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ABSTRACT

The practice of competency modeling has been widely applied as a strategic human resource initiative in the United States and abroad (Schuler & Jackson, 2005). It is estimated that 70–80% of Fortune 500 companies use some form of competency modeling within their talent management programs to define and/or measure work performance (Stone, Webster & Schoonover, 2013). This widespread popularity is likely explained by the many proposed benefits of competency modeling adoption. Some of these benefits include directly linking future-oriented talent requirements to business objectives and strategies, integrating talent programs across HR functions, and offering a more flexible and adaptable method to study work in a dynamic business environment.

While many articles debate competency modeling methods and best practices, little empirical evidence exists to support the broad claims that competency modeling improves organizational performance, warranting the need to empirically and critically examine proponents’ claims (Dubois, 1993; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Rahbar-Daniels, Erickson & Dalik, 2001; Stone et al., 2013). As such, this is a topic wanting and ready for empirical research. This research seeks to address this gap and extend the literature by examining the effectiveness of competency modeling as an organizational development intervention to improve organizational performance.

The organization that served as the case study and foundation of the research is a residential education department at a large private, Midwestern university that implemented a competency model immediately after redefining
their mission, vision, goals and values to reflect the departmental philosophy following reorganization. By implementing a competency model as an organizational development intervention, the department could directly articulate how employees’ roles and responsibilities relate to the overall department philosophy and ensure that all personnel practices and organizational activities are aligned to fulfill the departmental mission, vision, goals and values (Campion, Fink, Ruggeberg, Carr, Phillips & Odman, 2011; Shippmann, Ash, Battista, Carr, Eyde, Hesketh, Keyhoe, Pearlman, Prien & Sanchez, 2000).

The goals of this research were twofold. First, validity evidence was established for the competency model as a tool to measure and improve employee performance. Secondly, the effectiveness of the competency modeling as an organizational development intervention to improve organizational performance was investigated using a longitudinal non-equivalent control group quasi-experimental design. Results provided the first published empirical evidence demonstrating that competency modeling can sustainably improve organization performance and lend support to the theory and practice of competency modeling as an organization development initiative. While initial results are promising and support some of the claimed benefits of competency modeling to date (Dubois, 1993; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001; Stone et al., 2013), the causal mechanisms that are involved and impact practical effectiveness of competency modeling are still not well understood by the field. This area of study has much to explore and would continue to benefit from additional research to explain both how and why competency modeling may be effective in improving
organization performance. Practical implications as well as contributions of the research to the literature are discussed.
INTRODUCTION

According to Schippmann (2010), competency modeling, despite its merits or faults, “is here to stay.” (p. 197). Such a bold statement would not be made without sufficient evidence, and having studied the industry, practice and methods of competency modeling for well-over a decade, he would be well versed and possess the credibility to do so. Dr. Schippmann is not alone in his assessment, as many scholars in the field of psychology and management sciences have been advocating for methods that better adapt and align human resource functions to the needs of an increasing complex and dynamic business environment (Athey & Orth, 1999; Lawler, 1994; McLagan, 1997; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Schippmann, 2010; Singh, 2008). The need for more flexibility and adaptability in HR practices has boosted competency modeling’s popularity, as it has been widely used to align HR and talent management practices for improved organizational responsiveness and ease of use, often a criticism of traditional job and work analytic approaches (Campion, Fink, Ruggeberg, Carr, Phillips & Odman, 2011; Le Deist & Winterton, 2005, Rodriguez, Patel, Bright, Gregory, & Gowing, 2002; Stone et al., 2013). It is not surprising that competency modeling has been leveraged to incorporate more traditionally rigorous methods of studying work (Campion et al. 2011), as nearly 70–80% of Fortune 500 companies use some form competency modeling within their talent management programs to define and/or measure work performance (Stone et al., 2013).

Competency modeling has been a popular practice for some time. “By the mid-1990’s, practice and application had outstripped research and reporting by
such a huge margin that nobody had a clear sense of what was going on” (Schippmann, 2010, p. 204). Not surprisingly, significant gaps resulted between the scientist and practitioner literature, likely due to the diverse traditions, cultural contexts, and different levels of analysis that have informed the practice (Le Deist & Winterton 2005; Meriot, 2005; Schippmann et al., 2000; Schippmann, 2010). As such, it has been recommended that the effectiveness of the approach needs to be critically examined to support proponents’ claims of competency modeling being an effective tool to improve organizational performance (Dubois, 1993; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999). Despite competency modeling’s popularity, “competency modeling has not received the critical review its widespread adoption merits” and “research should use more objective measures of effectiveness” (Stone et al. 2013; p.338); thus, this research aims to address this gap in the literature by establishing validity evidence and examining the effectiveness of competency modeling as an organizational development intervention.

To support the hypotheses and research questions, the literature regarding the following topics will be reviewed: 1) The Diverse Definition of a Competency; 2) Competency Modeling as a Strategic Human Resource Practice; 3) The Practice of Competency Modeling to Enhance Individual and Organizational Performance.
The Diverse Definition of a Competency

David McClelland (1973) is often credited with launching the competency movement when his research suggested that academic aptitude and knowledge tests alone did not predict strong job performance or successful life outcomes. As such, McClelland outlined an approach to predicting ‘competence’ as an alternative to the accepted intelligence tests; however, in his article he does not explicitly define what a competency is or offer empirical support in favor of competency testing, foreshadowing the many challenges that competency modeling research has experienced since its inception. Table 1 details some examples of the competency definitions used in the field since McClelland’s seminal article:

Table 1

*Definitions of the Term Competency by Publication Date*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guion, 1991, p. 335</td>
<td>Competencies are underlying characteristics of people and indicate ways of behaving or thinking, generalizing across situations, and enduring for a reasonably long period of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois, 1993, p. 9</td>
<td>Is an underlying characteristic of an employee (i.e., motive, trait, skill, aspects of one's self image, social role, or a body of knowledge) which results in effective and or superior performance in a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer, McLelland &amp; Spencer, 1994, p. 4</td>
<td>Competencies can be motives, traits, self-concepts, attitudes or values, content knowledge, or cognitive or behavioral skills - any individual characteristic that can be measured or counted reliably and that can be shown to differentiate significantly between superior and average performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleishman, Wetrogan, Uhlman, &amp; Marshall-Mies, 1995, p. 10.1</td>
<td>A mixture of knowledge, skills, abilities, motivation, beliefs, values, and interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry 1996, p. 50</td>
<td>A cluster of related knowledge, skills and attitudes that affects a major part of one’s job (i.e., a role or responsibility), that correlates with performance on the job, that can be measured against well accepted standards, and that can be improved via training and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirabile, 1997, p. 75</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills, abilities, or other characteristics associated with high performance on a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solderquist, Papalexandris, Ioannou &amp; Prastacos, 2010, p. 326</td>
<td>A holistic definition of the individual-based competency arises as the knowledge, skills and abilities that underlie effective or successful job performance, which are observable, measurable, and distinguish superior from average performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia &amp; Lespingner, 1999, p. 5</td>
<td>Identifies the skills, knowledge, personal characteristics, and behaviors needed to effectively perform a role in the organization and help the business meet its strategic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, 1999, p. 5</td>
<td>A written description of measurable work habits and personal skills used to achieve work objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athey &amp; Orth, 1999, p. 216</td>
<td>A set of observable performance dimensions, including individual knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors, as well as collective team, process, and organizational capabilities, that are linked to high performance, and provide the organization with sustainable competitive advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartram Robertson, I. T., &amp; Callinan, 2002, p. 7</td>
<td>Sets of behaviors that are instrumental in the delivery of desired results or outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buford &amp; Lindner, 2002, p. 3</td>
<td>A validated decision tool, correlated to a specific group of activities that describes key knowledge, skills, and abilities for performing those activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schippmann, 2010, p. 198</td>
<td>Competencies are the measurable, organizationally relevant, and behaviorally based capabilities of people that reflect the knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOs) to descriptors that have become more specific, behavioral and useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion et al., 2011, p. 226</td>
<td>Competency models refer to collections of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) that are needed for effective performance in the jobs in question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upon review of the literature and demonstrated by the diversity of definitions presented in Table 1, it becomes clear that historically, there has not been clear conceptual alignment across definitions of a competency. One of the most evident differences is whether a competency should represent some combination of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) or is it more accurately thought of as a behavioral measure (Bartram et al., 2002; Stevens, 2013). Another difference pertains to the breadth of what is included in a competency. While some argue for basic knowledge, skills, and abilities (Campion, et al 2011; Mirabile, 1997), others advocate broader conceptualizations, including motivation, beliefs, values, interests, traits, and attitudes (e.g., Athey & Orth, 1999; Fleishman et al., 1995; Spencer, & Spencer, 1993). Also, the definitions tend to differ in regards to the need to distinguish higher performers (Athey & Orth, 1999; Mirabile, 1997), or merely achieve work expectations for effective performance (Green, 1999; Campion et al., 2011). Finally, the literature often speaks to competencies at different levels of analysis whether it is conceptualized at the individual position, team, job-family or at the organization level (Dubois, 1993; Spencer & Spencer, 1993; Athey & Orth, 1999; Mansfield, 1996). Additionally, Woodruffe (1993) suggests that some confusion may stem from a lack of distinction between what is meant by competency and competence. He explains that competencies are aspects of the person that allow him or her to be competent at different aspects of the job, while a competency is a set of behavior patterns that an individual must bring to the job in order to perform its tasks and functions with competence. Similarly, Campion and
colleagues (2010) suggest that competencies usually include a description of the process (i.e., how effective performance occurs) as well as the content (i.e., what effective performance is).

It is not surprising that conceptual ambiguity exists mostly due to the diverse traditions, methods, cultures, and academic fields that have informed the practice (Lado, Boyd & Wright, 1992; Le deist & Winterton 2005; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Schippmann et al., 2000; Schippmann, 2010; Schuler & Jackson, 2005). The differences noted above led Schippmann and colleagues (2000) to conclude that the term competency may have “no meaning apart from the particular definition with whom one is speaking” (p. 706), and why competency assessment is considered the “Achilles” heel (i.e., a potential weakness) of competency modeling (Catano, Darr & Campbell, 2007).

The tendency to ignore empirical distinctiveness is not a problem limited to competency modeling research; however, it runs contrary to the law of parsimony and has profound implications for the research and practice of the field. For example, while performance seems to be central to the conceptual definition of competencies, when discussing how to operationalize or measure competencies, reasoning can become circular and slippery, especially if KSAOs and behaviors are also used to assess effective work performance (i.e., the act of doing a job or task for a specific outcome). When seeking specific performance outcomes, it can be easy to begin with the end in mind, meaning that by defining competencies practitioners may just be defining performance expectations in terms of KSAOs and behaviors. This highlights one of many conceptual issues
that the field has grappled with and without resolution. Further, without clear operational definitions, consistent measurement and assessment become difficult goals and limits advancement of the field.

Given that conceptual confusion and inconsistent operationalization was prevalent (Schippmann, 2010; Stevens, 2013), the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychologists commissioned a task force in 1997 to review and critique the practice of competency modeling (Schippmann et al., 2000). This task force helped to motivate and focus future research efforts. Since the task force’s engagement, several researchers have attempted to reach consensus on definitions, applications and best practices of competency modeling (e.g., Campion et al., 2011; Sanchez & Levine, 2009; Schippmann, 2010), and seem to be making some progress towards conceptual clarity. Although no unifying formal definition exists, most definitions indicate that ‘competencies’ are behaviors, skills, abilities and/or knowledge that align with organizational strategies and are necessary for successful performance (Campion et al., 2011; Stone et al., 2013); in that the competencies (i.e., KSAOs and behaviors) enable effective performance through the action or possession of those qualities and attributes. Stevens and colleagues (2013) claim that “the basic parameters within which that competency is established—the definition, so to speak—seem now to be agreed on by a majority of the field” (p. 92).

Despite that the field has work to do to clearly define and operationalize the competencies, for purposes of this research, Campion, and colleagues’ (2011) definition will be used for both for its relative simplicity and for its merging of
common aspects of other definitions. With a clearer consensus and understanding of how competencies themselves are defined, the following section focuses more closely on the practice of competency modeling, particularly how it is used in organizations, and for what purposes.

**Competency Modeling as a Strategic Human Resource Practice**

The term “strategic human resource management” is used among HR practitioners to assert that human resource management activities should contribute to business effectiveness, and that effective human resource management leads to improved organizational performance (Schuler & Jackson, 1999). The field of Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) directly links the practice of human resources to organizational effectiveness and performance; in that, when employees are able to implement an organization’s strategy, they offer strategic value, especially when the talent strategy is integrated across the business (Becker & Huselid, 2006; Schuler & Jackson, 2005). Competency modeling is often used as a mechanism for that integration, offering tremendous value to organizations if competency modeling works to enhance organizational performance as theorized (Campion et al., 2011; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Rodriguez et al., 2002). With a few exceptions there has been little effort to extend SHRM theory in a way that formally defines the mechanism through which the human resource function actually influences organizational performance, but Becker and Huselid (2006), suggest that perhaps competency modeling may serve as that mechanism. Similar to training, competency modeling
can communicate and clarify how effective performance is demonstrated within a specific context; however, within organizations, selection, development and recruitment are separate processes that aim to accomplish similar but unique goals. As such, competency modeling offers unique value, as it can provide a framework that enables alignment across the separate functions despite their unique applications through the use of competency identification and communication, a goal that in my experience, training and other change programs do not often provide.

Competency modeling is the research procedure used for identifying and defining a structure of capability requirements for success for a given target of jobs (i.e., at the organization, job family or position level; Bartram, 2004; Schippmann, 2010). Competency models are usually 1) directly linked to business objectives and strategies, 2) consider future job requirements either directly or indirectly, 3) are intentionally used to align the HR systems, and 4) are used as an organizational development intervention that seeks broad organizational change; all of which, are some key differences between traditional job analysis methods and competency modeling (Campion et al., 2011; Schippmann 2010).

Given that the literature has extensively debated the differences between traditional job analysis and competency modeling, this topic will not be discussed in detail within this literature review (Sackett & Laczo, 2003; Sanchez & Levine, 2009; Sanchez & Levine, 2012; Schippmann et al., 2000; Stevens, 2013); especially, since the use of specific job analytic techniques is largely dependent on the choices one must make given the purpose of the analysis (Brannick, Levine
& Morgeson, 2007; Sackett & Laczo, 2003; Schippmann, 1999), and competency modeling initiatives often seek other goals and outcomes entirely (Campion et al., 2011; Schippmann, 2010).

The use of a competency-based approach as the basis for human resource management has been widely adopted in the United States and is gaining prevalence in international human resource practices (Athey & Orth, 1999; Schuler & Jackson, 2005; Stone et al., 2013). Competency models are claimed to enable the workforce to be more efficient and adaptable to the demands of the business, a considerable critical advantage in today’s competitive and dynamic business environment (Dubois & Rothwell, 2004; Lawler, 1996; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001; Sliter, 2015).

The need for organizational responsiveness is a concern echoed in the literature. Many publications today contain references to trends that are predicted to affect businesses in the future, which will ultimately affect the HR function. Some global trends that are likely to increase the need for organizational responsiveness include: 1) technological change, 2) increased globalization, 3) the continued need to control costs, 4) the accelerated speed in which markets change, 5) growing importance of knowledge capital, and 6) increased rate and magnitude of change (Cummings & Worley, 2009; Rothwell, Prescott & Taylor, 1998).

Competency modeling is perceived as a long-desired solution to enhance organizational responsiveness for a couple of reasons. First, competency modeling works to define requirements for success through the constellation and combination of KSAOs, which provides a distinct advantage as many of today’s
jobs require complex and collaborative problem solving skills (Sliter, 2015). Further, competency modeling works to align both the current and future needs of positions to the organization’s business strategy, enabling management to better anticipate, adapt and manage the speed of change needed for organizational and work design (Lawler, 1994; McLagan, 1997; Schippmann, 1999, 2010; Schuler & Jackson, 2005; Singh, 2008; Sliter, 2015); which in turn, helps organizations compete in complicated global environments prevalent in the 21st century (Gangani, Mclean & Braden, 2006; Lawler, 1994; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Schippmann, 2010; Schwartz, 1991).

The notion that competency modeling may provide a competitive advantage for adopting organizations was popularized by Prahalad and Hamel (1990). They introduced the concept of “core competence” to refer to the unique "people-embodied skills,” intellectual, process, and product skills associated with market competitiveness for an organization. They position core competencies as being particularly advantageous because core competencies may not be immediately apparent to competitors and "unlike physical assets, competencies do not deteriorate as they are applied and shared. They grow." (p. 82). Further, these desired capabilities may be intentionally and systematically developed by the choices and actions of business leaders (Bourgeois, 1984; Child, 1972; Lado et al., 1992; Smircich & Stubbart, 1985); suggesting, that competency models can strengthen core business operations, thereby positioning the business to gain a competitive advantage. As such, many focus their efforts in developing talent competencies or capabilities to enhance organizational performance and better
position themselves competitively within the external environment (Athey & Orth 1999; Lado et al., 1992; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001).

Harnessing organizational talent is becoming increasingly critical to organizational growth and survival, as recognized by the literature on individual and organizational learning (Argyris, 1991; Argyris & Schon, 1978; Senge, 1992; Schein, 1993a, 1993b). If competencies are the outcome of an organization’s collective learning and performance capabilities as theorized by Prahalad and Hamel (1990), it is not surprising to hear that organizations have adopted competency modeling to help cultivate the core KSAOs and behaviors that are perceived to offer companies a competitive advantage. Also, it explains why competency models are used today in a wide range of purposes within human resources, ranging from selection, retention, and leadership development to organizational strategic planning in order to align key organizational activities and processes around these core competencies needed for success, determined usually through thorough future-oriented job analytic research approaches (Campion et al., 2010) Gangani, Mclean, & Braden, 2006; Lawler, 1994; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001; Rodriguez et al., 2002; Schippmann, 1999; Schippmann, 2010; Schippmann et al., 2000). Competency modeling has even been used to bridge individual career development and organizational strategy. It is believed that by promoting the transferable competencies within an organization, competency modeling can facilitate internal workforce mobility, allowing individuals to staff strategic operations and develop organizationally desired capabilities (Martone, 2003; Olesen, White & Lemmer, 2007; Rothwell &
Lindholm, 1999). Further, competency-based performance management systems often delineate the performance criteria for each level of management so that employees know what competencies must be mastered in order to be considered for advancement or increased compensation (Martone, 2003; Zingheim, Ledford, & Schuster, 1996).

McLagan (1980) and Boyatzis (1982) conceptualized competency modeling as a focus for organizing, integrating, planning and improving all aspects of human resource management systems, and has often been used as an organizational development tool by aligning human resource (HR) systems so that employees are hired, trained, evaluated, compensated, and promoted based on the same attributes (Campion et al., 2011; Isle, 1993). An integrated talent system is particularly appealing in an environment where there is the increased need for, speed, simplicity, and practices that are more sophisticated and interrelated (Rothwell, Prescott & Taylor, 1998; Schippmann, 2010). Further, competency modeling provides a scalable platform for the broad range of talent and change management approaches that will be required to guide and elevate the HR practices needed for an increasingly competitive and complex business environment (Schippmann, 2010). Due to competency modeling’s broad applications and explicit link to business strategy, competency modeling initiatives often become highly visible organizational development interventions and are often led by senior management (Campion et al., 2011; Schippmann, 2010). A clear competency-based framework creates awareness and aligns the skills, knowledge, behaviors, characteristics, and motivations associated with a
company strategy; thereby, creating a common language to describe jobs, while ensuring validity, eliminating cross-functional inconsistencies, and reducing the cost of developing independent/redundant models within an organization (Campion et al., 2011; Rodriguez et al., 2002). Companies find this to be especially valuable given the ever-present need for efficiency and control of costs (Mansfield, 1996; Rodriguez et al., 2002; Sackett & Laczo, 2003).

Another appeal of competency modeling stems from the need to identify performance behaviors that drive organizational strategies and goals (Campion et al., 2011). Competency modeling is focused on improving organizational performance through HR strategy and partnership, as competency-based practices work to align key HR programs with the strategic imperatives of an organization (Rothwell & Lindholm, 1999; Schippmann, 2010). A strong influence behind the adoption of competency-based practices is the growing need for HR professionals to accelerate the translation of business imperatives into new learning and performance requirements much more quickly and to meet business demands and challenges (Athey & Orth, 1999; Henson, 2012). The movement to a competency-oriented approach to organizing requires a change in the mindset and operations of the company and raises issues concerning how individuals will adapt to this change (Lawler, 1994). HR is seen as being essential in enabling organizations to respond quickly to changing needs by linking job/organizational related competencies to the organizational mission and goals, as well as providing a clear line of sight from individual and team performance to organizational success (Rodriguez et al., 2002; Rothwell & Lindholm, 1999). As human resources
continues to evolve its roles to meet challenging business environments, competency modeling methods can be instrumental in aligning fragmented talent processes or functions, and their associated behavioral indicators become a common language across all talent functions that may have previously relied on their own tools and languages (Athly & Orth, 1999; Campion et al., 2011; Stevens, 2013).

