who responded had a computer in their room. One-third of the survey respondents answered “average” when asked about the ease of connecting to the computer network. Five percent of respondents wanted upgraded computers in the labs or wireless options. With more online classes being offered through the University, we will need to continuously upgrade our network to accommodate the increasing number of users in our halls.

Recommendations

Maintaining a competitive position in the Missoula housing market is a major priority. In forming our recommendations, we considered responses and suggestions from students, keeping in mind life safety code requirements, available resources, and the University’s goal to provide all students in residence halls with wired access to the Internet.

Residence Life should continue providing current services. Based on specific respondent feedback, we have made the following plans:

- Allow residence hall students free use of the coin-operated laundry facilities
- Improve the sign-up process for select services provided by Residence Life
- Continue to improve Residence Life Web pages, making them easier to navigate and read
- Explore the possibility of more computer labs
- Increase network speed
- Provide a wireless option
- Expand video surveillance outside residence halls for greater security
- Use Craighead and Sisson Villages as a beta site to test a limited wireless network solution
- Plan for and create classroom space and programs in the residence halls
- Plan and fund more capital improvement projects on a set schedule
- Provide additional training for staff in the following areas: 1) customer service (especially how to deal with difficult people); 2) employee supervision; 3) updated custodial cleaning techniques and products
- Work with Curry Health Center Health Enhancement to provide more information on personal safety and substance use and abuse at new student orientation

- Continue trying to increase faculty involvement with living/learning centers in residence halls
- Relocate the Residence Life Technology Center to Elrod Hall to consolidate services and provide better customer service for students
- Encourage students to pay for services online in an effort to increase overall usage
- Train staff on how to deal with disciplinary issues that involve illegal drug use, focusing on use of drugs that our staff have not been trained to handle
- Train staff on how to deal with suicide attempts, which are happening more frequently

Residence Life

University Villages Tenant Satisfaction Survey

Abstract

Residence Life - University Villages provides comfortable, competitively priced housing for University of Montana students and their families, fostering an environment that promotes academic learning and the positive aspects of community living. Residences meet all health and safety codes established by the state of Montana, and our instructive, co-curricular opportunities and programs support the educational mission of the University.

Every year, as we aim to meet the ever-changing needs of today's students and their families, we use surveys to assess our facilities and measure the efficacy of our services and programs, and we make changes and improvements based on the results. This year, tenants and their families were generally satisfied with the environment at University Villages and the services provided. However, some residents did suggest improvements in service delivery, customer service, community assistant visibility, and communication.

Background

University Villages strives to build a sense of community by offering educational services and programs tailored to single students and students with families. We encourage residents to celebrate diversity and to appreciate ethnic, socioeconomic, and family differences. We use a continually changing "Community Living Model" that promotes healthy values, behaviors, and choices essential to a successful college career, such as fostering interpersonal relationships and developing personal integrity.

The Tenant Satisfaction Survey is designed to collect data that would help us measure the efficacy of our program in ensuring safe facilities, providing an enjoyable and well-rounded experience for residents, and supporting their educational and co-curricular needs.

Assessment Procedure

In November 2005, we distributed a two-page survey to all UV residents through the UV newsletter, *The Cornerstone*. We instructed them to return it within 2-3 weeks to the main office, the community center, or their community assistant. The survey combined multiple choice questions with open-ended questions, prompting residents to rate or describe their level of satisfaction with community assistants, the University Villages Office, maintenance, customer service, community and safety. The survey also prompted residents to write down overall comments and suggestions in spaces provided. Residents were assured of confidentiality (names were not included on the surveys). We offered a grocery gift certificate as an incentive. After we received the surveys, we had a student compile the data and compute the percentages. Then we

wrote an assessment report and distributed it to the Director of Residence Life and the UV staff.

Findings

Out of 574 surveys distributed, 74 (13%) were returned (an 11% increase from 2004). Out of 74 surveys returned, 12 were not complete. Because some surveys were incomplete and because some respondents did not indicate where they lived, we have estimated the margin of error for percentages to be around 11 percent.

A vast majority of respondents were satisfied with the services, facilities, and programs of the University Villages. Some respondents provided suggestions for improvement, mostly regarding customer service, community assistants, and communication. The suggestions for improvement were as follows:

Community assistant staff

Excellent - 67%
Good - 20%
Poor - 13%

Maintenance personnel and repair

Handled repair in a timely manner; helpful and courteous - 76%
Repaired in a reasonable amount of time; made repair but not friendly - 21%
No one ever came to fix problem - 3%

UV main office staff

Excellent - 53%
Good - 39%
Poor - 8%

Community center

Does the community center provide good customer service or information?