While competency modeling may present many organizational benefits, there are numerous challenges for practitioners in implementing them that are both daunting and exciting (Athey & Orth, 1999). Organizations have many available methods to build, apply and measure competency models. According to the literature, in order to utilize competency-based human development strategy efficiently, business leaders and HR practitioners need to align on a number of fundamental issues, including 1) gaining leadership support; 2) linking competency-based approach to the organizational mission, values and objectives 3) building a conceptual framework with appropriate language and level of technical/functional specificity for the competency models; 4) adopting appropriate development methodology for a rigorous model that may be used for multiple purposes and based on future strategic requirements; 5) appropriately socializing the new initiative with employees; and 6) measuring the impact of competency-based practices on organizational performance (Campion et al., 2011; Cook & Bernthal, 1998; Gangani et al., 2006; Green, 1999; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001).
Given these challenges, the decision to introduce competency models into the organization should not be taken lightly (Gangani et al., 2006; Mirabile, 1997; Stevens, 2013). Without the proper due diligence, a competency modeling effort may not realize the anticipated benefits and could be an expensive endeavor (Rodriguez et al., 2002; Stevens, 2013). Rather, it is suggested that competency modeling be approached with a thorough understanding of theory, methods, and knowledge of the applied context and design elements that will influence the required amount of structure, documentation, and rigor (Campion et al., 2011).

The Practice of Competency Modeling to Enhance Individual and Organizational Performance

Performance management and assessment is one of the most important human resource systems, due to the belief that the performance of individuals within an organization is the primary driver of organizational success (Mondy, Noe, & Premeaux, 2002; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Performance appraisal systems are considered a necessary evil for organizations. These systems influence outcomes that have serious consequences for both organizations and individuals, including legal complaints, terminations, promotions, compensation, etc. (Pulakos, Hanson, Arad & Moye, 2015). Pulakos and colleagues (2015) contend that performance management systems often disappoint due to poor responsiveness to organizations’ needs. They suggest designing performance management systems to be more forward looking, align individual behaviors to organization goals and strategy, and equip employees with tools to monitor
behavior and results, all of which are considered to be enabled by the use
competency models. This clear linkage of performance behaviors to business
strategy can help individuals understand their role within the broader
organizational context, thereby enabling cohesion, alignment and stabiliziation of
the organization during disruptive organizational changes (Rahbar-Daniels et al.,
2001; Dubois & Rockwell, 2004). Further, these needs may justify why
competency models are often used as part of a performance management system
and implemented to enhance organizational performance (Campion et al., 2011).

However, a performance system leveraging a competency model must
meet the same standards of any other system, as companies are most likely to win
legal challenges when the following conditions are met: 1) the tool is based on
documented job analysis, 2) it is behaviorally based, 3) tools are used for
coaching and rating employee’s performance; 4) reliability and validity of
decisions are documented, and 5) the results have been reviewed with the
employee (Latham, Almost, Mann & Moore, 2005).

One of the many proposed advantages of using competency based
performance management practice is that it helps to communicate to individuals
how their role enables and delivers upon organizational strategy as well as
providing a high-degree of face validity to employees (Campion et al., 2011;
Sackett & Laczo, 2003; Schippmann et al., 2000). By communicating individual
performance criteria needed for success, competency models deliberately
articulate specific knowledge, skills, abilities, other characteristics and behaviors
that are linked to organizational mission and strategy, as well as connect
employees the values and vision of an organization (Campion et al., 2011). Further, competency models typically describe not only what really matters in terms of job performance but how effective performance occurs through robust behavioral descriptions. By explaining to individuals how to be successful within a specific environment, competency models can enhance learning, feedback and performance outcomes (Campion et al., 2011; Cannon & Whitherspoon, 2005; Gangani et al., 2006). This serves an important purpose, as an organizations’ capacity to perform is not a function of a single input but rather the product and output of individuals’ competencies emerging within an organizational environment. By aligning employee’s performance expectations with organizational strategy, the collective performance output for the organization should be much greater than that of individuals working independently, and competency modeling can enable this alignment, as well as communicate the behavioral requirements to fulfill the strategy.

It is theorized that through competency modeling, organizations can be more competitive by strengthening core capabilities, identifying and raising standards, and reinforcing the behaviors that lead to the top performance across individuals, rather than simply evaluating behaviors required for adequate performance (Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001). This common practice of identifying high-performance behaviors linked to business strategies, and using the organization’s language to generate buy-in and enhance ease of use, is believed to provide employees a clear, future focused view of the behaviors that the
organization will require for success, and is one of the primary drivers of adoption (Campion et al., 2011; Isle, 1993; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001).

**OVERVIEW**

While some researchers have documented the practice of implementing a competency based performance management system (Catano et al., 2007; Gangani et al., 2006; Jones, 1995; Nolan, 1998), the causal mechanisms that are involved and impact practical effectiveness of competency modeling are still not well understood by the field. Further, empirical evidence has not been published to support the broad claims that implementing a performance management system that leverages a competency model based design will improve organizational performance.

As such, this document outlines two research studies that examine the validity and effectiveness of a competency model that was developed as part of an external consulting project and implemented to enhance performance after a re-organization at a university’s residential education department. The first study aims to establish validity evidence for the competency model as a tool to measure and improve employee performance. The second study will investigate the effectiveness of competency modeling as an organizational development intervention to improve organizational performance and outcomes. If proposed hypotheses are supported, it will provide the first empirical evidence demonstrating that competency modeling can improve organization performance, and lend support to the theory and practice of competency modeling as an organization development initiative.
Background and Context of Applied Case Study

**Consulting Project Overview.** In this study, the organization is a residential education department at a large, private, Midwestern university. The Residential Education department is part of the university’s Student Affairs division and provides a variety of key programs and services aimed at responding to student needs and ensuring a quality residential experience. The department devotes time, talent and resources to build a relational, residential community where students are encouraged to explore, learn and develop holistically. The department provides three main services to fulfill their mission. First, the provide programming for the residential student population for social, experiential and academic skill development and to promote student success. Secondly, the department enables and manages the residential student conduct process to engage students in learning opportunities aimed at encouraging students to be responsible for their actions. Lastly, the department provides 24/7 availability of both professional and student staff (RD and RA) for emergency response and action to ensure a safe, engaging and learning community.

The residential education department implemented a competency model to enhance organizational performance after reorganizing and redefining their mission, vision, goals and values to reflect the departmental and institutional philosophy. As such, the consulting project aimed to meet four main objectives:

1) Modify the current departmental mission, vision and goals statements with input from key stakeholders in order to more accurately reflect and ensure
alignment of the departmental philosophy and objectives. This was done through interviews and focus groups with employees, students, constituents and benchmarking with best practices in the field.

2) Identify and document Residential Education organizational core values with input from key stakeholders to improve communication and integration of the departmental values throughout organizational activities and personnel practices.

3) Demonstrate how the core values may “come to life” at different jobs within Residential Education by integrating job description and competency analysis approaches, while aligning competencies with professional standards and best practices.

4) Create specific suggestions for how personnel practices (e.g., training, selection, evaluation, and performance appraisal) can more strategically include the department’s mission, vision, goals and core values through the implementation of the new competency model.

As an outcome of this work, the department re-aligned its mission and vision with national and university standards in a way that best represented the realities and philosophy of the department. The consultants delivered on this goal through a series of interviews and examination of national standards. In addition, revised departmental goals and values were adopted. Finally, a competency model was developed that was conceptually linked to the greater mission, vision and
values, and behaviorally linked to the individual position descriptions. More detail on the consulting project work that initiated the competency modeling project is provided in Appendix A.

**Competency Model Development.** In order to develop the competency model, the external organizational consultants employed multiple research and job analytic methods to develop the competency model, including 1) needs assessment and review of internal organizational strategic resources/research, 2) review and incorporation of national associations’ standards and professional competency model, and 3) a survey of incumbents to ensure comprehensive representation of performance requirements in job descriptions (see Appendix B). The applied approach used to develop the competency model closely aligns with the “Generic Model Overlay Method,” outlined in Dubois’ (1993) book; in which, he suggests that this approach is best used when an industry model can be leveraged for efficiency, especially when individualized development is the primary goal. Moreover, Dubois (1993) proposes that models developed by associations are usually high quality, useful and comprehensive given their investment and focus in pursuing a competency modeling endeavor. Specifically, as long as organizational fit is assured, it should be relatively straightforward in adopting an industry model. In doing so, the benefits of competency modeling may be realized, while at the same time avoiding the pitfalls of blindly applying a competency model in a different organizational setting or context (Campion et al., 2011; Stevens, 2013).
Given that the two largest comprehensive student affairs professional associations in the United States, specifically the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), collaborated, established and endorsed one set of professional competencies for the broad field of student affairs, this competency model framework was used as the foundation to create a customized model. The new model was designed to not only reflect competencies needed for the higher education administration and student affairs profession but would also apply to all members of the Department, including students, and emphasize the specific values and requirements of the institution. For a more detailed review of the professional competency development effort by the joint task force, please refer to the published technical report (ACPA, 2010).

To adapt the professional competencies to the organization, knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOs) relevant to both student and professional staff were used to select among the professional competencies that best reflected the values and mission of the department and university (Appendix A). Since the department competencies were required to apply to student staff, four competencies were not included in the customized model (i.e., reducing the number of competencies from ten to six). Next, the organizational consultants linked the core values to the corresponding departmental competencies by 1) determining alignment to values based on content representation (see Figure 1); and 2) utilizing research findings from their previous consulting work and focus groups that defined the values of the department (Appendix A).
Figure 1. Industry competencies mapped to the institutional values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Added Competency</th>
<th>Inspired by ACPA/NASPA Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Inclusion and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (to Others)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ☑ Represents; ☒ Not represented

Through multiple approaches detailed above, a competency model for all Residential Education employees that was aligned with professional standards was created to integrate the core values of the department into organizational practices, as well as reflect the collection of knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOs) necessary to successfully perform the employees’ job duties and fulfill the department’s mission, vision, goals and values. In this sense, the competencies were “blended” using methodological rigor in design, while incorporating the department’s strategy when developing the broad competencies (Schippmann et al., 2000). Further, a blended approach is likely to improve the accuracy and quality of inferences made from the resulting competency model (Lievens, Sanchez, & De Corte, 2004; Schippmann et al., 2000). The resulting core competencies are detailed in Study 1 methods and Appendix A.
**Competency Model Implementation.** The competency model was used to articulate the alignment of the competencies to the overall mission, vision, values and goals of Residential Education and to communicate to employees how they contribute to the success of the department. The competencies include, Professionalism, Inclusion & Diversity, Leadership, Learning & Development, Advising and Mentoring and Readiness (i.e., PILLAR). As described earlier, these competencies are essential to effective performance for both employees and the department, and aligned to industry and institutional requirements, standards and values.

To help employees recognize how they are helping to fulfill the overall mission and values of the department through performance of their individual job responsibilities, every job description was assessed and each duty/responsibility for each position was mapped onto the competency model and made available to employees. These results for the Resident Advisor (RA) and Resident Director (RD) are presented in Appendices C & D accordingly. This linkage of competencies to specific positions was used to strengthen the department’s ability to communicate and promote the importance of their foundational mission, vision, values and goals through employees’ activities and provide a clear line of sight between individual performance and organizational success (Campion et al., 2011; Rodriguez et al., 2002).

Also, recommendations were made to the department on how to implement the competency model into other human resource practices including performance, selection, and training, and all of which were completed in
subsequent years. For each organizational role, the consultant conducted position studies using the critical incident technique (i.e., through consensus of subject matter experts, in this case incumbents’ supervisors) to identify the critical behaviors that are necessary to perform each job within each competency, while determining what specific behaviors “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations” or would be “below expectations” (Flanagan, 1954). A sample of procedure for these studies is presented in Appendix F. The results of these position analyses were used to build the coaching tools used to evaluate employee’s PILLAR performance for development purposes on a quarterly basis, presented in Appendices G & H. It is a common application of competency models to evaluate performance and proficiency of employees to inform development (Catano et al., 2007; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Posthuma & Campion, 2008; Martone, 2003; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001). Of note, this work closely follows the recommended approach made by Dubois (1993) for building competency-based performance systems (e.g., review of existing job information, expert panel review and behavioral construction of each competency).

These position studies were conducted in a cascading manner across the department over a period of three years (see Appendix I). Once the critical behaviors for each competency were identified, assessment tools were created for each position, from RA to department Director, to identify an individual’s performance on the PILLARs and then provide specific and actionable advice for each competency on how they can improve to reach the next level of performance, while enabling fulfillment of the department’s mission.
STUDY 1

Rationale (STUDY 1)

To demonstrate the effectiveness of competency modeling as a performance improvement and organizational development initiative, validity evidence for the competency model will need to be established. With respect to the competency model, the issue of validity is one of making correct inferences that higher competency ratings reflect higher individual and organizational performance levels. This is a critical step in determining if implementation of a competency model can enhance organizational performance; thus, Study 1 aims to establish the validity of the competency model, as the extent to which the competency model is a valid measure of performance will serve as the upper limit of being able to detect an intervention effect of competency modeling in Study 2.

Validation is the process of accumulating various forms of judgmental and empirical forms of evidence to support inferences (Binning & Barrett, 1989). A sound validity argument should integrate across sources of evidence and form a coherent narrative in order to support the interpretation of scores for an intended use (AERA, 1999). In line with best practices in the psychometric and measurement literature (AERA, 1999; Messick, 1995; Tenopyr, 1977), this study will seek to establish validity evidence, including criterion-related and construct validity.

Criterion validity supports inferences by demonstrating that an empirical relationship between a predictor measure and criterion measure (SIOP, 2003). Specifically, to establish criterion validity, competency performance should
predict organizational outcomes (i.e., student outcomes, perceptions and experiences). Whereas, construct validity is the extent to which an assessment measures the concept intended, and supports validity inferences by providing rational evidence of a construct’s relation (i.e., convergence and/or divergence) with other constructs (AERA, 1999). To establish construct validity of the competency model, performance on individual competencies should be correlated to ratings of overall performance. A pattern of inter-correlations between competency assessments and overall performance evaluation would suggest an underlying conceptual basis and implies that the specific competencies could be viewed as separate items measuring the different aspects of the overall performance construct, as performance is often conceptualized as multidimensional in nature (Austin & Villanova, 1992; Ghiselli, 1956). This approach follows methods established in past research, as Catano and colleagues (2007) deployed a similar method to establish validity of the competencies used in a performance appraisal.

Construct validity is an important consideration for any instrument designed to measure a construct or set of constructs, especially one developed for performance assessment. Performance rating instruments are valid to the extent that there is a high degree of correspondence between the ratings and "true" levels of performance. Since "true" performance is unknown, construct validity must be assessed indirectly (Scullen, Mount, & Judge, 2003). Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) suggest that job performance should be conceptualized as a multidimensional construct that cannot be directly observed but rather should be
studied through observation of the behavioral manifestations of these constructs. One method of investigating construct validity is to examine the extent to which the relationships among the measured variables (i.e. rated competencies defined by behaviors) conform to what is hypothesized by the theoretical model (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Competency-based assessment assumes that the different competencies specified in the model are influencing individuals' performance with respect to the specific behaviors being rated. Therefore, ratings of behaviors that are believed to be influenced by the same competency should be more strongly related than ratings of behaviors believed to be influenced by different competencies.

To provide evidence of criterion validity, competency performance ratings will need to significantly predict some outcome of importance to the organization’s mission or purpose. This validation method focuses on assessing incumbents’ performance using the competency model, then evaluating performance using an alternative measure. In this case, student experiences, outcomes and reactions will serve as the criterion measure, as student residents are the customers of student affairs organizations, and the department strives to enhance a variety of student experiences and outcomes during their tenure at the university (see Appendix A). This department strives to enhance resident learning, affinity for their community, and ensure positive interactions with staff. As such, student perceptions of employee (i.e., RA) performance and overall satisfaction with their residential educational experience will serve as a meaningful measure of departmental success and organizational performance for this study.
Overall, this validation approach provides three key pieces of information. It enables an estimate of competency proficiency for each employee, and it relates those estimates to an independent measure of performance. Further, it assesses the extent to which competency performance influences desired organizational outcomes; thus, Study 1’s proposed validation process will provide the evidence needed to investigate the effectiveness of competency modeling as an organizational development and performance intervention in Study 2.

**Statement of Hypotheses (STUDY 1)**

Hypothesis I: Each competency (RD ratings of RA fall performance) will significantly and positively correlate with supervisors’ year-end ratings of overall performance (RD ratings of RA spring performance) demonstrating evidence of construct validity.

- **Hypothesis Ia:** Professionalism will significantly positively correlate with overall job performance.

- **Hypothesis Ib:** Inclusion and Diversity will significantly positively correlate with overall job performance.

- **Hypothesis Ic:** Leadership will significantly positively correlate with overall job performance.

- **Hypothesis Id:** Learning and Development will significantly positively correlate with overall job performance.
Hypothesis Ie: Advising and Mentoring will significantly positively correlate with overall job performance.

Hypothesis If: Readiness will significantly positively correlate with overall job performance.

Hypothesis II: Mean PILLAR competency performance (RD ratings of RA fall performance) will significantly positively correlate with supervisor’s year-end ratings of overall job performance (RD ratings of RA spring performance).

Hypothesis III: Mean PILLAR competency performance (RD ratings of RA fall performance) will significantly positively correlate with supervisor’s year-end ratings of Mean PILLAR competency performance (RD ratings of RA spring performance).

Hypothesis IV: Mean PILLAR competency performance (RD ratings of RA fall performance) will significantly positively correlate with mean resident satisfaction of RA performance.

Hypothesis V: Mean PILLAR competency performance (RD ratings of RA fall performance) will significantly positively correlate with mean resident outcomes in residential halls.

**Methods (STUDY 1)**

The research questions and hypotheses identified for Study 1 will be investigated to provide validity evidence for the PILLAR competency model for the Resident Advisor position. The independent variables for this study will be the
Resident Advisor performance ratings provided by their supervisors (i.e., Residence Directors) during the fall quarter. The dependent variables will be provided by the Residential Satisfaction Survey that was completed at the end of the academic year by students living on campus, as well as Residence Directors’ spring ratings of RA performance. Please note that the data to be used for this study were acquired as part of independent consulting work and routine assessment activities that address the needs of the Department of Residential Education, and are therefore archival records. Also, all data were de-identified and any confidential information linking ratings to individuals was destroyed (i.e., permanently deleted).

**Participants.**

At a large Midwestern University campus, Resident Advisors, Residence Directors and undergraduate students, who lived on-campus and chose to participate in the annual Residential Satisfaction Survey, served as the participants for Study 1.

**Resident Advisors (RAs).** Residential Advisors (RAs) are undergraduate students who were selected and trained to assist and support fellow students that live on campus and carry out relationship and community building activities as designated by the Department of Residential Education. For employment eligibility, RAs must be considered a full-time undergraduate student and maintain over a 2.50 GPA. Those who were employed during the 2011 to 2012 academic year and met the employment eligibility requirements were selected for Study 1. The RA position description is included in Appendix C. Of 56 employed
RAs in spring 2012, only 52 had corresponding resident satisfaction data completed necessary to be included in the study; thus, resulting in a sample size of 52 for Study 1, limiting both statistical power and the ability to detect an effect. Most RAs were new to the position the academic year, 2011-2012, rather than returners (1st year RA $n = 31$; 2nd year RA $n = 19$; 3rd year RA $n = 6$).

Unfortunately, other RA demographic information is unavailable for reporting due to the confidential and archival nature of the data (i.e., other demographic information on employees was not collected as part of this research or consulting project, any additional information is held confidentially with the university’s human resource department).

**Residence Directors (RDs).** The Residence Directors consist of six professional staff members employed by the Department of Residential Education to supervise the RAs, as well as facilitate the educational and social-learning opportunities in the residence halls. The RD position description is included in Appendix D. Given that RDs supervise the RAs, they were responsible for providing performance ratings for each of the RAs on their staff.

At the time of evaluation in spring 2012, most RDs had supervised their RAs for nearly one year (RD supervision less than 3 months $n = 4$; RD supervision 3-6 months $n = 3$; RD supervision 7-11 months $n = 24$; RD supervision 1 year $n = 12$; RD supervision 2 years $n = 12$; RD supervision 3 years $n = 1$), and reported being familiar with their RA’s performance (barely familiar $n = 1$; somewhat familiar $n = 10$; familiar $n = 36$; extremely familiar $n = 9$).
Unfortunately, other RD demographic information is unavailable for reporting due to the confidential and archival nature of the data.

**Residents.** Residents are undergraduate students who chose to live on-campus in residential halls. The residents that were included in this study chose to complete the Resident Satisfaction Survey. Using a registry of all students living on campus during the time of the survey (i.e., April 2012), the Department of Residential Education emailed all residents a request and link to complete the Resident Satisfaction Survey online. The recruitment email for participation is presented in Appendix E. Participation in the Residential Satisfaction Survey was completely voluntary, and anonymous. Further, those who elected to complete the survey were eligible to receive a gift (i.e., iPad 2) via random drawing once they submitted a separate and independent contact information form after completing the Residential Satisfaction Survey. The contact information form cannot be linked to the Residential Satisfaction Survey, maintaining residents’ complete anonymity. Four hundred and forty-four residents completed the survey representing all twelve residence halls and approximately 19.2% of the students living on-campus. Of residents that completed the resident satisfaction survey, most lived on campus for 3 - 4 academic quarters (1 - 2 quarters $n = 82$; 3 - 4 quarters $n = 231$; 5 - 7 quarters $n = 79$; more than 8 quarters $n = 33$; missing $n = 19$), achieved a cumulative GPA in the range of 3.50 to 4.00 (below 2.0 $n = 4$; 2.0-2.5 $n = 6$; 2.5-3.0 $n = 44$; 3.0-3.5 $n = 117$; 3.5-4.0 $n = 253$; missing $n = 20$), were female (female $n = 292$; male $n = 131$; transgender $n = 1$, missing $n = 21$), were freshmen (freshman $n = 262$; sophomore $n = 94$; junior $n = 44$; senior $n = 18$; 5th
or 6th year \( n = 3 \); missing \( n = 23 \), identified as white (Asian \( n = 23 \); Black/African-American \( n = 32 \); white \( n = 307 \); Hispanic/Latino(a) \( n = 35 \); Native American \( n = 2 \); Biracial/Multiracial \( n = 23 \); missing \( n = 22 \)), and 19 years old (17 years old \( n = 1 \); 18 years old \( n = 94 \); 19 years old \( n = 210 \); 20 years old \( n = 74 \); 21 years old \( n = 24 \); 22 years old \( n = 12 \); 23 years old \( n = 3 \); 24 years old or older \( n = 4 \); missing \( n = 22 \)). Of the 444 students that completed the survey, only those that identified their RA will be included in this study.

**Measures.**

Two measures were be used for Study 1 data collection, including the RA PILLAR Evaluation Form, and the Resident Satisfaction Survey. The Department of Residential Education administered both measures during the 2011-2012 academic year. The RA PILLAR Evaluation Form was administered twice, once in the fall quarter and then the following spring quarter, where the Resident Satisfaction Survey was only administered in the spring.

**RA PILLAR Performance Evaluation Form.** This measure was developed as part of consulting work with the Department of Residential Education to provide validity evidence for the PILLAR competency model. Core positions in the department were studied to determine the behavioral manifestation of the PILLAR model at each job level. The methods, protocols and procedure for the PILLAR position studies are presented in Appendix F. Results of the position studies were presented to the department in the format of performance-coaching tools to be used for staff development and feedback within each position. The RA position study was conducted during the fall quarter of
Results informed the development of the RA PILLAR Performance Coaching Tool, which was implemented for RA feedback and training purposes starting Fall of 2011. The coaching tool is presented in Appendix G, as well as the RA PILLAR Performance Evaluation Form presented in Appendix J.

The RA PILLAR Performance Evaluation Form consists of items assessing each PILLAR competency performance, RA overall job performance, RA performance relative to others, and demographic information (see Appendix J for details). Both PILLAR competencies and overall job performance ratings were measured by a 9-point Likert scale with anchors ranging from “Poor/Unsatisfactory: Performance needs significant improvement to succeed in role; performs at the bottom 15% of all RAs;” “Adequate/Competent: Performs as expected, or at the level of 70% of RAs; has some room for improvement;” to “Outstanding/Strength: Performs at a level other RAs should aspire to, or at the top 15% of all RAs; demonstrates truly exceptional performance.”

**PILLAR Competency Performance.** These competencies were identified and developed from the consulting project, which identified the mission, vision, and goals of the department. As part of a strategic organizational development initiative, this project also developed the competency model which outlined each of the competencies mentioned above to guide employee actions and behaviors. RA competency performance level will be measured by RDs ratings of performance on the following six competencies with the RA PILLAR Performance Evaluation Form: 1) Professionalism. The first competency is Professionalism and is defined by being accountable for work role
responsibilities, following through with professional commitments, supporting ResEd initiatives, and striving for continuous personal and organizational improvement. This is necessary to accomplish one’s job duties while meeting all standards of ethics and excellence. 2) Inclusion & Diversity. The second competency is Inclusion and Diversity, which is defined as building a community that is enriched with diverse views and people of varied backgrounds, races, cultures, and beliefs. This is necessary to promote respect and appreciation for individuality and diversity. 3) Leadership. The third competency is Leadership, which is defined by envisioning, planning, effecting change within individuals and groups, and identifying and responding to needs within Residential Education and the community. This is necessary to fulfill Residential Education’s mission, vision and departmental goals. 4) Learning & Development is defined as applying best practices, concepts and principles of the profession and work role, including rigorous assessment of organizational initiatives and goals. This is necessary to encourage the holistic development of students and Residential Education professionals, and guide evidenced-based decision-making. 5) Advising & Mentoring. This competency is defined as providing counseling and advising support, direction, feedback, referral, and guidance to individuals and groups. This is necessary to encourage healthy, safe, and community-minded decision making among students. 6) Readiness. The last competency, Readiness, is defined as maintaining personal health and wellness, being self-reflective, passionate for the welfare of others, comfortable with ambiguity, and adaptable. This is
necessary to prepare oneself for the demands of the work role, Residential Education, and its constituents.

**Overall job performance.** To measure RAs’ performance level, RD’s were requested to rate each RA’s overall job performance at the time of evaluation (i.e., please rate this RA’s current performance on the job). As mentioned previously, overall job performance was measured on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from poor to outstanding. Performance relative to others was measured by an item that asked “Based on your knowledge of this RA’s work skills and abilities, how would you rate this RA compared to others who perform this job? However, the relative performance item was not used in the current study.

**Resident Satisfaction Survey 2012.** Detailed in Appendix K, this measure was developed as part of normal assessment activities at the Department of Residential Education to report to university leadership on resident perceptions of departmental activities and to inform future practices for enhanced departmental functioning. Historically, each year the department surveys residents regarding satisfaction of RA and RD performance and programming activities, residents’ perceptions of outcomes, as well as demographic information of the respondents. For the 2012 Resident Satisfaction Survey, a student affairs assessment specialist designed the survey presented in Appendix K.

**Resident Satisfaction with RA performance.** Items that were used for Study 1 include residents’ satisfaction with RA performance dimensions, including 1) efforts to get to know residents, 2) communication of policies and
procedures, 3) availability, visibility on floor/area, 4) promotion of respect in the community, 5) ability to gain respect, 6) enforcement of University policies, 7) treatment of all residents equitably and 8) organization of floor programs and events. These items were measured by a 6-point likert scale with anchors of “very dissatisfied,” “dissatisfied,” “somewhat dissatisfied,” “somewhat satisfied,” “satisfied,” and “very satisfied.”

**Resident Outcomes.** Additional items used from the Resident Satisfaction Survey include residents’ perceptions of learning outcomes or opportunities. These items included having the ability or opportunity to 1) contribute positively to my residence hall community; 2) reflect upon my decisions and consider alternative action in the future; 3) learn how to maintain a healthy lifestyle. 4) develop strong relationships with others while living in the halls; 5) engage in dialogue with others different from me; 6) learn from my peers while in dialogue with them. 7) see the ways in which RAs and RDs can contribute to my success at the University; 8) regardless of my agreement with them, I understand why student housing policies are necessary; 9) overall, living on campus has enhanced my learning experience at the University. These items were measured by a 6-point likert scale with anchors of “very dissatisfied,” “dissatisfied,” “somewhat dissatisfied,” “somewhat satisfied,” “satisfied,” and “very satisfied.”

**Demographic information.** Additional demographic items were used for Study 1 to help understand sample characteristics are presented in Appendix K (i.e., RA name, gender, age, amount of time living on campus, ethnicity, academic classification and GPA).
Procedure.

The Department of Residential Education provided the principal investigator complete access to the archival records of the RA PILLAR Performance Evaluations and the Residential Satisfaction Survey. Details on the prior administration of both instruments are detailed in the next section.

The RA PILLAR evaluation form was administered twice, once in Fall 2011 after implementation and training of the coaching tool and during Spring 2012 to assess year-end performance. In the fall, RDs attended an hour-long session on rating training, which included an overview of the content for each competency, what effective behavior performance looks like for each domain, as well as how to leverage the coaching tool as a thorough behavioral assessment to provide constructive, frequent and informative coaching and feedback based on the behavioral requirements for effective job performance. After the training, RDs were instructed to complete the rating forms. Specifically, they were told that 1) the form should take approximately five to ten minutes to complete per RA; 2) to consider each RA individually; 3) focus only on the RA’s behavior and accomplishments; and 4) to use the complete range of the scale when applicable and to review behavioral information presented in the RA PILLAR Performance Coaching Tool. Completed forms were provided to the principal investigator for data entry and use in the current study. All identifying information was stripped from the completed forms and any confidential information linking ratings to individuals were destroyed. Anonymous codes replaced RA identifying information to enable linking of datasets for later analysis.
In spring of 2012, the Resident Satisfaction Survey was administered by ResED staff through Qualtrics, an online data collection tool. Undergraduate students living on campus in April 2012 were sent a request and link to complete the survey via email. Residents were given approximately two weeks to participate in the survey. Those who did not complete the survey at the first solicitation were sent the survey once more, approximately 48 hours before survey closure. Participation in the Residential Satisfaction Survey was completely voluntary, and anonymous. After completing the Residential Satisfaction Survey, residents were directed to a contact information form to voluntarily enter into a random drawing to receive a gift (i.e., iPad 2). The contact information form cannot be linked to the Residential Satisfaction Survey, maintaining residents’ complete anonymity. These data were provided to the principal investigator for use in the current study. For these data, anonymous codes replaced RA identifying information to enable linking of residents’ data to RAs performance ratings for later analysis. As mentioned previously, any confidential information linking identifying information to individuals was destroyed.

**Results (STUDY 1)**

**Preliminary Analyses**

Initial analyses were conducted to examine whether the independent and dependent variables have proper statistical variance and normality (i.e., normal distribution via examination of each item’s descriptive statistics and visual inspection of outliers). All data were checked for accuracy and upon inspection,
it was determined that one item was negatively skewed (i.e., Mean Resident Satisfaction with RA Performance); however, upon additional review of the residual scatterplots all variables met the three statistical assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Also, reliability of each measure were examined for any variable in which a mean/composite score was calculated and used in analyses following traditional measurement techniques (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha). Results of the psychometric proprieties and descriptive statistics of Study 1 variables are presented in Table 2.
### Table 2

**Study 1: Psychometric Properties of Independent and Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Skew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professionalism - Fall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>4 - 9</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusion &amp; Diversity - Fall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>4 - 9</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership - Fall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>4 - 9</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learning &amp; Development - Fall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>3 - 8</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advising &amp; Mentoring - Fall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>4 - 9</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Readiness - Fall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>3 - 9</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RA Mean Performance - Fall</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>4.50 - 7.67</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RA Mean Performance - Spring</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>4.33 - 8.33</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall Job Performance - Spring</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>4 - 9</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mean Resident Satisfaction</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>1.17 - 5.66</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mean Resident Outcomes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>2.13 - 6.00</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The variation in sample size is attributed to RA attrition from fall to year-end (n = 4).
Ideally, exploratory factor analyses would be conducted to assess the dimensionality and factor structure of the competency-based performance evaluation through examining the interrelationships among competencies and grouping these variables into factors for better explanation and understanding of the construct of RA performance. Additionally, a confirmatory factor analysis would be beneficial to test the hypothesized theoretical relationships among competencies and overall performance (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994); however, both of these analyses were not conducted to test the hypothesized measurement model (i.e., competency model), as there was not a sufficient sample size to interpret results confidently. For Factor Analysis, it recommended that at least 10 participants per item is needed for each scale being examined to reduce sampling error (Nunnally, 1978; Pett, Lackey & Sullivan, 2003). For confirmatory factor analysis, while the literature disagrees on the minimum satisfactory sample size to conduct structural equation modeling, most suggest that more than 200 subjects or 10-20 subjects per variable be required to product stable estimates and provide better changes of validating a model (Myers, Ahn & Jin, 2011; Schumacker & Lomax, 2004; Wolf, Harrington, Clark & Miller, 2013); thus, this study does not meet the specified requirements to conduct these analyses.

**PILLAR Competency Performance.** The independent variables of competency performance, was measured by RDs ratings of RA performance on the following six competencies with using the RA PILLAR Performance Evaluation Form: 1) Professionalism; 2) Inclusion & Diversity; 3) Leadership; 4) Learning & Development; 5) Advising & Mentoring; and 6) Readiness. Each
competency was measured by a 9-point Likert scale with anchors ranging from “Poor/Unsatisfactory: Performance needs significant improvement to succeed in role; performs at the bottom 15% of all RAs;” “Adequate/Competent: Performs as expected, or at the level of 70% of RAs; has some room for improvement;” to “Outstanding/Strength: Performs at a level other RAs should aspire to, or at the top 15% of all RAs; demonstrates truly exceptional performance.”

**RA Mean Performance.** RA competency performance was measured by calculating the mean of RDs performance ratings of the six PILLAR competencies assessed by the Performance Evaluation Form. Both fall and spring administration means were calculated independently for this study. Reliability analysis revealed sufficient internal consistency of the six items for both administrations (i.e., Cronbach $\alpha = .85$). The fall mean was used as an independent variable for Study 1, where the spring mean was used as a dependent variable.

**Overall Job Performance.** To measure RAs’ performance level, RD’s were requested to rate each RA’s overall job performance at the time of evaluation (i.e., please rate this RA’s current performance on the job). As mentioned previously, overall job performance was measured on a 9-point likert scale ranging from poor to outstanding. This item was assessed with the Performance Evaluation Form for the spring administration and was used as a dependent variable in this study.
Mean Resident Satisfaction. For Study 1, the dependent variable, residents’ satisfaction with RA performance, was measured by computing the mean of eight items on the Residential Satisfaction Survey. These items included 1) efforts to get to know residents, 2) communication of policies and procedures, 3) availability, visibility on floor/area, 4) promotion of respect in the community, 5) ability to gain respect, 6) enforcement of University policies, 7) treatment of all residents equitably and, 8) organization of floor programs and events. These items were measured by a 6-point likert scale with anchors of “very dissatisfied,” “dissatisfied,” “somewhat dissatisfied,” “somewhat satisfied,” “satisfied,” and “very satisfied.”

Given the multilevel nature of the data, the analytic strategy must account for the fact that individuals were nested within residence halls. Specifically, the RAs oversee multiple residents and thus have ratings from multiple residents on the same measures (collected via the resident satisfaction survey). As such, these data were aggregated via the additive composition model to account for the functional relationship between the constructs at different levels (Chan, 1998). In the additive composition model, the meaning of the higher-level construct is a summation of the lower level units regardless of the variance among these units. In this study, this model was appropriately used to account for each resident’s perception of RA performance, and is independent of within-group level agreement among residents supervised by an RA (i.e., it doesn’t matter if the students agree on an RA’s level of performance because it is expected that individuals to have different experiences and perceptions of their RA. This model
was used because theoretically, each resident’s perception of performance could be unique and not dependent on another resident’s experience (i.e., an RA might have specific and unique interactions with each resident that accounts for differences in ratings). Other multilevel models depend on explaining variance at the lower levers but since the variance at the lower level unit was no theoretical or operational concern in this study, the additive model was used to determine and measure the higher level construct (i.e., RA performance across a resident group).

For each RA, his/her residents’ data was aggregated and a mean was calculated for each item used on the resident satisfaction survey (i.e., if multiple responses for an item exists, the sum of resident item responses will be divided by number of residents that responded for each RA). Thus, the mean resident satisfaction composite variable reflected the aggregated data across resident responses. Reliability analysis revealed sufficient internal consistency of the eight items for (i.e., Cronbach’s α = .93).

**Mean Resident Outcomes.** Additional items were used from the Resident Satisfaction Survey to compute the mean resident outcomes dependent variable for Study 1. These items included residents’ perceptions of learning outcomes or opportunities. These items include having the ability or opportunity to 1) contribute positively to my residence hall community; 2) reflect upon my decisions and consider alternative action in the future; 3) learn how to maintain a healthy lifestyle; 4) develop strong relationships with others while living in the halls; 5) engage in dialogue with others different from me; 6) learn from my peers while in dialogue with them; 7) see the ways in which RAs and RDs can
contribute to my success at the University; and 8) regardless of my agreement with them, I understand why student housing policies are necessary. These items were measured by a 6-point Likert scale with anchors of “very dissatisfied,” “dissatisfied,” “somewhat dissatisfied,” “somewhat satisfied,” “satisfied,” and “very satisfied.” For each RA, his/her residents’ data was aggregated and a mean was calculated for each item used on the resident satisfaction survey. Thus, the mean resident outcome composite variable reflected the aggregated data across resident responses. Reliability analysis revealed sufficient internal consistency of the eight items for (i.e., Cronbach’s α = .91).

Test of Hypotheses

To test Hypotheses I - V, a series of bivariate correlations were conducted to evaluate the relationships of the independent and dependent variables. Means, standard deviations and Pearson correlations between variables are presented in Table 2 and Table 3, while the coefficients of determination are presented in Table 4. Higher scores indicate higher correlations between variables. Results of significance tests are summarized in Table 5 and will be discussed in the following sections.
Table 3

Study 1: Inter-correlations and descriptive statistics of independent and dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professionalism - Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusion &amp; Diversity - Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership - Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learning &amp; Development - Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advising &amp; Mentoring - Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Readiness - Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RA Mean Performance - Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RA Mean Performance - Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall Job Performance - Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mean Resident Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mean Resident Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Resident Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p < 0.01. * p < 0.05.
Table 4

Study 1: Coefficients of Determination ($r^2$) for independent and dependent variables represented as a percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professionalism - Fall</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inclusion &amp; Diversity - Fall</td>
<td>21.16%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership - Fall</td>
<td>30.25%</td>
<td>29.16%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learning &amp; Development - Fall</td>
<td>43.56%</td>
<td>13.69%</td>
<td>32.49%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advising &amp; Mentoring - Fall</td>
<td>30.25%</td>
<td>28.09%</td>
<td>21.16%</td>
<td>18.49%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Readiness - Fall</td>
<td>23.04%</td>
<td>7.84%</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
<td>21.16%</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RA Mean Performance - Fall</td>
<td>65.61%</td>
<td>51.84%</td>
<td>57.76%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td>46.24%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RA Mean Performance - Spring</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
<td>23.04%</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>17.64%</td>
<td>15.21%</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
<td>24.01%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall Job Performance - Spring</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>13.69%</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>15.21%</td>
<td>88.59%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mean Resident Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>70.71%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mean Resident Outcomes</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>73.99%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>44.89%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Study 1: Test of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$t_{observed}$</th>
<th>$t_{critical}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Achieved Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Ia</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Ib</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Ic</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Id</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>13.69%</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis Ie</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis If</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis II</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>15.21%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis III</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>24.01%</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis IV</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis V</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sensitivity analysis reveals that given a sample of (n = 51), power of ($\beta = .70$) and probability of Type I error of ($p < .05$), effect sizes must be moderate in size ($r = .33$) to be statistically significant.

**Hypothesis I.** Hypotheses Ia-If predicted that each competency rating would significantly and positively correlate with supervisor’s year-end ratings of overall performance, thereby demonstrating evidence of construct validity. A series of bivariate correlations were conducted to predict the magnitude and direction of the relationship between supervisor’s year end ratings of overall performance and RA performance on each competency. As summarized in Table 4, significant and positive correlations were found for each PILLAR competency with overall job performance at year end, except for the competency, Readiness. Thus, Hypothesis If was not supported, where Hypothesis Ia-Ie were supported with positive correlations ranging from small to moderate magnitude (Cohen,
1992). While Readiness did not significantly correlate with overall job performance, it did trend slightly in the positive direction. Additionally, each of the other competencies independently explained from 8.41% to 13.69% of the variance in year-end overall job performance. These findings suggest that the PILLAR competencies provide a distinct view of the “overall” performance as measured by the PILLAR evaluation form.

**Hypothesis II.** Hypotheses II predicted that Mean PILLAR competency ratings of RA performance will significantly and positively correlate with supervisor’s year-end ratings of overall job performance. The results in Table 4 support this hypothesis \((r = .39, r^2 = 15.21\%, t(51) = 2.97; p < 0.01)\). Specifically, mean competency performance explains 15.21% of the variance over overall job performance, further suggesting that these competencies provide a distinct but slightly related view of the overall performance dimension.