Yes - 86%
No - 14%

Community safety

Do you feel safe living in the University Villages?

Yes - 96%
No - 4%

Percentage of tenants requesting more security patrol - 29%

Recommendations

We have established the following recommendations for action, based mostly on comments and suggestions that appeared five or more times in the surveys:

- Increase campus patrol, specifically in the form of foot patrol. We will pay special attention to the area around Maurice Avenue homes, which are located across the street from the Craighead and Sisson apartment complexes, because of problems we have had there in the past.
- Improve communication with tenants regarding policies and procedures, especially quiet hours and outdoor storage (improved communication might increase student understanding of UV policies and procedures, which might in turn increase student satisfaction with services).
- Increase security patrol of visitor parking and enforce rules that pertain to abandoned vehicles.
- Provide more lighting for UV areas, particularly on Cinnabar Drive.
- Improve customer service and service delivery.
- Increase visibility of community assistant staff.
- Host popular social events more frequently, such as bowling and barbeques, and create activities for single students.

University Center

Assessment of University Center using ACUI peer data



Submitted by Candy Holt, Director of University Center

University Center

Assessment of University Center using ACUI peer data

Abstract

The University Center (UC) analyzed data on other college unions at peer institutions and compared and contrasted our operations and services. Our goal was to assess whether the UC operates on par with “industry standards”. We found that staffing levels at the UC are below par when compared with similar institutions in the region.

Background

The University Center is the heart of The University of Montana, providing a gathering place with a welcoming atmosphere that is full of activity and rich in diversity. A bridge between formal classroom learning and life experience, activities coordinated by the University Center work in harmony with the mission of the University. The University Center provides information resources, a variety of high quality convenient services, a multitude of cultural programs, varied educational and entertainment events, and recreational and leisure activities. It serves as a place for free expression and the exchange of creative ideas.

The Association of College Unions International (ACUI) is our professional organization of choice. ACUI has compiled statistical, operational, and organizational data—on everything from staffing, salaries, services, and enrolled FTE, to building hours, maintenance, and overhead costs per square foot—for 187 college unions at various institutions. Access to the database is granted only to organization members that share information about their institution, so we spent a significant amount of time entering information about our operations into the system. In return, we were able to access benchmarking data for this assessment.

Assessment Procedure

In preparation for the Northwest Union Directors meeting in November 2005, UC staff entered numerical data into the ACUInfo database, responding to more than 693 questions about our operations. We then used the ACUInfo database to gather information on selected organizations that are located in the Northwest and have a reputation among ACUI members for being well-managed.

Findings

The University Center falls far below most of our peers in matters related to staffing. We have fewer permanent full-time staff and student staff, and our wages are lower than our peers in both employment categories. The UC ranks third highest in assignable square feet per employee (23,579 sq. ft.). For example, out of ten peers, the

average ratio of permanent, full-time custodial staff to building square footage is 20,644 square feet per staff member. If one considers that employees at the other organizations are not responsible for cleaning kitchen space and/or restorative cleaning, the UC's ratio becomes even more disproportionate.

Recommendations

The results of this assessment spurred a decision to augment staffing levels. By reallocating the budget, we were able to fund a permanent Administrative Associate in Administrative Offices and a full-time staff position that will split event support and custodial duties. Though this latter position will provide a regular staff presence during weekend days, it will not fully remedy the critical need for additional custodial staff FTE, in both permanent and student labor. Therefore, in the next biennium, funding a dedicated full-time position on the night crew to address the shortage of custodial hours will be a high priority. We hope to perform further analysis to identify other areas requiring staffing and/or organizational structure changes.

University Dining Services

Guest Satisfaction Survey



Submitted by Byron Drake, Assistant Director for Residential Dining, University Dining
Services

University Dining Services

Guest Satisfaction Survey

Abstract

Each year, University Dining Services (UDS) assesses guest satisfaction with meal plans and cash operations by administering a voluntary survey to guests. Trends in foodservice change constantly; therefore, it is necessary to stay abreast of guests' preferences in order to succeed.

Survey results indicated that guests are generally pleased with our services. We are currently reviewing specific comments within each venue and developing action plans to respond to suggestions and address areas of dissatisfaction.