**Hypothesis III.** Hypotheses III predicted that Mean PILLAR competency ratings of RA performance will significantly and positively correlate with supervisor’s year-end mean ratings of PILLAR competency performance. The results in Table 4 support this hypothesis \((r = .49, r^2 = 24.01\%, t(51) = 3.94; p < 0.01)\). Specifically, mean competency performance explain 24.01% of the variance in mean competency performance in the spring.

**Hypothesis IV.** Hypotheses IV predicted that Mean PILLAR competency performance would significantly positively correlate with mean resident satisfaction of RA performance. The results in Table 4 do not support this
hypothesis \((r = .06, r^2 = 1.44\%, t(49) = 0.41; p = \text{ns})\), as the correlation was both weak and not statistically significant.

**Hypothesis V.** Hypotheses V predicted that Mean PILLAR competency performance would significantly positively correlate with mean resident outcomes in residential halls. The results in Table 4 also do not support this hypothesis \((r = .09, r^2 = 0.81\%, t(49) = 0.62; p = \text{ns})\), as the correlation was both weak and not statistically significant.

**Discussion (STUDY 1)**

Competency modeling has emerged as a technique for describing and evaluating job performance, a process that involves identifying a set of constructs (i.e. competencies) and behavioral manifestations that are believed to be important for performance in the job as well as the organization (Camion et al., 2011; Catano et al., 2007; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990). The strength of this approach is claimed to be its emphasis on aspects of in describing individual performance requirements and its link to organizational outcomes (Campion et al., 2011; Schippmann et al., 2000). Additionally, it is theorized that through competency modeling, organizations can be more competitive by strengthening core capabilities, identifying and raising standards, and reinforcing the behaviors that lead to the top performance across individuals (Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001). This common practice of identifying high-performance behaviors linked to business strategies, and using the organization’s language to generate buy-in and enhance ease of use, is believed to provide employees a clear, future focused view
of the behaviors that the organization will require for success (Campion et al., 2011; Isle, 1993; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001). While some researchers have documented the practice of implementing a competency based performance management system (Catano et al., 2007; Gangani et al., 2006; Jones, 1995; Nolan, 1998), empirical evidence has not been provided; thus, Study 1 investigated the validity of the competency model as a measure of performance to aid in the evaluation of whether implementing a competency model can enhance organizational performance.

To provide construct validity evidence for the competency model, performance on individual competencies needed to correlate with ratings of overall performance to demonstrate an underlying conceptual basis and imply that the specific competencies could be viewed as distinct items measuring the same overall performance construct (Austin & Villanova, 1992; Ghiselli, 1956). Alternatively, to establish criterion validity, competency performance should predict organizational outcomes. This validation method focused on assessing RA’s performance using the competency model, and then evaluating performance and outcomes by using an alternative measure. In this case, student experiences, outcomes and reactions served as the criterion measure, as student residents are the customers of student affairs organizations, and the department strives to enhance a variety of student experiences and outcomes during their tenure at the university (see Appendix A).

A series of bivariate correlations were conducted to test the hypotheses that predicted significant and positive relationships between competency ratings
and year-end ratings of overall performance, mean competency performance, as well as mean resident satisfaction and outcomes. In summary, results revealed that the competency model generally served as a valid measure of performance according to supervisor ratings but did not a predict residents’ ratings of RA performance or outcomes. Specifically, four of five competencies defined in the competency model (i.e., Professionalism, Inclusion and Diversity, Leadership, Learning & Development, and Advising & Mentoring) were significantly and positively correlated to year-end overall performance and mean competency ratings; however, relationships between supervisor ratings of RA performance did not significantly correlate with residents’ perceptions of RA performance or resident outcomes as predicted. In addition, while the correlations between supervisor ratings and resident ratings were positive, the relationships were quite weak (i.e., \( r \leq .10 \)), suggesting little alignment or conceptual agreement between supervisor and resident perceptions of RA performance. Taken together, these results provided some evidence of construct validity but since competency performance did not significantly influence desired organizational outcomes, criterion validity evidence was not provided with this study.

Results indicated that ratings of the competency Readiness did not significantly correlate with year-end ratings of performance; however, this is not completely surprising given that the definition of readiness is defined as maintaining personal health and wellness, being self-reflective, passionate for the welfare of others, comfortable with ambiguity, and adaptable. Conceptually, this competency is aligned to self-regulation and personality/ trait-based constructs
and may be less related to true RA performance compared to the other PILLAR competencies that describe the actual behaviors needed to perform the RA role requirements. This suggests that a true relationship between the Readiness competency and true RA performance may not exist, and is supported by the findings of the present study.

Another surprising finding is that criterion validity evidence was not provided by both rating sources in this study, as supervisor ratings of RA performance did not significantly correlate with resident ratings of RA performance but only with other supervisor ratings. Several possible factors could help explain these results. First, residents may not be the best rater or observer of performance, as they may be biased given the role of an RA to enforce policies that they may disagree with. Further, students were not trained as part of this study, and given that research has demonstrated that assessors that are trained through frame of reference training can better assess KSAs and performance, this is a known limitation of this study (Hauenstein, 1998). Further, it is common in residence hall organizations to have a large span of control of residents to advisors (e.g., sixty residents to one RA). As such, it is possible that the respondents to the survey may not have had a lot of exposure or opportunity to observe their respective RA. In fact, the majority of resident satisfaction survey respondents could not identify their resident advisor within the survey ($n = 336$ of 441 or 76.20%), suggesting that they may not be best suited to serve as a source for rating RA performance, especially compared to RA’s supervisors that were trained to rate and manage RA performance directly.
Limitations & Future Research

Several limitations of Study 1 deserve mention. First, given the archival nature of this study, there were design limitations in the resident satisfaction survey in that it did not assess PILLAR competency performance directly but rather other performance and other job-related content. Additionally, this study was limited by the small staff (i.e., sample size) and thus statistical power. For future research, it is recommended to study an organization with a larger staff, as well as to enhance measurement of organizational performance by leveraging an assessment that is directly aligned to competency model performance to enable greater opportunity to produce evidence of criterion validity. Further, with a larger sample size more sophisticated techniques to measure construct validity of a competency model could be leveraged to test the hypothesized theoretical relationships among competencies and overall performance (i.e., confirmatory factor analysis). Lastly, meta analytic research has shown that in rating overall job performance, the estimated mean observed correlation between single peer and supervisor raters is .48 (Viswesvaran, Schmidt, & Ones, 2002), suggesting that peer and supervisor ratings for performance can be justifiably pooled for better understanding of overall employee performance. Further, it has been noted that little to no research has been conducted to report correlations between peer and/or supervisor ratings of performance with and customer ratings of performance; thus, future research along those lines may refine our understanding of the construct of job performance, as well as tease apart the finding of the present study in that student ratings of RA job performance did not correlate with
supervisor ratings (Viswesvaran et al., 2002; Viswesvaran, Schmidt, & Ones, 2005).

**Implications**

While not all hypothesized relationships were supported in this validation study, the competency model may still demonstrate sufficient validity evidence to proceed with Study 2. Specifically, four of five competencies defined in the model (i.e., Professionalism, Inclusion and Diversity, Leadership, Learning & Development, and Advising & Mentoring) were significantly and positively correlated to year-end overall performance and mean competency ratings. Even though criterion validity evidence was not provided in Study 1 through residents’ rating of RA performance, supervisor ratings are probably more representative of true RA performance given that they are trained managers and raters of RA performance. Further, previous research has supported the practice of competency modeling as a technique for validly describing and assessing performance (Catano et al., 2007; Wolfe, 2008). Thus, despite Study 1’s limitations, Study 2 was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of competency modeling as an organizational development intervention.
STUDY 2

Rationale (STUDY 2)

Study 2 investigated the effectiveness of competency modeling as an organizational development intervention to improve organizational performance and outcomes. In this study, the organization of interest is a residential education department at a large private, Midwestern university that implemented a competency model immediately after redefining their mission, vision, goals and values to reflect the departmental philosophy following reorganization, as described in Study 1.

By implementing a competency model (conceptualized here as an organizational development initiative), the department can directly connect and explain employees’ roles and responsibilities as they relate to the overall department philosophy and ensure that all personnel practices and organizational activities are aligned to fulfill the departmental mission, vision, goals and values (Campion et al., 2011; Shippmann et al. 2000). Organizational development is defined as investigation to determine an organizational state or problem and to implement an intervention to result in a planned organizational change (Austin & Bartunick, 2012; Bartunek & Woodman, 2015; Cummings & Worley, 2009). Scholars often describe organizational development as being core to competency modeling, as competency modeling efforts often seek broad organizational change, focus on outcomes for employees and organizational effectiveness, are based on behavioral science, built through adaptive and iterative processes, and include both development and implementation of the model.
(Campion et al., 2011; Schippmann et al., 2010); and all of which are characteristics aligned with organizational development initiatives (Cummings & Worley, 2009).

For this study, the competency modeling project should be conceptualized as an organizational development initiative, as the project aligns with the literature’s broad definition of an organizational development intervention (Austin & Bartunik, 2012; Neuman, Edwards, & Raju, 1989). More specifically, in this study the consultants were engaged to 1) assist the department evaluating their current mission, vision and goals, as there was a concern that they did not accurately represent their institutional philosophies given recent structural changes; 2) improve organizational effectiveness by creating a competency model to integrate the department’s newly defined mission, vision, goals and core values throughout their personnel practices (e.g., training, in-role development, selection, and performance management); and 3) to infuse the values of the department and gain commitment by involving internal and external stakeholders in development and implementation of the model (Cummings & Worley, 2009). For additional detail on the initial consulting work that initiated the competency modeling project and subsequent cascaded implementation approach please refer to Appendix I.

As an organizational development initiative, the competency model was used to create performance assessment and coaching tools to provide ongoing development feedback to employees on a bi-monthly basis, representing a common application of competency modeling to evaluate performance and
proficiency of employees (Catano et al., 2007; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Posthuma & Campion, 2008; Martone, 2003). These tools were built for each role in the organization and implemented over a period of three years as part of a external consulting engagement.

In this study, the implementation of the competency model/intervention at a certain point in time separates an observed time series of the outcome under investigation into two parts: the time series before and the time series after intervention. As such, regression analysis can be used to assess potential effects of the intervention. For an effective intervention, one would expect an interruption in the pattern of the observed time series immediately after the intervention point. In the simplest case, this can be either a change in the time series’ level, slope, or both.

If the competency modeling and associated tools had the intended effect, improved organization performance would be observed during the first year and following years of the intervention. Further, we would expect to see effects for only those students that lived on campus, as they were exposed to and interacted with employees that were coached on the competency model and associated performance behaviors. Following the same reasoning, non-residents would not be expected to experience an effect during the years of the organizational development initiative, making them eligible to serve as the non-equivalent control group for this study.
The department’s primary mission is to identify and address students’ needs as well as to cultivate a relational, residential community, where students are encouraged to explore, learn and develop holistically. Of many desired outcomes, this department strives to enhance resident participation in and affinity for the community and university in which they live. As such, residents’ overall satisfaction and reactions to their entire educational experience and institution serve as a meaningful measure of departmental success and organizational performance for this study. Overall satisfaction with the institution and educational experience is an important variable in forming a high-quality undergraduate experience. Satisfaction represents a sense that a student feels loyalty and affinity to the institution (Lenning, Beal & Sauer, 1980; Tinto, 1987). Further, student satisfaction highly correlates with academic performance (Bean, 1980; Bean & Bradley, 1986; Bean & Vesper, 1994; Pike 1991; Pike, 1993).

Statement of Hypotheses (STUDY 2)

The research questions and hypotheses identified for Study 2 will be investigated to determine the effectiveness of competency modeling as an organizational development intervention to improve organizational performance.

**Hypothesis 1:** For residents, there will be a significant positive deviation of student satisfaction means from the baseline mean trend for post intervention years (i.e., there will be a significant and positive change in slope at the year of intervention for residents).
**Hypothesis 2:** There will be a significant impact of the intervention beyond baseline trends across groups on student satisfaction, in that the difference between the deviation from the baseline trend of the resident group and the deviation from the baseline trend of the non-equivalent control group (i.e., non-residents) will be positive and significant.

**Methods (STUDY 2)**

The research questions and hypotheses identified for Study 2 were investigated using comparative interrupted time-series research design to determine the effectiveness of competency modeling as an organization development initiative. Comparative interrupted time-series research design is one of the strongest quasi-experimental designs because it leverages a non-equivalent control group, which can reveal potential threats to internal validity (e.g., historical threats) (Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002; Somers, Zhu, Jacob, & Bloom, 2013). The dependent variable is measured by overall student satisfaction ratings collected annually from 2001-2014, as part of ongoing institutional and educational student engagement research. As detailed in Appendix I, there were three observations collected post-intervention and 11 pre-intervention observations.

**Participants.**

At a large Midwestern University campus Residential Department employees and undergraduate students who chose to participate in the National Student Engagement Survey, serve as the participants for Study 2. A total of 5,419 students completed the survey from 2001 to 2014, of which only 4,401
were included in Study 2 due to missing data on either the independent or dependent variables of interest. Table 6 summarizes the final sample size for each resident group by year used in Study 2.

Table 6

*Study 2: Sample Sizes by Resident Group and Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2451</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>4401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Residential Educational Department Employees.** Individuals employed by the Residential Educational Department during organizational development intervention years of 2011 - 2014 serve as participants for study 2, as staff and newly hired RAs, RDs and ADs were selected, trained, assessed and coached on the competency model developed for their organization during these years. These academic years are considered the organizational development intervention years of the competency modeling project.

**Students.** Freshmen undergraduate students attending a large, urban Midwestern university from 2001-2014 that voluntarily completed the National Student Engagement Survey are considered participants in study 2. These students include both residents that chose to live on campus and those that decided to live off campus as well.

**Competency Modeling as an Organizational Development Intervention.** The academic years of 2011 - 2014 serve as the treatment years, as incumbents and newly hired department staff (i.e., RAs, RDs and ARDs) were selected, trained, assessed and coached on the organization’s competency model during these years. These academic years are considered the organizational development intervention years, as the competency modeling project was designed and introduced to the department in 2010 and specific coaching tools were developed and launched in a cascading manner for each role throughout the following years to improve individual and organizational performance. Please note that for this study organizational performance is measured annually through the student engagement surveys.
In this study, the intervention at a certain point in time separates an observed time series into two parts: the time series before and the time series after intervention; thus, 2011 serves as the point in time that divides pre and post intervention outcomes, as we would expect to see changes in the outcome after the competency model was introduced and as the tools and processed were executed from 2011-2014. Please note that outcome data were measured during the spring of each academic year, meaning 2012 is the first year that an intended effect should be observed.

**Procedure.**

Study 2 was conducted by using archival data collected annually through ongoing institutional research efforts to measure the effectiveness of the organizational intervention over time. Access and permission was granted by the institutional research department in charge of collaborating with the national research agency that administers the survey. To use these existing datasets for my study, only data needed to evaluate the proposed hypotheses were provided and all data were de-identified. Leveraging archival data for this study provides a comprehensive view of the expected effects of the intervention over time and bolsters arguments about the generalizability of the results of a study, as repeated measures were collected independently across time and samples (Campbell, Stanley & Gage, 1963).

**Measures.**

*National Student Survey of Engagement.* NSSE is an industry benchmarking tool used by colleges and universities that assesses the extent that
students engage in educationally purposeful activities associated with high levels of learning and development, as well as how the institution deploys its resources, learning opportunities and support services to contribute to student learning (Kuh, 2009). NSSE defines engagement as student participation in activities, both inside and outside the classroom, that lead to important experiences and desired outcomes, including persistence, satisfaction, learning, and graduation. For a more detailed overview of the survey’s conceptual and empirical foundations see Kuh (2009). Please note that NSSE’s conceptualization of engagement strays far from the industrial organizational psychology concept of employee engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008); however, it will still serve as a valuable measure, as it is aimed to measure the quality of student experiences and involvement in educationally purposeful activities because of its psychometric properties, provision of normative data, and perceived value by administrators and faculty (Banta, Pike & Hansen, 2009). Further, it has often been used for institutional accreditation and accountability measures for student access, retention and graduation (Banta et al., 2009).

NSSE is administered annually by the Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University School of Education, and was designed for and used by institutions to help identify aspects of the undergraduate experience that can be improved (Kuh, 2009). This survey is administered annually to first year and senior undergraduates of participating institutions; however, only first year student data will be used for this research to evaluate the proposed hypotheses,
since they are the only population eligible to live within the resident halls, and thereby were exposed to the effects of the intervention.

NSSE has been administered at this university annually since 2001, making it suitable to investigate intervention effects over time. Given the longitudinal nature of this research, it is important to note that survey has had slight revisions between administrations over the years but more specifically, in 2013, substantial revisions were made to a majority of the items. As such, for this study, items are limited to those that have remained consistent across administrations and are relevant to the hypotheses.

A brief summary of the revisions implemented in 2013 is provided. Prior to 2013, the questionnaire collected information in five categories: (1) participation in dozens of educationally purposeful activities, (2) institutional requirements and the challenging nature of coursework, (3) perceptions of the college environment, (4) estimates of educational and personal growth since starting college, and (5) background and demographic information (Banta et al., 2009). For 2013 and beyond, the survey measured student engagement in primarily two ways: 1) the amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other educationally purposeful activities and 2) the ways the institution organizes the curriculum and other learning opportunities to create four specific experiences: academic challenge, learning with peers, experiences with faculty and a supportive campus (NSSE, 2015). Detailed NSSE surveys are presented in Appendix L & M to illustrate the different versions used for this study.
Since survey items are limited to those that have remained consistent over time and are relevant to the hypotheses for Study 2, the rest of the discussion in this section is limited to the specific dependent variable items used for Study 2. Student satisfaction will serve as the dependent variable for this study from ratings that were collected annually from 2001-2014, as part of The National Survey of Student Engagement.

**Mean Student Satisfaction.** The dependent variable was computed according to the NSSE scales guidelines (NSSE, 2015). Mean student satisfaction was computed by creating a new variable from the calculated mean of two student experience reaction items 1) How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?, which has a response four-point scale with anchors of “poor,” “fair,” “good” and “excellent”; and 2) If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?, which is measured on a four point scale with responses of “definitely no,” “probably no,” “probably yes” and “definitely yes.”

**Results (STUDY 2)**

**Preliminary Analysis**

Initial analyses were conducted to assess whether the independent and dependent variables have proper statistical variance and normality to meet the assumptions of regression analysis. To see if the assumptions of linear regression hold, heteroscedasticity and multicollinearity were examined. To check for heteroscedasticity, a visual inspection of the regression residuals plots showed that there was evenness in the distribution of error variance so no further analysis
was needed. Next, a test of multicollinearity was conducted to see if two or more predictors are substantially intercorrelated. None of the tolerance levels were less than .10 thus multicollinearity is not a concern (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Further, the variables were examined by inspecting the stem and leaf plots, and no outliers were observed and the satisfaction variable was normally distributed.

In summary, the preliminary analyses suggest that regression assumptions were met. In addition, the reliability of the mean satisfaction variable was computed using the individual student data set and it demonstrated sufficient reliability (i.e., Cronbach’s α = .77). Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics and reliability estimates for Study 2 variables. Given that data for study two was aggregated across individuals to calculate group means, it is not surprising that the assumptions of regression are met since by aggregating data to a group level provides more stable estimates and limits the error-variance. An additive model was used to compute the composite satisfaction variable, as the variance of the lower level units is of no theoretical or operational concern for composing the lower level construct to the higher level construct (Chan, 1998).

**Test of Hypotheses**

For Study 2, several types of analyses were considered to examine the research questions. First, ARIMA, known as the Autoregressive integrated, moving average approach, was investigated as an alternative time series approach but the current study does not fit the minimum criteria of at least 50 time period observations to achieve estimates that approach stability and to account for the
autocorrelation between time points (Biglan, Ary & Wagenaar, 2000; Shadish et al., 2002; Velicer & Harrop, 1983).

Next, the Comparative Interrupted Time Series design was investigated, as it has greater potential than other designs to provide valid inferences about program impacts, because it implicitly controls for differences between the “natural growth” rates of treatment and comparison groups (Bloom, 2003; Somers et al., 2013; Snijders & Bosker, 1999). Also, the CITS design is an especially rigorous study design for estimating longer-term impacts since it requires more pre-treatment data in the baseline, positioning it to better estimate longer-term impacts because these projections are based on past trends (Bloom, 2003; Somers et al., 2013). The CITS design also provides realistic estimates of the precision of impact compared to regression discontinuity or difference-in-difference designs (Somers et al., 2013). Further, the CITS design is a solid method to evaluate quasi-experimental designs and other authors have made suggestions that evaluation of applied research efforts should be made outside of true experimental designs (Somers et al., 2013; Taylor & Adams, 1982).
Table 7

Study 2: Means, Standard Deviations, Inter-correlations and Reliability Estimates for Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Residency Group</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Year of administration</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Year*Group</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Treatment</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Posttreatment</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mean Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 28; ** p < 0.01. ** p < 0.05. Residency Group of students denotes (resident) vs. comparison group (non-resident) groups. Year of survey administrations spans all 14 years of the study when NSSE was administered. Treatment status denotes the 11 baseline years (2001-2011) and three follow-up years (2012-2014). Treatment denotes time expressed as 0’s up to the intervention year and as 1’s following the competency modeling intervention and includes the first intervention year. Lastly, Posttreatment status denotes the two years following the first intervention year, which enables estimation of the change in slopes between groups’ pre and post treatment and ultimately test of Study 2’s hypothesis.
Originally, a multilevel regression model/HLM was proposed to test the proposed hypothesis with a CITS design to evaluate the impact of a competency modeling initiative on organizational performance; however, upon closer review of the data it was revealed that the Study 2 data were not actually nested in a hierarchical structure, as student samples vary across time (i.e., freshmen students are new to the university each year). Thus, these data are collected independently across time, warranting a hierarchical regression to be conducted rather than multilevel modeling approach.

To evaluate the impact of a competency modeling initiative on organizational performance, where organizational performance is operationalized as mean student satisfaction with their institutional and educational experience, a hierarchical regression analyses was conducted with the following model to test the hypothesis:

\[ Y = b_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_1X_2 + b_4 X_4 + b_5 X_5 + e \]

Variables are defined below to measure the trend in satisfaction scores and the between-group variation in the intercepts and trends before and after the intervention:

\[ Y = \text{Mean Student Satisfaction} \]
\[ b_0 = \text{Mean of student satisfaction for non-residents at year zero (i.e., 2001)} \]
\[ b_1 = \text{Difference in the means of the residency groups at year zero (2001)} \]
\[ X_1 = \text{Residency group, where 0 denotes non-residents and 1 denotes residents} \]
\[ b_2 = \text{Change in satisfaction for non-residents from one year to the next (across 14 years)} \]
\[ X_2 = \text{Year of survey, where 0 represents the first survey administration year (i.e., 2001) and increases continuously by one integer per year} \]
\[ b_3 = \text{Differences of the trend lines between residency groups} \]
\[ b_4 = \text{Change in means of resident satisfaction pre and post treatment} \]
\[ X_4 = \text{Treatment Status, where 0 denotes the 11 baseline years (2001-2011) before the intervention and 1 denotes the three follow-up years (2012-2014)} \]
\[ b_5 = \text{Change in means of resident satisfaction slope from pre to post treatment} \]
\[ X_5 = \text{Posttreatment Status, where 1 denotes the two years following the first intervention year (i.e., 2011), with all other years as 0} \]
\[ e = \text{Residual variance across all occasions of measurement for residency group in the population} \]

For this model, the independent variables include residency group status, year of survey administration, treatment status, and post-treatment status.

Residency status of students denotes (resident) vs. comparison group (non-resident) groups. Year of survey administrations spans all 14 years of the study. Treatment status denotes the 11 baseline years (2001-2011) and three follow-up years (2012-2014). Treatment denotes time expressed as 0’s up to the intervention year and as 1’s following the competency modeling intervention and includes the first intervention year. Lastly, Posttreatment status denotes the two years following the first intervention year, which enables estimation of the change in slopes between groups’ pre and post treatment and ultimately test of Study 2’s hypothesis.

At the first step, residency group was regressed on student satisfaction to determine the relationship between residency group and satisfaction across the 14 years. The second step includes survey year administration along with the interaction term of residency group with year, enabling determination of between residency group differences on satisfaction for each year of the 14 years. For the third step, treatment status was entered into the model along with the interaction term of treatment and residency group, which allows for estimation of the average
treatment effects for each group. The final step introduces the post treatment term into the model, which allows for estimation of differences in slopes for each group before and after the treatment. Overall, the results of this hierarchical regression analysis enables determination of whether there is systematic variation in student satisfaction over time and where that variation resides (i.e., within or between residency groups and/or before or after the competency model intervention). Further, this model enables testing of the hypothesis by including the treatment and post treatment terms to determine the changes in slopes and intercepts for each residency group for each year of the study.

Study 2’s hypothesis states that there will be a significant and positive change in slope at the intervention year for residents, and that this change is greater than the change in slope for the non-resident control group at the intervention year. If this is the case, the competency modeling as an organizational development intervention would be interpreted as having a significant, positive and sustained effect on organizational performance (i.e., mean student satisfaction) at the year of the intervention and for following years.

Hierarchical regression was used to test this hypothesis, and results are presented in Table 8. Residency Group was entered as step one. Results demonstrate that there was not a significant effect of residency group status on satisfaction over the 14 years \(R^2 = .05; F(1, 26) = 1.23; p = .28\), in that residents did not have significantly different mean satisfaction than students that lived off-campus during the 14 years of the study \(b = -.03, t = -1.108, p = .28\). Figure 2
provides a visual illustration of the mean differences between Residency Groups on satisfaction averaged across the 14 years of the study.

For step 2, year of administration and the interaction of residency group and year were added to the model to determine how satisfaction varies for each residency group for each year. Overall, this model was significant [$R^2 = .29; F(2, 24) = 3.27; p = .04$], suggesting that were different trends for residency groups when accounting for year of survey and its interaction with residency group. Figure 3 provides an illustration of predicting differences in Group Residency satisfaction trends across time.
Table 8

*Study 2: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Residency Group Satisfaction across time, accounting for pre and post intervention effects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Residency Group</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Residency Group</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year of Administration</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year of Administration X Residency Group</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Residency Group</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year of Administration</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year of Administration X Residency Group</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>Residency Group</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year of Administration</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year of Administration X Residency Group</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttreatment</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* n = 28; *p < .05
Figure 2. Predicting mean differences between Residency Groups on satisfaction averaged across the 14 years of the study
Figure 3. Predicting differences in Group Residency satisfaction trends across time
By adding these terms, an additional 25% of the variance in mean satisfaction was explained. In step 3, the treatment term was added to the model to determine the average intervention effect on mean satisfaction at the initiation year of the intervention. Results of the overall model suggest that treatment did not have a significant effect [$R^2 = .29; F(2, 23) = 2.36; p = .08$] in that there was not a significant change in satisfaction means pre and post treatment ($b = -.01; t = -.20; p = .85$). Figure 4 provides an illustration of predicting change in mean satisfaction for residency group pre and post intervention.

Lastly, the post-treatment term was added to the model in step 4. Introducing the post treatment term into the model allows for direct testing of Study 2’s hypothesis by estimating the differences in slopes for residency groups before and after introduction of the competency model as an organizational development intervention. Results demonstrate that the overall model was significant [$R^2 = .44; F(1, 22) = 3.48; p = .02$], and suggest that slopes differ for the residency groups before and after the intervention, which explains an additional 15% of variance in student satisfaction. Further, the change in slope was greater for the resident group than for the non-resident group during the post-treatment years ($b = .10; t = 2.43; p = .02$), supporting the hypothesis for study 2 that the competency model improved mean student satisfaction for the resident group beyond baseline trends and more than the comparison group that was not exposed to the organizational development intervention. Figure 5 provides an illustration of predicting change in satisfaction trends for residency group pre and post intervention.
Figure 4. Predicting change in mean satisfaction for residency group pre and post intervention
**Figure 5.** Predicting change in satisfaction trends for residency group pre and post intervention

Note: Mean Student Satisfaction = \(3.26 + \cdot.07x_1 + .004x_2 + .006x_1x_2 + -.10x_4 + .10x_5 + e\)
Discussion (STUDY 2)

Study 2 investigated whether implementing a competency model as an organizational development intervention to improve organizational performance had the intended effect for a Residential Education department in a large university. More specifically, organizational performance was operationalized as student engagement, measuring the extent to which students rate their entire educational experience at the institution and the degree to which they would repeat their experience by returning to the same institution.

The hypothesis predicted that for the years during the intervention, there would be a significant positive deviation of the student satisfaction mean from the baseline mean trend for post intervention years for residents (i.e., there would be a significant and positive change in slope at the year of intervention for residents), and this change in slope would be greater than the non-resident control group. A hierarchical regression was conducted to measure the impact of residency group, year of survey administration, treatment status and posttreatment status on student satisfaction across 14 years of the study. Results of the hierarchical regression did indeed support the hypothesis in that there was significant and positive change in slope at the intervention year for residents, and that this change was greater than the change in slope for the non-equivalent control group from pre to post intervention years.

As such, this study suggests that implementing a competency model to improve organization performance can have a positive and sustained effect for the
years following the intervention and provides the first empirical evidence supporting some of the claimed benefits of competency modeling to date (Dubois, 1993; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Rahbar-Daniels, Erickson & Dalik, 2001; Stone et al., 2013). While this study does not support all of the broad claims that proponents boast (Dubois, 1993; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Rahbar-Daniels, Erickson & Dalik, 2001; Stone et al., 2013), this study is the first to demonstrate that by implementing and integrating a competency modeling as a strategic human resource intervention, organization performance can be improved; thereby, extending and contributing to the competency modeling literature. This research has thoughtful implications to the practice of competency modeling, as it has been widely applied as a strategic human resource initiative without published empirical evidence to lend support to the practice (Schuler & Jackson, 2005).

Overall, this research supports the practice of competency modeling to improve organization performance, and results warrant further discussion. Of note, there was an observed drop in resident mean engagement at the first year of the intervention when the competency model was introduced. While surprising, the actual mean drop is only .10 and may be explained by natural variation in engagement or actual lower engagement due to the change intervention, as employees often react negatively to change due to uncertainty or role conflict (Seo & Hill, 2005). Also, employee reactions to employment practices have been shown to influence customer service levels, suggesting that if an employee becomes disengaged due to organizational change his or her customer service may decline (Chaung & Liao, 2010). Negative staff perceptions to organizational
change could explain the decline in resident engagement observed during the year the intervention was introduced for Study 2.

Also, results of this study suggest a delayed effect, possibly due to the strength of the intervention increasing overtime. In fact, the intervention effect was not observed at the first or second year of the invention but only for the third year, suggesting that the effects became stronger overtime. This may be explained due to the cascading design and increased strength of the invention as shown in Appendix I. More specifically, the intervention targeted the entry level positions within the department first and then was expanded to the leadership positions. It is possible that the full strength of the effect was not realized until the entire department was exposed to the competency modeling practices of the intervention.

Similarly, supervisors could have improved their coaching techniques with RAs overtime with practice or by observing best practice coaching behaviors from the interactions with their supervisors once their supervisors were exposed to the intervention. This logic is aligned with many OD and change theories, as it is important to view the entire OD process as a series of events that have repercussions in regards to employee participation, reactions and learning. As such, the cascading effects of change across the larger organizational system and its interactions with the organizational environment could likely impact the degree of the effect across time (Cummings & Worley, 2009; Hannan, Polos & Carroll, 2003; Weis & Croponzano, 1996), and should be taken into consideration in future design of research and practice.
Limitations & Future Research

Some alternative explanations for these results and limitations of the study deserve mention. Despite the strengths of a CITS design, there are still possible threats to casual inference (Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002). First, while there is a comparison group that was not exposed to the intervention, it does not control for selection bias or historical threats. For example, it is possible that students that chose to live on campus differ in important ways compared to students who chose to live off-campus. It is possible that these fundamental differences in student groups could have meaningful impact on engagement levels. While this is a possibility, it is an unlikely explanation given that at this university on-campus housing options are limited and in high-demand, meaning that not all students that want to live on campus have the opportunity, likely limiting the differences between these populations. Further, these groups are likely vastly similar given that they are freshmen students attending the same university at the same time.

As for historical threats, it is possible that Residential Education could have implemented other changes at the same time of the intervention, which could impact engagement for the resident group. If so, this would be a potential confound to the present study and limit the casual inferences about the effect of the competency modeling intervention. Of note, the department piloted a new programming model at the first year of the intervention and then implemented it campus wide the following year. The change to the programming model increased the number and type of programs provided to residents; thus, making it possible that the programming model could improve resident engagement during the time
of the intervention. However, a primary component of the new programming model was a passive “lemonade stand” approach that exposed students to programming informally and without advanced notice. An open question revolves around the extent that these programs were isolated to residents versus the broader student population. If it is the latter, it would likely impact the control group engagement in a similar manner, which was not observed in the present study. Either way, it is recommended that additional research be conducted with the department to see if resident engagement returns to baseline levels when the competency modeling practices were discontinued in 2014-2015, while the programming practices are still in effect to date.

In terms of future research, it is recommended that the effectiveness of competency modeling interventions leverage within subjects repeated measures design to enable more advanced measurement modeling (i.e., hierarchical linear modeling). Additionally, researching organizations that have typical employment terms would be ideal, as the present study was conducted in an academic setting, where student employees are usually employed on an annual basis rather than over multiple years as in a typical employment model. Additionally, since this study leveraged archival data, it would be beneficial to design a study that could better measure organizational performance as this study was limited to student engagement, which represents only one of many facets of organizational performance. Also, it would be of interest to measure not only organizational performance but organizational climate and employee engagement given that organizational climate has been shown to influence organizational outcomes such
as market performance and customer loyalty, with employee perceptions and engagement playing a key role (Chaung & Liao, 2010; Salanova, Agut & Peiro´, 2005). Lastly, while it is known which talent systems were impacted by the competency model intervention in this study (i.e., selection, training and performance), it is unclear which system enhancements (if any independently) had the most effect on organizational performance or if it was attributed to holistic integration of the competency model and enhancements across each system. Given that competency modeling’s casual mechanisms in improving organizational performance are still not well understood or explained by the field, this area of study has much to explore and would continue to benefit from additional research to explain both how and why competency modeling may be effective in improving organization performance.

**Implications**

There are several important implications of this study for the field of I/O psychology. First, the fundamental idea that competency modeling can enhance organizational performance has led to wide adoption and diverse practices applied in the field (Schuler & Jackson, 2005); however, before this study, no published empirical evidence existed to support the practice, exposing a large number of companies to risk and highlighting the importance of this research and need to leverage well-tested practices in design (Stone et al., 2013). Competency modeling should be implemented with technically sound methods in order to enhance organizational outcomes, aligning with previous recommendations in the literature (Catano et al., 2007; Lievens et al., 2004; Schippmann et al., 2000).
More specifically, this study suggests that subject matter experts should deploy rigorous future-oriented job analytic methods to understand the entire performance domain, involve employees extensively in the creation and feedback process to enhance the design of the model and develop a model that enables organization-wide results sustainably. Additionally, great care should be taken in identifying and designing the competency model. Specifically, this study followed the best practice recommendations of the field: 1) competencies are defined by KSAOs that describe how effective performance occurs as well as what effective performance is, while connecting employees to broader organizational goals and strategies, 2) competencies are internally consistent in that performance on one competency should not conflict with performance on another competency but reinforce each other in clear ways, 3) competencies predict and explain successful performance in a wide range of job domains, 4) competencies may inform judgments with respect to key outcomes (e.g., selection and compensation), and 5) competencies are compelling and promote thoughtful discussion about effective job performance beyond a list of KSAOs (Campion et al., 2010). Thus, future research and practice should seek to replicate best practice in overall design and implementation to enable the best results.

Further, this research lends support to the theory of competency modeling as an organization development intervention. Scholars often describe organizational development as being core to competency modeling, as competency modeling efforts often seek broad organizational change, focus on outcomes for employees and organizational effectiveness, are based on behavioral
science, built through adaptive and iterative processes, and include both
development and implementation of the model (Campion et al., 2011; Cummings
& Worley, 2009; Schippmann et al., 2010). As an organizational development
intervention, the competency model was developed with extensive involvement
from the employees and stakeholders of the department, and ultimately the model
informed the design of performance coaching tools that were implemented in a
cascading manner across the organization over three years, illustrating a common
application of organizational development and competency modeling applications
to improve organizational performance (Catano et al., 2007; Rahbar-Daniels et al.,
2001; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Posthuma & Campion, 2008; Martone, 2003).
As such, this study suggests that implementing a competency model with well-
designed tools and with informed change management approach can improve
organization performance and can have a positive and sustained effect for the
years following the intervention. Overall, these results have important
implications for future practice in competency modeling, especially if there is
hope to replicate results in other organizations.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Competency modeling is a popular human resource practice but is not well
researched by the field to support its wide use and broad application, warranting
the need to empirically and critically examine proponents’ claims that
competency modeling improves organizational performance (Dubois, 1993; Lucia
& Lepsinger, 1999; Rahbar-Daniels et al., 2001; Stone et al., 2013). This research
aimed to address gaps in the competency modeling literature by examining
whether competency modeling can enhance organizational performance, given that it is estimated that 70–80% of Fortune 500 companies use some form of competency modeling within their talent management programs (Schuler & Jackson, 2005; Stone et al., 2013).

An organization that implemented a competency model immediately after redefining their mission, vision, goals and values to reflect the departmental philosophy following reorganization served as the case study for this competency modeling research. By implementing a competency model with well-designed tools and with an informed change management approach, the department could directly connect and explain employees’ roles and responsibilities as they relate to the overall department goals and philosophy (Campion et al., 2011; Shippmann et al., 2000). Also, the competency model intervention aligned the personnel systems (i.e., selection, training and performance) to the organizational strategy, and according to theory, enabled employees to offer strategic value, especially when the talent strategy is integrated across the business (Becker & Huselid, 2006; Schuler & Jackson, 2005). While most of the theories about competency modeling’ effectiveness are intuitively appealing, little has been done to research the impact of such techniques; however, this research presents some preliminary support.

Overall, the results of this research provides the first published empirical evidence demonstrating that competency modeling can improve organization performance, and lend support to the theory and practice of competency modeling as an organization development initiative. Further, this study provides an example
of how competency modeling can be used to align and integrate talent systems to enhance and sustain organizational performance for the years following an intervention by enhancing performance coaching, selection and training systems. While initial results are promising (Dubois, 1993; Lucia & Lepsinger, 1999; Rahbar-Daniels, Erickson & Dalik, 2001; Stone et al., 2013), the causal mechanisms that are involved are still not understood by the field. There is still much to explore and benefits to realize by researching both how and why competency modeling may be effective in improving organization performance. Once the field better understands the causal mechanisms behind competency modeling’s effectiveness, efforts can be devoted to ensure the best practice and design of such interventions, as the field will be guided with vision and direction based on solid theory and empirical research, rather than popular, disparate and mostly proprietary based practice.

As scientist practitioners, our work is inevitably ongoing and requires continued review and focused examination. The present research is one of many studies needed to establish competency modeling as an evidence-based practice, a concept that the field, and especially competency modeling, could greatly draw upon (Briner & Rousseau, 2011). Despite the challenges in establishing competency modeling as an evidence-based practice, the field is now one step closer to doing so, but we still have a long way to go.
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Residential Education Technical Report

Residential Education Organizational Consulting Project

The Year in Review
Executive Summary

- A revised mission and vision are proposed to align with national and university standards and be representative of the department’s philosophy.
- A revised set of departmental goals representing both students and the department are proposed.
- New departmental values are introduced to reflect the department’s philosophy.
- A competency model called PILLAR is introduced that is conceptually linked to the proposed values and behaviorally linked to the available job descriptions.
- An evaluation plan is recommended for all of the proposed departmental changes and revisions. Specific measures were provided.
- Recommended Next Steps for Residential Education are provided.
Project Overview

This project’s objective was to assist the Department of Residential Education in evaluating their current mission, vision and goals, as there was a departmental concern that their mission statement, vision and goals did not accurately represent their institutional philosophies. As such, the Department of Residential Education and Department of Psychology collaborated to engage in an internal review of their stated organizational philosophies and objectives. Using qualified graduate students from the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Doctoral Program to conduct the evaluation, a yearlong collaboration between departments ensued to meet four main objectives:

5) Review and modify the current departmental mission, vision and goals statements with input from key stakeholders in order to more accurately reflect and ensure alignment of the departmental philosophy and objectives. This was done through interviews and focus groups with Residential Education employees, students, constituents and benchmarking with best practices in the field.

6) Identify and document Residential Education organizational core values with input from key stakeholders to improve communication and integration of the departmental values throughout organizational activities and personnel practices.

7) Demonstrate how the core values may “come to life” at different jobs within Residential Education by integrating job description and competency analysis approaches, while aligning competencies with professional standards and best practices.

8) Create specific suggestions for how personnel practices (e.g., training, selection, evaluation, and performance appraisal) can more strategically include the Residential Education’s mission, vision, goals and core values through the implementation of the new competency model.
This report outlines the specific results and methods for addressing the above stated objectives. In addition, recommendations and illustrations for implementation and integration of deliverables as well as proposed methods for evaluating effectiveness are detailed.

Phase 1 – Mission, Vision, and Departmental Goals

Goal. Consultants were engaged to evaluate the Residential Education’s mission, vision, and departmental goals as found in the official organizational documents. The consultants were tasked with determining whether the current mission, vision, and departmental goals adequately reflected those of Residential Education and were appropriately aligned with DePaul’s philosophy and national residential standards; if they did not, the consultants were to revise the mission, vision and departmental goals with input from staff members.