Background

UDS supports the University by cultivating partnerships with our guests, employees, and community. Our efforts are focused on providing consistency, quality, and value. We respect the rights and dignity of our employees and guests. We achieve our mission through **SERVICE**:

- Standards that meet or exceed our guests' expectations
- Environment that fosters diversity and growth
- Responsive employees and accessible facilities
- Vision and innovation
- Integrity and professionalism
- Commitment to excellence
- Education of guests and employees

SERVICE is expressed in our motto: "Satisfying guests is our business."

UDS is a self-operating state auxiliary, providing foodservice for the multi-campus community of The University of Montana. To measure our success and gather information for future planning, UDS utilizes a variety of assessment methods.

Assessment Procedure

We distributed Guest Satisfaction Surveys at six venues: The Food Zoo; Cascade Country Store; La Peak; Biz Buzz; Think Tank; and the UC Food Court. We assessed satisfaction in a variety of categories, from menu selection to ambiance.

Guest Satisfaction Surveys are administered at the same time each year, once in the fall and once in the spring. The UDS marketing manager designs the surveys and obtains the approval of each assistant director. Core questions are consistent in every survey (areas covered always include "environment," "menu," etc.), but surveys include

venue-specific questions as well. Most questions ask respondents to rank an aspect of Dining Services on a scale of 1-5.

Cashiers distribute the surveys at each venue, and guests return them to collection boxes located at each venue. We compile the raw data, record any additional comments, and combine this information with survey results from prior years to allow for comparative analysis. The marketing manager presents an overview of the findings. This has been our process since fall 2001.

In spring 2006, 997 surveys were returned. Small incentives, such as a chance to win a free smoothie, were offered, but most of the participation was generated by friendly cashiers.

Findings

Survey results were mostly positive. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1= poor, 5 = excellent), each venue achieved an average score of 3.5 or above, measured across 13 comparators. The overall average score (the average of all averages taken together) has increased over the last five years, from 3.61 in 2001 to 3.983 in 2006.

Other findings, which pertain specifically to Think Tank, include:

Guests

- 80% student, 18% faculty staff
- Students are well distributed among classes (freshman through graduate)
- 55% live off campus (25% unknown)
- 64% visit 3 or more times a week
- 86% visit before noon

Strengths

- High scores overall
- When given a choice between location, price and Cravens Coffee, as reasons to frequent Think Tank, "location" was the most common "reason to frequent" (97%)
- "Speed of service" was rated .23 points higher this year and respondents' answers were less varied
- 161 surveys were returned, Think Tanks highest return rate ever

Opportunities

- Cravens Coffee continues to rank low (10%) for "reason to frequent," when respondents are asked to compare with "location," "price" and "other"
- Opinion varied widely when respondents were asked to rate "healthy choices," "price," "hours" and "speed of service" (opinions were either very positive or very negative)
- Of all food-related topics, "variety" received the lowest score
- Numbers of guests who visit 5 or more times a week dropped slightly from 35% to 28%

Key Comments

- Why do you choose Think Tank?
 - great mochas
 - good coffee
 - staff

Noted suggestions on back of survey

- Prices are too high, but I pay for the convenience
- Too slow in between class times
- Add express line for drip coffee
- Stay open later

Recommendations

Venue managers are expected to maintain high scores and develop action plans to address areas of low satisfaction. Several changes have already been implemented, or are currently being discussed, as a result of the survey. Here is a sampling of such changes:

1. The University Food Court has already addressed complaints about the speed of service at the grill and dessert kiosks.
2. We will provide new options in the Grab-and-Go area and on the Pacific Rim menu.
3. We will be examining portion sizes with value perception in mind.
4. We will market healthy options in the Cascade Country Store more effectively by using signs and advertising in the Kaimin.
5. We plan to address perceptions of food quality in the Cascade Country Store.
6. The number of guests who consider crepes a good reason to visit La Peak jumped from 2% to 20%; enhanced marketing efforts should grow our customer base even more.
7. Think Tank has resolved the speed of service issues that last year's survey uncovered.
8. One survey question asked respondents why they choose Think Tank and gave them three multiple choice options (price, convenience, Craven's Coffee) and one "Other" option with a fill-in-the-blank. Only 10% of respondents pointed to Cravens as a reason to frequent The Think Tank. We will consider alternatives, such as Liquid Planet.

9. According to the surveys, the number of guests who named the Starbucks brand as a reason to visit Biz Buzz declined from 27% to 16%. We will address this in our Operations Plan.

10. Zero respondents at Biz Buzz hailed from the School of Music, which is located directly across the street. We will implement a targeted marketing campaign to attract patrons from the School of Music.