Method. A series of interviews were conducted from October through December 2009 to incorporate the perspectives and opinions of a variety of Residential Education stakeholders and collaborating departments. Interview protocols were developed that had a structured set of questions that were asked across interview sessions as well as a subset of questions tailored to each interview session participant(s). The groups and individuals interviewed were:

- Associate Vice President of Student Development
- Residential Education Director
- Assistant Director for Outreach and Student Success
- Assistant Director for Selection and Training
- Residential Education Administrative Office Assistant
- Dean of Students
- Public Safety Representatives
- Housing Services Representatives
- Director of University Counseling Services
- Residence Directors (n = 6)
- Resident Assistants (n = 9)
- Student Judicial Board (n = 4)
- Residence Hall Council (n = 10)

Each interview was documented through detailed note-taking and audio-recording. After all interviews had been conducted, a theme analysis was conducted by the consultants through thoroughly reviewing all of the notes for the interviews. Once a list of themes had been created, the consultants independently re-analyzed the interview notes and coded responses to the interview questions for resulting themes; consultants then came together to form a consensus for the prevalence of themes in the interviews. This process allowed for a loosely quantitative analysis of themes that emerged from the interviews that could direct revisions of the mission, vision, and departmental goals.
Deliverable. The consultants agreed that the mission, vision, and departmental goals needed modification to be more representative of the Department of Residential Education, and to improve alignment with university and national standards. The revisions follow:

**Mission:** The purpose behind Residential Education. Through our passion and dedication, we identify and respond to student needs. We devote our time, talent and resources to build a relational, residential community where students are encouraged to explore, learn and develop holistically.

**Vision:** What Residential Education hopes to accomplish through the mission. We strive to transform students into responsible adults who desire to make decisions out of respect for themselves and others. We aspire for these adults to always pursue excellence, welcome diverse perspectives, and proactively contribute to their university and community.

**Departmental Goals.** Outcomes that Residential Education seek to support through the mission and vision.

** Desired Student Outcomes.**

- Enhanced self-understanding and appreciation
- Enhanced appreciation for others’ experiences and perspectives
- Increased responsible decision-making
- Enhanced participation in and affinity for the communities in which they live
Desired Department Outcomes

- Safe and social residence halls that facilitate learning beyond the classroom
- Collaborative, engaged relationships with others
- Culture of employee appreciation, development and growth

The revisions resulting from Phase 1 more accurately reflect the perception and reality of Residential Education as defined through invested stakeholders and collaborating departments. These revisions were developed in consultation with CAS and ACUHO-I publications to align with national standards. Additionally, they were written to align with University values and initiatives, specifically the University Vision 2012. The revised mission, vision, and departmental goals should help Residential Education moving forward when considering initiatives, selecting and training employees, and educating students about its purpose by providing a unified, qualitatively-driven (i.e., constructed through comprehensive interviews and examination of organizational and industry literature) departmental philosophy.
Phase 2 – Values

**Goal.** After revising the departmental mission, vision and goals, the consultants set out to identify the core values of Residential Education to document and communicate the organizational philosophy and culture, as well as ensure that departmental values can be integrated into personnel practices.

**Method.** The consultants independently conducted a theme analysis by thoroughly reviewing all notes from the interviews conducted in Phase 1 to identify the core values of the Residential Education. Once a comprehensive list of themes had been created regarding institutional values, the consultants reached consensus through discussion of the emergent themes. This process allowed for a loosely quantitative analysis of themes through identifying the most prevalent and critical values communicated from within members and constituencies of the department. Lastly, when documenting the core values, consultants reviewed and ensured alignment with university and industry philosophies.

**Deliverable.** The consultants identified the core values of the Department of Residential Education. Upon review and approval from key stakeholders, the core values are documented in Figure 6.
**Figure 6.** The Department of Residential Education values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Department of Residential Education values:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service (to Others)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon formal documentation, these core values can be communicated to the Department of Residential Education’s personnel and other stakeholders, as well as integrated throughout personnel practices to ensure alignment with department’s mission, vision, values and departmental goals in all organizational activities.
Phase 3 – Competency Model

Goal. Now that Residential Education has newly identified mission, vision, goals and values statements that accurately reflect the departmental philosophy, the consultants developed a competency model that is comprised of a meaningful aggregate of value and mission driven workforce characteristics (comprised of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics) that individuals must exhibit to successfully perform their jobs and organizational roles. By implementing a competency model, the department can directly link employees’ roles and responsibilities to the overall philosophy of Residential Education to align all personnel practices and organizational activities to fulfill the departmental mission, vision, and departmental goals while embodying the foundational values.

Method. To demonstrate how the core values of Residential Education may “come to life” within different jobs in the department, the consultants employed multiple human resources methods to develop the competency model. First, the consultants reviewed organizational documents pertaining to each job within the department to develop an understanding of the scope of each role. Next, the consultants surveyed employees at all levels within the department to determine the accuracy of each role’s job description. The survey and recruitment email for the position description studies are presented in Appendix B.
Overall results of the survey suggested that all job descriptions represented the main duties and responsibilities for each position\(^1\); thus, the consultants could proceed with developing the competency model using the current job descriptions and other organizational documents. The consultants developed a competency model that reflected competencies that were applicable to all members of the Department of Residential Education (student staff included) and that were aligned with the Professional Competency Areas for Student Affairs Practitioners identified by national associations’ standards (ACPA & NASPA). This involved adapting the professional competencies to include KSAOs relevant to student staff and specific to the University. Next, the core values of Residential Education documented in Phase 2 were linked to their corresponding departmental competencies as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Added Competency</th>
<th>Inspired by ACPA/NASPA Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (to Others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  

\(^2\) 85% respondents feel that their job description accurately represents their position. However, results suggest that the Director of Residential Education’s position description should be updated to better reflect the position, as the responsibilities and duties of the role may have changed over time.
**Deliverable.** Through multiple approaches detailed above, a competency model for all Residential Education employees that is aligned with professional standards and best practices was created to integrate the core values of the department into organizational practices. The resulting model is articulated below and illustrated in Figure 7:

**Competency Model.** Competencies are a collection of knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOs) necessary to successfully perform Residential Education employees’ job duties and help fulfill its mission, vision, goals and values. Residential Education’s competencies address specific KSAOs related to each of the following:

*Professionalism.* Being accountable for work role responsibilities, following through with professional commitments, supporting ResEd initiatives, and striving for continuous personal and organizational improvement. This is necessary to accomplish one’s job duties while meeting all standards of ethics and excellence.

*Inclusion and Diversity.* Building a community that is enriched with diverse views and people of varied backgrounds, races, cultures, and beliefs. This is necessary to promote respect and appreciation for individuality and diversity.

*Leadership.* Envisioning, planning, effecting change within individuals and groups, and identifying and responding to needs within Residential Education and the community. This is necessary to fulfill Residential Education’s mission, vision and departmental goals.
Learning and Development. Applying best practices, concepts and principles of the profession and work role, including rigorous assessment of organizational initiatives and goals. This is necessary to encourage the holistic development of students and Residential Education professionals, and guide evidenced-based decision making.

Advising and Mentoring. Providing counseling and advising support, direction, feedback, referral, and guidance to individuals and groups. This is necessary to encourage healthy, safe, and community-minded decision making among students.

Readiness. Maintaining personal health and wellness, being self-reflective, passionate for the welfare of others, comfortable with ambiguity, and adaptable. This is necessary to prepare oneself for the demands of the work role, Residential Education, and its constituents.
Integration. The proposed competency model can be used to articulate the alignment of the core PILLAR competencies to the overall mission, vision, values and goals of Residential Education. Every job description was evaluated and each duty/responsibility for each position was mapped onto the competency model framework. Now, employees can recognize how they are helping Residential Education fulfill the overall mission and values of Residential Education through performance of their individual job responsibilities. This articulation process can strengthen Residential Education’s ability to communicate the importance of their foundational mission, vision, values and goals through employees’ activities.

For each organizational role, we encourage Residential Education to conduct position studies (through consensus of subject matter experts, such as current position holders or supervisors) to identify the critical behaviors that are necessary to perform each job within each competency, while determining what specific behaviors “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations” or would be “below expectations.” The results of these position analyses will create a rubric that Residential Education can use to evaluate PILLAR performance in the future.
For example, under the Learning and Development competency, what does “counseling and advising support” mean for a Resident Assistant compared to a Residence Director? Within this competency, what behaviors must employees exhibit to exceed/ meet/ perform below expectations for each position? By determining what critical behaviors represent each competency within each level of the organization, Residential Education can more effectively design and evaluate their personnel systems to better train, select, coach and assess employees on the PILLARs of Residential Education.

**Implementation.** To fully implement the model, each personnel practice should be evaluated to determine how the competency model can be reflected within each system. Additionally, the PILLARs provide a framework for identifying gaps in current systems that should be addressed to ensure that Residential Education’s mission, vision, values and goals are being fulfilled by organizational initiatives. Recommendations on how to implement the competency model into current human resource practices are summarized below:
Selection. All interview guides and selection processes can be designed to address each of the PILLARs. Once critical behaviors for each position are identified, questions can be developed to assess candidate’s performance on each competency. Current guides can be evaluated and restructured to fit into the PILLAR framework. Also, gaps can be identified to ensure each competency area is addressed by the selection tool. A sample of how the RA interview guide can be modified is appended at the end of this technical report. Again, we recommend that key behaviors be determined through position studies to determine what behaviors should be used to predict candidates’ success on the job but there is likely room for some immediate changes.

Training. The consultants encourage a holistic approach to designing training for each job. All training modules and materials can be sorted into the PILLAR framework. When training employees, it would be valuable to inform trainees how each training session addresses one or several of the competencies. Providing this framework can help employees develop an understanding of how each competency area and job responsibility fits into the larger goals of Residential Education, while training them on the specific competencies that are required to fulfill their job responsibilities.
Performance Appraisal (Development Only): While there are limitations to working within a larger University system (as one cannot modify formal performance evaluations) the consultants encourage Residential Education to develop a performance evaluation system that is used only for developmental purposes. Once critical behaviors for each competency are identified, assessment tools can be created for each position to identify an individual’s performance on the PILLARs and then provide specific and actionable advice for each competency on how they can improve to reach the next level of performance (all while helping Residential Education fulfill their mission). Additionally, long-term developmental planning should be emphasized under the Learning and Development Competency to help identify an individual’s career aspirations and determine specific steps to help them reach their professional goals.
Evaluation of Deliverables

Evaluating organizational initiatives, such as changing departmental goals and/or introducing a competency model, are important for organizational effectiveness. An initiative that looks excellent on paper might not turn out to work so well for a specific organization. Residential Education is encouraged to evaluate the proposed mission, vision, departmental goals, values and PILLAR competency model. The consultants recommend following Kirkpatrick’s model for organizational initiative evaluation (Kirkpatrick, 1996). This model includes four levels of evaluation: reactions, learning, behavior, and results.

Because most of the changes introduced this year are more cultural and philosophical in nature, the evaluation of organizational members’ reactions to the changes and introductions made by the consulting team are very appropriate. These reaction measures should provide an indication as to the acceptance and relevance of the mission, vision, departmental goals, values and the PILLAR model. An example of a measure that can be used for this task is provided. If organizational members are dissatisfied with any of these implementations, Residential Education should become informed relatively quickly and begin to examine why such dissatisfaction exists.

Evaluating the extent to which important information introduced this year learned by those within and outside of Residential Education is also applicable. In addition to the perceptions measure, a learning measure is provided; this measure can help inform Residential Education the extent to which organizational stakeholders are internalizing the mission, vision, departmental goals, values and
the PILLAR model. If organizational members have a difficult time recalling this information, then perhaps the criticality of the organizational initiatives is being underemphasized, or it is not being used to guide the department to the best extent possible. Overall, the two provided measures should help Residential Education assess the reactions to and internalization of this year’s organizational implementations.

Evaluating organizational members on the occurrence of appropriate and desired behaviors is a good way to evaluate the application and utility of the PILLAR model. Once the PILLARs are fully integrated into Residential Education and behaviors of each PILLAR have been defined across job, Residential Education can then ensure that all organizational members are displaying the PILLAR behaviors to an adequate degree. This recommendation is best used in conjunction with the implementation of a developmental performance appraisal.

The final level of evaluation for organizational initiatives is that of results. Traditionally, results are measured by assessing organizational financial performance following the introduction of an initiative, such as a selection process. It is recommended that in place of financial performance, Residential Education evaluate the results of the organizational initiatives by rigorously measuring the department’s level of success at meeting its departmental goals. As these goals were constructed in conjunction with the department’s overall mission and vision, these goals can be considered the final results in which Residential Education measures success (since through the mission, vision and organizational
initiatives the department should achieve their goals). The extent to which these goals are satisfactorily met, however, is defined by Residential Education, and can be considered an indication of the success of the proposed initiatives.
Next Steps

Based on the information detailed in this report, the following is a succinct list of next steps that Residential Education can take in its continuing efforts at departmental development and improvement:

- Integrate the proposed mission, vision, departmental goals, values and competency model into official organizational literature and discourse, including all personnel systems as soon as feasible.

- Develop sound evaluation measures and methods to be used to assess the level of success at meeting the proposed departmental goals. This can also serve as an evaluation for the proposed changes as a whole.

- Evaluate existing personnel systems (i.e., selection, performance appraisal, and training) to ensure that the PILLAR model is adequately represented within them. If this is not the case, make any necessary revisions to ensure PILLAR coverage.

- Develop a rubric for the PILLAR model that specifies behaviors that exceed, meet, and are below departmental expectations for each competency in each position. This will help leverage the PILLAR model across the organization in a specific and relevant developmental manner. Also, this will enable behavioral evaluation of the PILLAR model.
• Evaluate the reactions to and learning of the proposed changes using the measures provided. It is recommended this be done annually for to track any changes or trends that occur over time and evaluate them if needed.

Conclusion

Residential Education sought to re-align its mission and vision with national and university standards in a way that best represented the realities and philosophy of the department. The consultants delivered on this goal through a series of interviews and examination of national standards. In addition, revised departmental goals and values were proposed that complemented the mission and vision. Finally, a competency model was developed that is conceptually linked to the greater mission, vision and values, and behaviorally linked to the individual position descriptions. The information provided over the course of the year, and in this report, should help serve Residential Education moving forward.
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Introduction

Hello. Introduce ourselves…..

We are an organizational consulting team from the Industrial Organizational Program at DePaul University, and today we are conducting this [focus group/interview] to help us identify and develop a new mission and new core values for the department of Residential Education so they can best serve DePaul University’s community of students, staff, and faculty.

As a part of this process, we would like to discuss your ideas and relationships regarding the Department of Residential Education. When answering our questions, please feel free to respond based on your personal opinion or observations, and what you have gathered about the general opinions of others. There may be times during the focus groups that we move the session on to another question. We want to make sure we get your opinions on all of the topics we are interested in. Feel free to jot down some comments and let us know later if you think of something important, but didn’t get a chance to say it:

Today, we will be recording our conversations strictly for note taking purposes. All findings will be reported at the aggregate level so any comments that you make will not be connected to you personally (excluding single interviews?).

Do you have any questions before we begin?
Residential Education Management and Directors

Mission and Values

1. What does ResEd mean to you?
2. What does ResEd mean to others (i.e., students, faculty, staff, etc…)?
3. In your opinion, what are ResEd’s primary values?
   a. How do you embody those values day-to-day in your position?
      Examples?
4. In your opinion, what is the purpose of ResEd?
5. What does DePaul’s Vision 2012 mean to you (don’t list them)?
   a. How is ResEd Supporting and embodying this vision, if at all?

Personal and Professional Development

6. What skills has ResEd helped you develop? (get examples)
   a. Probe for leadership
7. How has ResEd contributed to your personal and professional development?
   a. Probe: How has ResEd helped you develop your spirituality/self-understanding/respect for others?
   b. Probe: What emphasis, if any, is placed on self-set goals? Have you set any personal goals due in part to ResEd?

Learning Outcomes and Impact on Students

8. What do you hope to see as an outcome of ResEd’s influences?
9. What skills do you observe ResEd developing in students? How do you help students develop them?
10. What does "socially responsible leadership" mean to you? How does ResEd facilitate this? How is ResEd doing in this with students?
11. What impact does ResEd have on student's choices and experiences with drugs, sexuality, and alcohol?
12. What services exist for students struggling in school, either academically or with substances? What do these look like?
13. What do you think about the programming ResEd provides? Probes - is it enough, do you go, are they useful? What would you change?
14. How would you describe ResEd’s interactions with residents?
   a. Probe: How do you encourage others to respect individuals and their opinions/beliefs, regardless of personal differences?
   b. Probe: How do you promote an inclusive environment?
   c. Probe: In what ways does ResEd promote a service orientation?
16. What services and resources are provided for non-traditional students (i.e., off-campus, evening…)?
Structure

17. How important are the CAS standard to you and your job?
   a. How is your job impacted by the CAS standards?
   b. In your opinion, how effective is ResEd at meeting these standards?

18. Are ResEd management practices and activities helping you accomplish the departmental mission and goals?

19. Do you feel you have the resourced needed to fulfill ResEd’s mission, goals and learning outcomes?

Conclusion

20. What do you think ResEd should be striving to accomplish?

21. Get reactions to mission Statement - *[We connect students with learning opportunities in an academic, residential community]* - What is your reaction to this? What are the strengths? What are the shortcomings? What would you change?

22. Get reactions to Vision - *[Through our connections with students and others, we support the University’s Vincentian values. We devote our time, talent and resources to the pursuit of academic excellence, respect for diversity and civic responsibility]*

23. Get reactions to learning outcomes - *[The Department of Residential Education seeks to provide our students the opportunity to achieve growth and development by:]*
   - Enhancing students' respect and appreciation for themselves and one another;
   - Assisting students in making healthy and responsible choices in relation to alcohol, drugs, sexuality and wellness;
   - Increasing the academic learning potential of students;
   - Engaging collaboratively with other faculty, staff, students and the broader community.]

Other questions if time allows:

☐ How would you describe the typical ResED employee?
   - How does that differ from the ideal ResED employee?
Residential Education Support Staff

Mission and Values

24. What does ResEd mean to you?
25. What does ResEd mean to others (i.e., students, faculty, staff, etc…)?
26. In your opinion, what are ResEd’s primary values?
   a. How do you embody those values day-to-day in your position? Examples?
27. In your opinion, what is the purpose of ResEd?

Personal Development

28. What skills has ResEd helped you develop? (get examples)
   a. Probe for leadership
29. Has ResEd contributed to your personal development? If so, how?
   c. Probe: How has ResEd helped you develop your spirituality/self-understanding/respect for others?

Learning Outcomes and Impact on Students

30. What do you hope to see as an outcome of ResEd’s influences?
31. What skills do you observe ResEd developing in students? How do you help students develop them?
32. What does "socially responsible leadership" mean to you? How does ResEd facilitate this? How is ResEd doing in this with students?
33. How would you describe ResEd’s interactions with residents?
   d. Probe: Does ResED encourage others to respect individuals and their opinions/beliefs, regardless of personal differences? If so, how?
   e. Probe: Does ResEd promote an inclusive environment? If so, how?
34. Do you feel ResEd fosters a sense of belonging and connectedness to the community? Res hall community? DePaul community? Neighborhood?
   f. Probe: In what ways does ResEd promote a service orientation?

Structure

35. Do you feel you have the resources needed to fulfill ResEd’s mission, goals and learning outcomes?

Conclusion

36. What do you think ResEd should be striving to accomplish?
37. Get reactions to Mission Statement - [We connect students with learning opportunities in an academic, residential community] - What is your reaction to this? What are the strengths? What are the shortcomings? What would you change?

38. Get reactions to Vision - [Through our connections with students and others, we support the University’s Vincentian values. We devote our time, talent and resources to the pursuit of academic excellence, respect for diversity and civic responsibility]

39. Get reactions to learning outcomes - [The Department of Residential Education seeks to provide our students the opportunity to achieve growth and development by:

- Enhancing students' respect and appreciation for themselves and one another;
- Assisting students in making healthy and responsible choices in relation to alcohol, drugs, sexuality and wellness;
- Increasing the academic learning potential of students;
- Engaging collaboratively with other faculty, staff, students and the broader community.]

Other questions if time allows:

☐ How would you describe the ideal ResED employee?
  ■ How does that differ from the typical ResED employee?
  ■ What qualities would you like to see in a ResED employee?

Resident Advisors

Mission and Values

40. What does ResEd mean to you?
41. What does ResEd mean to others (i.e., students, faculty, staff, etc…)?
42. In your opinion, what are ResEd’s primary values?
  a. How do you embody those values day-to-day in your position?
     Examples?
43. In your opinion, what is the purpose of ResEd?

Personal Development

44. What skills has ResEd helped you develop? (get examples)
  a. Probe for leadership
45. How has ResEd contributed to your personal development?
  d. Probe: How has ResEd helped you develop your spirituality/self-understanding/respect for others?
Learning Outcomes and Impact on Students

46. What do you hope to see as an outcome of ResEd’s influences?
47. What skills do you observe ResEd developing in students? How do you help students develop them?
48. What does "socially responsible leadership" mean to you? How does ResEd facilitate this? How is ResEd doing in this with students?
49. What impact does ResEd have on student's choices and experiences with drugs, sexuality, and alcohol?
50. What services exist for students struggling in school, either academically or with substances? What do these look like?
51. What do you think about the programming ResEd provides? Probes - is it enough, do you go, are they useful? What would you change?
52. How would you describe ResEd’s interactions with residents?
  g. Probe: How do you encourage others to respect individuals and their opinions/beliefs, regardless of personal differences?
  h. Probe: How do you promote an inclusive environment?
  i. Probe: In what ways does ResEd promote a service orientation?

Structure

54. Do you feel you have the resources needed to fulfill ResEd’s mission, goals and learning outcomes?

Conclusion

55. What do you think ResEd should be striving to accomplish?
56. Get reactions to Mission Statement - [We connect students with learning opportunities in an academic, residential community] - What is your reaction to this? What are the strengths? What are the shortcomings? What would you change?
57. Get reactions to Vision - [Through our connections with students and others, we support the University’s Vincentian values. We devote our time, talent and resources to the pursuit of academic excellence, respect for diversity and civic responsibility]
58. Get reactions to learning outcomes - [The Department of Residential Education seeks to provide our students the opportunity to achieve growth and development by:
  • Enhancing students' respect and appreciation for themselves and one another;]
• Assisting students in making healthy and responsible choices in relation to alcohol, drugs, sexuality and wellness;
• Increasing the academic learning potential of students;
• Engaging collaboratively with other faculty, staff, students and the broader community.]

Other questions if time allows:

☐ How would you describe the ideal ResED employee?
  ▪ How does that differ from the typical ResED employee?
  ▪ What qualities would you like to see in a ResED employee?

Student Groups

Opener

59. Describe the relationship between your group and ResEd.

Mission and Values

60. What does ResEd mean to you
61. What does ResEd mean to other students?
62. In your opinion, what are ResEd’s primary values?
63. In your opinion, what is the purpose of ResEd?
64. What does DePaul’s Vision 2012 mean to you (don’t list them)?
   b. How is ResEd Supporting and embodying this vision, if at all?

Resident Learning Outcomes

65. In your opinion, what is important that residents gain through their experiences with ResEd?
66. What are some ways ResEd has helped you and/or other students?
67. How has ResEd contributed to your personal development?
   c. Probe: How has ResEd enhanced your educational experience?
   d. Probe: How has ResEd helped you develop your spirituality/self-understanding?
   e. Probe: What emphasis, if any, is placed on self-set goals? Have you set any personal goals due in part to ResEd?
   f. Probe: Do you feel ResEd has helped you learn to respect yourself more? What about respecting others?
68. What does "socially responsible leadership" mean to you? How does ResEd facilitate this?
69. Has ResEd helped develop your leadership abilities? In what ways (get examples)?
   a. How are you applying these skills to your community?
Impact on Students

70. What impact does ResEd have on student's choices and experiences with drugs, sexuality, and alcohol?
71. Do any services exist for students struggling in school, either academically or with substances? What do these look like?
72. What do you think about the programming ResEd provides? Probes - is it enough, do you go, are they useful, are they missing something, etc…
73. How would you describe your interactions with ResEd?
   a. Probe: Do you perceive ResEd staff as respecting individuals and their opinions/beliefs, regardless of personal differences?
   b. Probe: Do you perceive ResEd as fostering an inclusive environment?
74. Do you feel ResEd fosters a sense of belonging and connectedness to the community? Res hall community? DePaul community? Neighborhood?
   c. Probe: In what ways is ResEd service oriented? (i.e., how are they involved in the community)

Conclusion

75. What do you think ResEd should be striving to accomplish
76. [We connect students with learning opportunities in an academic, residential community] - What is your reaction to this? What are the strengths? What are the shortcomings? What would you change?

Other questions if time allows:

☐ How would you describe the typical ResED employee?
   ▪ How does that differ from the ideal ResED employee?
   ▪ What qualities would you like to see in a ResED employee?

Other University Constituencies

Introduction

1. Describe the relationship between your department and ResEd?

Mission and Values

2. What does ResEd mean to you?
3. Based on your observations, what does ResEd mean to students?
4. What would you consider to be their primary values?
5. In your opinion, what is the purpose of ResEd?
6. Without going into specifics, what does DePaul’s Vision 2012 mean to you?
a. How is ResEd supporting and embodying that vision, if at all?

Student Outcomes

7. What do you think is important that residents gain through their experiences with ResEd?
8. Do you perceive ResEd staff as respecting individuals and their opinions/beliefs, regardless of personal differences?
9. In what ways is ResEd service oriented? (i.e., how are they involved in the community?)

Departmental Interaction and Unique Questions

10. How would you describe your interactions with ResEd staff?
11. Does your department and ResEd cooperate in any way to further student development and learning? If so, please describe.
12. Unique question depending on department (as many as needed)

Conclusion

13. What do you think ResEd should be striving to accomplish?
14. [We connect students with learning opportunities in an academic, residential community] – After what we have discussed, what is your reaction to this? What are the strengths? What are the shortcomings? What would you change?

Other questions if time allows:

☐ How would you describe the typical ResED employee?
  ▪ How does that differ from the ideal ResED employee?
  ▪ What qualities would you like to see in a ResED employee?
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RA Selection Interview Guide

Connections to and Gaps with the Competency Model
It can be observed that the first two sections of the RA interview form fit nicely with the Readiness competency as currently outlined (i.e., Maintaining personal health and wellness, being self-reflective, passionate for the welfare of others, comfortable with ambiguity, and adaptable. This is necessary to prepare oneself for the demands of the work role, Residential Education, and its constituents). This seems appropriate since Readiness is a major consideration for RA selection.

- Specifically, the questions really tap into the self-reflective aspect of the competency which is particularly important
- The answers to questions may also give insight into passion for others’ welfare
- May want to ask something about comfort with ambiguity and changing work demands, as this is not represented here.

The Professionalism competency is also addressed here, particularly by the first question in the second section. The third question in the second section also taps into the desire that Resident Advisors need to continually improve, and must recognize where this is needed.
The next two sections fit very well into the Inclusion and Diversity competency (i.e., Building a community that is enriched with diverse views and people of varied backgrounds, races, cultures, and beliefs. This is necessary to promote respect and appreciation for individuality and diversity.)
We can see that between these five questions, the Leadership (i.e., Envisioning, planning, effecting change within individuals and groups, and identifying and responding to needs within Residential Education and the community. This is necessary to fulfill Residential Education’s mission, vision and departmental goals) and Advising and Mentoring (i.e., Providing counseling and advising support, direction, feedback, referral, and guidance to individuals and groups. This is necessary to encourage healthy, safe, and community-minded decision making among students) competencies are tapped.

- Question 2 on the bottom even addresses Readiness.
- There is room try and further gauge the Advising and Mentoring competency, however. Question three on top is good, but another question
about how they have helped guide others through difficult or uncertain
times might be beneficial.

- The Leadership competency could be more directly addressed. Perhaps
  having them recall a time when they had to plan something from
  beginning to end, and what kind of difficulties and lessons they learned?
Summary – PILLAR Representation

- **Professionalism**
  - Tapped by question one under the “Self-Awareness” section
  - But may also want to address the “continuous improvement” aspect.
    - Ex) Give an example of a time when you actively sought to learn a new skill, or improve a skill you already possessed? Why did you do this?

- **Inclusion and Diversity** - Very well represented in these items and probably needs no changes
Summary – PILLAR Representation

- **Learning and Development**
  - Not addressed in any of the items on the interview sheet. This is the hardest one to incorporate, as it is more trained and acquired at the RA level than actively sought after.
  - Two possible routes: focusing on how feedback and excellence
    - Ex) How has feedback helped shape you as a person? Give an example of a time when you incorporated feedback into a work or school role.
    - Ex) What methods do you use to try and perform work or school roles to the best of your ability?

- **Leadership**
  - Addressed by question 1 on the “Teamwork” section, and the “Theme Community Interest” section.
  - May be helpful to have one or two more overt questions about leadership:
    - Ex) Have you ever been involved in planning and executing an event, school project or work project? Describe the situation, and how you handled it.
    - Ex) Describe a situation in which you influenced another individual towards a course of action.
Summary – PILLAR Representation

- **Advising and Mentoring**
  - Represented by questions two and three in the “Teamwork” section
  - Might benefit from also including a question about advising someone non-work/team related
    - Ex) When someone you know comes to you for advice, how do you go about helping them?

- **Readiness**
  - Very well represented in this document.
  - Most of these question are self-reflection, so they are inherently “Readiness”-based. Poor responders probably aren’t “ready” for the job.
  - May possibly benefit from a question tapping into the adaptable nature of the work, or the comfort with ambiguity.
    - Ex) How do you react when given few directions for accomplish a goal?
    - Ex) Have you ever found yourself in a situation where what was expected of you suddenly changed? What happened, and how did you react?

Reactions

Please read the following statements and indicate your agreement by circling the appropriate number. Your answers are anonymous, and will help the Department of Residential Education better serve students.

1. I believe the following statement accurately describes the mission of Residential Education:

   Through our passion and dedication, we identify and respond to student needs. We devote our time, talent and resources to build a relational, residential community where students are encouraged to explore, learn and develop holistically.

   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Somewhat Disagree
   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
   4. Somewhat Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

2. I believe the following statement accurately describes the vision of Residential Education:

   We strive to transform students into responsible adults who desire to make decisions out of respect for themselves and others. We aspire for these adults to always pursue excellence, welcome diverse perspectives, and proactively contribute to their university and community.

   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Somewhat Disagree
   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
   4. Somewhat Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

3. I believe the following outcomes accurately represent the desired goals of Residential Education for students:

   - Enhanced self-understanding and appreciation
   - Enhanced appreciation for others’ experiences and perspectives
   - Increased responsible decision-making
 Enhanced participation in and affinity for the communities in which they live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. [For Staff Only] I believe the following outcomes accurately represent the desired goals of Residential Education for its employees:

- *Safe and social residence halls that facilitate learning beyond the classroom*
- *Collaborative, engaged relationships with others*
- *Culture of employee appreciation, development and growth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I believe the following *values* accurately reflect those of Residential Education:

- **Wellness** - We value the safety of our residents and staff through our commitment to safe residence halls and facilities, and encouragement of healthy decisions.
- **Connections** – We value our relationships with students and others, through building connections, creating cohesive residential communities, and collaborating to better serve students and staff.
- **Development** – We value developing oneself personally and professionally through learning at home, work and school.
- **Excellence** – We value striving for continuous improvement through the pursuit of excellence in all activities and relationships.
- **Responsibility** - We value discipline, responsibility and accountability to oneself and others in the community and organization.
- **Service (to Others)** – We value inspiring others to lead and serve the community in which they live and operate.
- **Respect** – We value the uniqueness and diversity of others; we strive to help others gain understanding of, remain open to and respect themselves and others for their individuality.
6. I believe the competency model used by Residential Education has helped make Residential Education a better department.

7. If you disagreed, either strongly or somewhat, with any of the items above, could you please explain which item and why? [Open Ended Response Item]

**Learning**

The following questions ask about the mission, vision, departmental goals and values for Residential Education. This information will help inform Residential Education on how well the department is informing others about itself. Please answer to the best of your ability. Your responses are anonymous, and it is important to remember that word-for-word recall is not important.

1. What is the **mission** of Residential Education?

2. What is the **vision** of Residential Education?

3. What are Residential Education’s **departmental goals for Students**?

4. What are Residential Education’s **departmental goals for Staff**?

5. What are Residential Education’s **values**?

6. [Management Only] What are Residential Education’s core **Competencies**?
Appendix B

Job Description Recruitment Email and Survey

Hello ResED (Insert RD, RA, AD or participant name) employee,

As part of a research process to understand ResED's positions, we would like you to respond to a few questions about your job. Please review the attached position description and take our very brief survey.

Your responses will be completely confidential, and the information you provide WILL NOT AFFECT YOUR JOB OR BENEFITS IN ANY WAY. Your valuable input will help us gain a better understanding of your position and ResED's personnel practices.

Please follow the link to take our brief survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ResED

Thank you for your help,

Sincerely,
Organizational Consultants

1) How accurately does this job description describe your position?
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Moderately Disagree
   d. Moderately Agree
   e. Agree
   f. Strongly Agree

2) What is inaccurate about this job description?

3) What other job duties and responsibilities are missing from this job description?

4) If you could change this job description in any way, what would you change?

5) What is your current job?
   a. Resident Advisor
   b. Residence Director
   c. Assistant Director
   d. Other (Please Specify)
**Appendix C**

**RA Job Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT:</th>
<th>Residential Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION:</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB TITLE:</td>
<td>Residence Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTS TO:</td>
<td>Residence Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Summary**

Reporting to a residence director, the resident advisor is a part-time student staff member. The RA works in a residential community and has specific responsibility for working with students in his/her community. She/he is the primary facilitator for the development of community in his/her specified area.

**Principal Duties and Responsibilities**

1. Cultivates relationships with students in the residential community through regular contact, quarterly attendance at Residence Hall Council meetings, floor meetings, and duty rounds. (25%) - D, L, R, AM
2. Plans and implements educational and community building opportunities consistent with department requirements and learning outcomes. (20%) - LD, L, AM
3. Responds to student issues, provides student conflict resolution, and acts on crises as they occur. (15%) - R, AM, LD
4. Maintains regular communications with supervisor. This includes but is not limited to participation in RA Advisory Board, weekly reports, incident reports and the completion of a formal evaluation process annually. (15%) – P
5. Attends regularly scheduled staff meetings, 1-1 meetings, pre-employment training in the spring quarter prior to employment, fall and winter training sessions, professional and paraprofessional recruitment and selection and ongoing departmental training programs. (10%) – P, LD
6. Is aware of, updates and appropriately disseminates information to residents through postings, electronic communications, and regular contact. (10%) – R, LD, P
7. Collaborates with other student housing units in support of hall openings, winter break housing, room changes, and building closings. (5%) – ID, P
8. Other duties and assignments as assigned. - R, P

**Minimum Knowledge, Skills and Abilities required:**

1. Ability to organize several projects and tasks with multiple deadlines- R, P
2. Ability to effectively interact with resident students and their guests- R, P
3. Ability to communicate effectively in written and oral form- P
4. Demonstrated ability to work and make decisions in a high-volume, fast-paced environment- R, P
5. Ability to provide both a student-centered and a customer service orientation - R
6. Appreciation for and commitment to multiculturalism - ID

**Position Qualifications:**
1. Full-time undergraduate student.
2. Cumulative GPA of 2.5 by June 30th in order to assume the position in August. (Mid-year hires must have a 2.5 GPA on the date of hire)
3. Resident Advisor must maintain a 2.5 for the duration of employment.

**Physical Requirements:**
This position requires frequent overnight response to student emergencies which includes interrupted sleep and the ability to hear a pager and/or phone while sleeping.

**Other Required Skill and Abilities:**
1. Must be well-organized and able to work under pressure with multiple deadlines in an ever changing, fast paced environment. Commitment to students and appreciation for multiculturalism and diversity is crucial. Must be willing to be a team player. Seek candidates with a clear understanding of a Catholic, Vincentian and urban institution.
2. The job incumbent understands that an undergraduate staff position in residence halls cannot easily be translated into hours worked per day or week because of the unique nature of the work. The resident advisor position requires regularly scheduled responsibilities, meetings, and times at which resident advisors must be available to floor residents and residential education staff. It is expected that staff treat this position as a priority ahead of other work commitments or campus involvement.
3. Fall training is an intensive 17 day experience. Resident Advisors may not have any additional employment during the fall training period.
4. Non-International students can work a maximum of 10 additional hours of on-campus employment per week.
5. International students may have no additional on-campus employment

*The above statements are intended to describe the general nature and level of the work being performed by people assigned to this work. This is not an exhaustive list of all duties and responsibilities associated with it. Management reserves the right to amend and change responsibilities to meet business and organizational needs.*

As an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) employer, the University and Residential Education provide job opportunities to qualified individuals without regard to race, color, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, parental status, housing status, source of income or military status, in accordance with applicable federal, state and local EEO laws. All candidates for employment shall receive consistent and equitable treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Learning &amp; Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Inclusion &amp; Diversity</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Advising &amp; Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Readiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

RD Job Description

DEPARTMENT: Residential Education
DIVISION: Student Affairs
JOB TITLE: Resident Director
REPORTS TO: Assistant/Associate Director of Residential Education

General Summary:
Reporting to the assistant director staff, the residence director is a full-time professional responsible for the administration of a residential area, including, but not limited to staff supervision, student learning opportunities, discipline, crisis response, and community building.

Principal Duties and Responsibilities:
1. Coordinates and oversees all educational aspects of hall management, including staff training and supervision, student issue response, student learning opportunities, judicial procedures and crisis response. (40%) – LD, AM, L
2. Addresses student and parent issues in order to resolve them in satisfactory manner and counsels resident advisors on issues that arise from demands of their jobs. (20%) – AM, LD
3. Attends, conducts, and coordinates all pre-service and in-service training for student staff. (10%) – LD, AM, L
4. Creates and implements a yearlong developmental plan for the residence hall through staff programming efforts. (10%) – LD, L
5. Participates in all appropriate divisional and university meetings and training programs. (10%) – P, L
6. Cultivates relationships with various university departments, specifically Student Development, Dean of Students Office and Student Affairs, but also including Housing Services and Facility Operations. May involve collateral positions with other university departments. (10%) – P, L
7. Other duties as assigned by supervisor. – R, P

Other Job Related Information:
1. The residence director is responsible for routine duty night coverage for the residence halls, which includes pager coverage during non-business hours for responding to residential student emergencies. Coverage is required every day of the year.
2. The residence director may participate in the supervision of student mentors through the First Year Program of the University.
3. All other duties and assignments as designated by the assistant directors or other residential education staff.
Minimum Knowledge, Skills and Abilities:

Management: Leadership and motivation, supervision, planning and organizing, decision-making. The job incumbent must acquire and demonstrate knowledge of residence life policies and procedures in order to represent the Department of Residential Education. – L, R, P

Professional: Written and oral communication skills, presentation skills, relationship building, flexibility, adaptability, creativity, and team player in order to build community and communication within the residence area – R, P, ID

Developmental: Basic understanding of student development theory- LD

Counseling: Demonstrated aptitude for dealing with crisis intervention, conflict resolution and mediation. – R, LD, L, AM

Technical: Proficient PC user, expected to use MS Office Suite. - P

Position Qualifications:

Education: Master’s degree or equivalent combination of education and experience required.

Experience: Prior residence life experience required.

Professional Attributes:

Must be well-organized and able to work under pressure with multiple deadlines in an ever changing, fast paced environment. Commitment to student development and appreciation for multiculturalism and diversity is crucial. Must be willing to be a team player. Seek candidates with a clear understanding of a Catholic, urban institution.

Availability: Duty coverage during non-business hours, however a significant number of RDs must be on campus at all times.

The above statements are intended to describe the general nature and level of the work being performed by people assigned to this work. This is not an exhaustive list of all duties and responsibilities associated with it. Management reserves the right to amend and change responsibilities to meet business and organizational needs.

As an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) employer, the University and the Department of Residential Education provide job opportunities to qualified individuals without regard to race, color, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, parental status, housing status, source of income or military status, in accordance with applicable federal, state and local EEO laws. All candidates for employment shall receive consistent and equitable treatment.
Appendix E

Recruitment Email for Resident Satisfaction Survey 2012

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2012 4:00 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Quality of Life Survey 2012

Dear Residential Student,

As you know, the Department of Residential Education is committed to making your experience on campus the best that it can be. With your help, we can better meet our goal of making a safe, supportive, and engaging community for students living in the residence halls and apartments.

In an effort to continually improve our efforts and programs, we would like to ask you for feedback in regards to your residential experience this year. This Quality of Life survey is an important initiative designed to help us better serve you.

Take the Quality of Life Survey

The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete, and can be taken on a computer, or via iPhone/iTouch or Blackberry. All students that complete the survey have the option to enter to win prizes, including an iPad 2!

Thank you for your time and for sharing your perspective!

[redacted]
Director, Residential Education

If your survey link is not working, please copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
http://us2.qualtrics.com/
Appendix F

PILLAR Position Studies - Method & Protocol

**Purpose:** To fully integrate the PILLAR competency model throughout ResEd, position/behavior studies were conducted to determine the necessary behaviors for effective job performance for each position. Complete integration of the PILLAR model through these studies provide insight to which specific behaviors are deemed critical to fulfill the mission, vision, values and goals of ResEd within each position. Results of these studies were used to inform a variety of personnel systems including, training, selection and development of employees. Specifically, performance coaching tools were used to showcase the behavioral level data within each competency for each position. Positions studied include the Director, Assistant Directors, Residence Directors and Resident Advisor positions to integrate the PILLAR model.

**Job Analysts:** Responsibility for data collection and analysis was designated to external organizational development consultants. Both analysts were trained in Industrial Organizational Psychology and posses graduate degrees in the field.

**Data Collection Methods:** A combination of data collection methods were used for each position study as detailed in Brannick, Levine and Moregeson (2007).

- **Archival Data:** Job Descriptions, organizational charts, training manuals and any other available information regarding the positions were reviewed and data were collected in regards to behavioral expectations of the job.

- **Interview/Focus Groups Incumbents, Supervisors, Direct Reports, Customers:** Semi-structured protocols were adapted and used for each position to collect behaviors necessary for foundational/visionary performance within each competency. Groups and individuals were interviewed using the protocol and instructions detailed in the following sections. For example, for the RA position, focus groups were conducted with residents, incumbents and supervisors to determine behaviors necessary for successful and exemplary job performance within each PILLAR competency.

**Data Synthesis and Integrating the PILLAR framework:** All of the job data collected through the above methods were condensed as best as possible into single lines of data in an Excel sheet, while retaining the essence of the content. Next, these lines of data were independently coded by the job analysts into the PILLAR model. After independent coding, job analysts reached consensus on sorting the behaviors into the PILLAR framework. Based on this classification process, the analysts noted emergent behavioral themes and generated behavioral clusters. Behavior statements were then written that illustrate examples of behaviors within those clusters and define each competency to fully integrate the PILLAR model for each position.
**Results:** Results of the position studies were presented in the format of a performance-coaching tool to be used for staff development and feedback. The resulting document details each behavioral statement, nested within each behavioral cluster, which is nested within each PILLAR competency.

**Focus Group & Interview Instructions**

1. Goal – to obtain as many statements about what makes effective behavior for the target positions as possible.
   a. Be sure to separate the job from person holding it to collect information on the content and quality of behaviors performed for effective and exceptional performance.
   b. Determine alignment with previous works (i.e., PILLAR model).
2. During data collection, it is important to note that the fewer participants there are to interview, the more structure the interview/focus-group needs to become after an initial open-ended period to facilitate constructive and informative dialogue.
3. Use the term “behavioral examples.” It is better when the explain is behaviorally-based, but it is OK if participants drift from this concept as it is hard to think in those terms.
4. For every statement we ideally want:
   - The behavior taken
     - Be specific. Don’t focus on a series of incidents, focus on one incident.
     - Don’t focus on the person.
   - The context the behavior was taken in
     - What preceded the behavior
     - Why was the behavior appropriate and/or necessary
   - The consequence of the behavior
     - Should be direct result of the behavior
     - Can get a % of how much the person’s behavior contributed to the outcome.
5. When running the focus group or interview:
   - Tell participants not to focus on their own behaviors, if possible.
     - This will be less possible if interviewing someone about a position for which they are one of a few incumbents.
   - Focus on behaviors within the past year, if possible. Usually the nature of the job or the participants makes this difficult, so it is OK to stray from this if needed.
   - Start w/ general focus on behaviors – first 50-60 minutes
• After that, hand out PILLAR model for remaining 30-40 minutes. Ask to structure behaviors within the framework.

6. Focus on the positive rather than the negative. Try to turn negative statements into positive ones. This is critical for positions with fewer individuals to talk to.

7. If having trouble generating behaviors:
   • Have participants focus on what they think would constitute someone being:
     o Great in the position (i.e., focus on discovering “Visionary” examples of behavior)
     o Doing/did just enough to be acceptable (i.e., focus on discovering examples of “Foundational” behaviors.
   • Have focus on what they think it takes to be good at the job, and think of concrete examples of how they’ve seen that enacted.

**Position Study Protocol - Interview/Focus Groups**

Hello. Introduce ourselves and relationship to group and position of interest.

Today, we are conducting this [interview/focus group/behavior study] to help identify employee characteristics and behaviors that are critical to effective job performance so ResED can develop the best personnel systems to serve the University’s community of students, staff, and faculty.

As a part of this process, we would like to discuss your ideas and experiences regarding the [position of interest] role in the Department of Residential Education.

When answering our questions, please feel free to respond based on your personal opinion or observations, and what you have gathered about the general opinions of others. There may be times during the focus groups that we move the session on to another question. We want to make sure we get your opinions on all of the topics we are interested in. Feel free to jot down some comments and let us know later if you think of something important, but didn’t get a chance to say it:

**Disclose the extent to which participants’ responses are confidential and any consequences of the use of data.**

Do you have any questions before we begin?
**Department of Residential Education PILLAR Competencies**

Competencies are a collection of knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOs) necessary to successfully perform Residential Education employees' job duties and help fulfill its mission, vision, goals and values. Residential Education’s competencies address specific KSAOs related to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism</strong></td>
<td>Being accountable for work role responsibilities, following through with professional commitments, supporting ResEd initiatives, and striving for continuous personal and organizational improvement. This is necessary to accomplish one's job duties while meeting all standards of ethics and excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion and Diversity</strong></td>
<td>Building a community that is enriched with diverse views and people of varied backgrounds, races, cultures, and beliefs. This is necessary to promote respect and appreciation for individuality and diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Envisioning, planning, effecting change within individuals and groups, and identifying and responding to needs within Residential Education and the community. This is necessary to fulfill Residential Education’s mission, vision and departmental goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning and Development</strong></td>
<td>Applying best practices, concepts and principles of the profession and work role, including rigorous assessment of organizational initiatives and goals. This is necessary to encourage the holistic development of students and Residential Education professionals, and guide evidenced-based decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advising and Mentoring</strong></td>
<td>Providing counseling and advising support, direction, feedback, referral, and guidance to individuals and groups. This is necessary to encourage healthy, safe, and community-minded decision making among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readiness</strong></td>
<td>Maintaining personal health and wellness, being self-reflective, passionate for the welfare of others, comfortable with ambiguity, and adaptable. This is necessary to prepare oneself for the demands of the work role, Residential Education, and its constituents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

RA PILLAR Coaching Tool

Residential Education Development Tool for the Resident Advisor Position

A behaviorally-based tool derived from the PILLAR model.

Ratee Name: ___________________________  Date: __________

Rater Name: ___________________________
Overview & Instructions

Purpose & Use
This document is to serve as a coaching tool to facilitate RA development, and it should be used for developmental purposes only.

- This document can be used for development in a variety of ways, it can be completed based on observations from supervisor (e.g., RAs), peers (e.g., other RAs), or based on self-reflection by the RAs themselves.
- Users should identify each person's strengths and developmental opportunities for each competency. This will help facilitate conversations on how an RA can improve or change their behavior to meet and exceed expectations for foundational and/or visionary performance.
- Behaviors listed within this tool are derived from in-depth data gathering, so they can be used when developing or adjusting other personnel systems (e.g., selection, training, etc.).

Do thorough, but focus your attention on overall behavioral themes and targeted developmental areas.

Definitions
| Foundational | Performs as expected, or at the level of 90% of RAs; has some room for improvement. |
| Visionary    | Performs at a level other RAs should aspire to, or at the top 15% of all RAs; demonstrates truly exceptional performance. |

Instructions
Each competency has a cluster of behaviors, with specific, data-driven examples of these behaviors included.

- Consider each behavior cluster and determine how well those behaviors are enacted. Use the behavioral examples to guide your thinking.
- For each behavior cluster, please place a checkmark indicating whether the RA demonstrates foundational or visionary performance. Then, justify your rating with behavioral examples of why the RA is placed in that group, and detail areas for future improvement in each cluster.
- If the RA meets neither foundational or visionary status, then disclose what behaviors were not exhibited in the behavioral justification column, and identify how they can improve within the improvement opportunity column.

Best Practices

Coaching Conversation
Focus on being positive in your coaching sessions. This includes providing encouragement and recognition. Also provide actionable advice in terms of offering ideas, tips, and training to help an RA know what they can do to become visionary. Seek to emulate the practices of the best coaches. This includes asking challenging questions, spurring an RA’s own thinking and problem solving, listening to learn, and demonstrating your commitment to the RA's success.

- Take a future-focused approach to coaching others as opposed to simply focusing on past mistakes (e.g., “To be even more effective next time, try...”). Make others feel valued and show them how they fit into the bigger picture at ResEd. To aid in providing direct and honest feedback, we recommend using the framework provided below in structuring these conversations:
  o Have all details before the meeting by thoroughly completing this document.
  o Start the meeting in a positive manner and minimize any defensiveness. Be sure to compliment your RAs for their positive skills and contributions.
  o Make sure that work expectations and performance objectives are clear. Discuss ResEd values and policies to help with this.
  o Describe any problematic behavior and its impact on you, the team, and the community. Tell your RAs the benefit of performance improvement.
  o Solicit individuals' thinking and listen actively to their responses.
  o Suggest specific, behavioral next steps, and then check for understanding. Ask them to provide some suggestions about effective behavior as well.
  o Offer your support and guidance to ensure their development.

Action-Planning & Follow-Up
Ensure that you recap and close the loop regarding performance issues, obtain commitment to improvement and explain how you will support your RAs in their own development. Similarly, we encourage you to conduct longer-term development planning in addition to addressing how they can improve their performance in the short-term. Help them to prepare for future challenges and career goals. It is recommended that you:

- Help your RA identify 2-3 areas that can be targeted for development.
- Draft a plan that clearly communicates these areas.
- In the action plan, use goal-setting, timelines for improvement and follow-up, and consider how improvement can be identified.
- As best as possible, observe for improvement or lack of it, and provide timely feedback.
## Professionalism

Being accountable for work role responsibilities, following through with professional commitments, supporting ResEd initiatives, and striving for continuous personal and organizational improvement. This is necessary to accomplish one's job duties while meeting all standards of ethics and excellence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Performance is expected</th>
<th>Visionary Action that should be expected</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility and Presence</td>
<td>Introduces self to all residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keeps door open when in room.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engages residents in conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values unobtrusive acts in resident room.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publishes schedule for residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attends hall programs and functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments and Obligations</td>
<td>Completes appropriate paperwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attends meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responds to emails from staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performs rounds and other duties as assigned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains residents' confidentiality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regularly updates bulletin boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Use of Resources</td>
<td>Reads policy and training manuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks knowledge of all department and campus services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applies knowledge of resources to take action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests support when unprepared to respond appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Enforcement</td>
<td>Promotes role and relationship boundaries with residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforces policies and procedures fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicates policy expectations and consequences to residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies policy violations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicates consequences and next steps for policy violations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follows up with residents after incidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and Organization</td>
<td>Act in a calm manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responds to situations swiftly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alerts appropriate individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the “Professionalism” competency and outline developmental discussion points for RA improvement, coaching, and next steps.
### Inclusion & Diversity

Building a community that is enriched with diverse views and people of varied backgrounds, races, cultures, and beliefs. This is necessary to promote respect and appreciation for individuality and diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Reference as expected</th>
<th>Visionary Role Model should agree to</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Community</td>
<td>Learns names of all residents on floor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learns personal information about individual residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learns hall layout and resident locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic knowledge of the community early in year to enable better responding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Community</td>
<td>Encourages residents to keep their doors open.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages resident to get involved in hall and/or campus activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduces residents to each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create programs that serve to encourage socialization among residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourages residents from excluding others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates conversations among the student population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary Environment</td>
<td>Encourages sharing and understanding of alternative perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates respectful communication about different perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respects the different needs and perspectives of residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages educational dialogues around diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming and Supportive Environment</td>
<td>Facilitates space where residents are comfortable sharing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stops derogatory and hurtful language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps residents to participate in conversations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explains how language or comments can be offensive or dehumanizing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforces quiet hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the “Inclusion & Diversity” competency and outline developmental discussion points for R&A improvement, coaching, and next steps:
Leadership

Envisioning, planning, effecting change within individuals and groups, and identifying and responding to needs within Residential Education and the community. This is necessary to fulfill Residential Education’s mission, vision, and departmental goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Performance</th>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling Leadership</td>
<td>Actively participates in campus programs and events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participates in community service outside of DefPax.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates age-appropriate behavior regarding alcohol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Models socially responsible leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborates with other departments and sectors in the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role models healthy and safe decisions for residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>Encourages residents to participate in floor and hall events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages residents to participate in DefPax University programs and events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informs residents ahead of programs and events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides service opportunities for residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages residents’ academic excellence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages residents to take ownership and accountability in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Excellence</td>
<td>Asks clarifying questions in staff meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tries new programs, strategies or techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocates for the needs of residents to appropriate parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goes above and beyond role requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges practices to improve upon them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influences changes in roles, policies and/or guidelines to serve resident needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the “Leadership” competency and outline developmental discussion points for RA improvement, coaching, and next steps.
## Learning & Development

Applying best practices, concepts and principles of the profession and work role, including rigorous assessment of organizational initiatives and goals. This is necessary to encourage the holistic development of students and Residential Education professionals, and guide evidenced-based decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Reference</th>
<th>Visionary Framework</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Directed Learning</td>
<td>Solicits feedback and guidance from students on how they can improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listens to feedback with an open mind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implements changes based on suggestions and feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admits mistakes, avoids repeating them in the future and learns lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages the development and improvement of transferable skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Directed Learning</td>
<td>Schedules educational programming with a developmental focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engages students in group discussions to facilitate learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages students to attend campus social and educational events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customizes programming and practices based on community needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices and Assessment</td>
<td>Evaluates programming effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solicits feedback from residents about programming effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tracks attendance at programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adheres to the ethical standards expected by RA's.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the area presented below, please summarize performance in the “Learning & Development” competency and outline developmental discussion points for RA improvement, coaching, and next steps.
## Advising & Mentoring

Providing counseling and advising support, direction, feedback, referral, and guidance to individuals and groups. This is necessary to encourage healthy, safe, and community-minded decision making among students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Visionary Framework: What should students be able to do?</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation and Conflict</td>
<td>Asks questions during conversations to provoke independent thought and action.</td>
<td>Encourages residents to act, rather than acting on their behalf.</td>
<td>Encourages residents to think about alternative perspectives during conflict.</td>
<td>Mediates conflict without relying on personal issues.</td>
<td>Leverages roommate agreement contracts as mediation devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Referral</td>
<td>Directs residents to appropriate resources when appropriate.</td>
<td>Exploits residents to resources based on individual's needs.</td>
<td>Exhibits a helping mindset towards residents and others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Wellness</td>
<td>Engages residents in conversations about personal wellness issues.</td>
<td>Notify residents of their readiness to discuss wellness-related issues.</td>
<td>Encourages residents of how to avoid risky and harmful situations or behaviors.</td>
<td>Provides health and wellness-related information advice (e.g., sleep, exercise, nutrition, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the "Advising & Mentoring" competency and outline developmental discussion needs for ISA improvement, coaching, and mentorship.
# Readiness

Maintaining personal health and wellness, being self-reflective, passionate for the welfare of others, comfortable with ambiguity, and adaptable. This is necessary to prepare oneself for the demands of the work role, Residential Education, and its constituents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Conditional Performance Expected</th>
<th>Visionary Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is aware of personal limits for stressful or panic situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knows when to shift from advising to referring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asks for help when appropriate, even for non-work related issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitors commitments to avoid over-involvement and burnout.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is committed to the Mission and Vision of Residence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains an approachable, engaging, friendly and accessible demeanor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has self-confidence to succeed in work role and beyond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is able to adapt to changing or ambiguous situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays a passion for residents’ welfare and development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains composure during stressful situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedules time to balance work, academic, and personal commitments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explores personal interests and passions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes time to re-energize (e.g., get away from campus).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans ahead to minimize work interference with personal life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the "Readiness" competency and outline developmental discussion points for IRA improvement, coaching, and next steps:
Overview and Next Steps

Consider all of the competencies and behaviors reviewed so far. If possible, determine three areas of strength where the RA’s behavior serves as a visionary example for other RAs, and that could be used to train RAs to be more effective. Then consider three areas where the raise displays the most opportunity for improvement, and what behaviors they can change for improvement. Try to be as behavioral as possible. Finally, set up an appointment to revisit and monitor progress; this could be either a follow-up meeting, a date you’d like to see change by, a self-assessment on a certain competency, etc...  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations; actions to be revisited, and/or timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix H

RD PILLAR Coaching Tool

Residential Education Development Tool for the Residence Director Position

A behaviorally-based tool derived from the PILLAR model.

Ratee Name: ___________________________ Date: ____________
Rater Name: ___________________________
### Overview & Instructions

#### Purpose & Use

This document is to serve as a coaching tool to facilitate RD development, and it should be used for developmental purposes only.

This document can be used for development in a variety of ways: it can be completed based on observations from supervisors (i.e., REM, peers (i.e., other RDs), one's team (i.e., RAs) or based on self-reflection by the RDs themselves.

Users should identify current strengths and developmental opportunities for each competency. This should help facilitate conversations on how an RD can improve or change their behavior to meet and exceed expectations for foundational and/or visionary performance.

Behaviors listed within this tool are derived from in-depth data gathering, so they can be used when developing or adjusting other personnel systems (e.g., selection, training, etc.).

Be thorough, but focus your attention on overall behavioral themes and targeted developmental areas.

#### Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundational</td>
<td>Performs as expected, or at the level of 85% of RDs in a particular area; has some room for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Performs at a level other RDs should aspire to, or at the top 15% of all RDs in a particular area; demonstrates truly exceptional performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Instructions

Each competency has a cluster of behaviors, with specific, data-driven examples of those behaviors included.

Consider each behavior cluster and determine how well those behaviors are enacted. Use the behavioral examples to guide your thinking.

For each behavior cluster, please place a checkmark indicating whether the RD demonstrates foundational or visionary performance. Then, justify your rating with behavioral examples of why the RD is placed in that group, and detail areas for future improvement in each cluster.

If the RD meets neither foundational or visionary status, then identify what behaviors were not exhibited in the behavioral justification column, and identify how they can improve within the improvement opportunities column.

### Best Practices

#### Coaching Conversation

Focus on being positive in your coaching sessions. This includes providing encouragement and recognition. Also provide actionable advice in terms of offering ideas, tips, and training to help an RD know what they can do to become visionary. Seek to emulate the practices of the best coaches. This includes asking challenging questions, sparking an RD’s own thinking and problem solving, listening to learn, and demonstrating your commitment to the RD’s success. Also, take a future-focused approach to coaching others as opposed to simply focusing on past mistakes (e.g., “To be even more effective next time, try...”). Make others feel valued and show them how they fit into the bigger picture at ResEd. To aid in providing direct and honest feedback, we recommend using the framework provided below in structuring these conversations.

- Have all details before the meeting to thoroughly complete this document.
- Start the meeting in a positive manner and minimize any defensiveness. Be sure to compliment your RDs for their positive skills and contributions.
- Make sure that work expectations and performance objectives are clear. Discuss ResEd values and policies to help with this.
- Describe any problematic behavior and its impact on you, the team, and the community. Explain the benefits of performance improvement.
- Solicit individuals’ thinking and listen actively to their responses.
- Suggest specific, behavioral next steps, and then check for understanding. Ask them to provide some suggestions about effective behavior as well.
- Offer your support and guidance to ensure their development.

#### Action-Planning & Follow-Up

Ensure that you recap and close the loop regarding performance issues, obtain commitment to improvement and explain how you will support your RDs in their own development. Similarly, we encourage you to conduct longer-term development planning; in addition to addressing how they can improve their performance in the short-term, help them to prepare for future challenges and career goals. It is recommended that you:

- Help your RDs identify 2-3 areas that can be targeted for development.
- Draft a plan with clear goals to ensure that they focus on targeted ongoing development.
- In the action plan, use goal-setting, timelines for improvement and follow-up, and consider how improvement can be identified.
- As best as possible, observe for improvement or lack of it, and provide timely feedback.
## Professionalism

Being accountable for work role responsibilities, following through with professional commitments, supporting ResEd initiatives, and striving for continuous personal and organizational improvement. This is necessary to accomplish one's job duties while meeting all standards of ethics and excellence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Personas as expected</th>
<th>Visionary what others should aspire to</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time and Organization</td>
<td>Responds to professional communications in a timely manner as determined by the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures on-time to appointments and commitments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates and implements strategies to manage and prioritize multiple role responsibilities (e.g., long-term planning).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performs time-sensitive obligations before deadlines and without reminders to ensure efficient departmental functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure and Policy</td>
<td>Maintains strict confidentiality when appropriate, even among staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforces policy and makes tough decisions when required (e.g., terminating or counseling RAs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforces policy and makes tough decisions when required (e.g., terminating or counseling RAs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains and communicates appropriate role boundaries with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures fairness in all personnel decision-making (e.g., gives equal consideration to all RA candidates).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Consistent departmental traditions in a professional and constructive manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in behavior consistent with ResEd initiatives, values, and goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain a visible and professional presence at DePaul and in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes themselves available to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Collaboration</td>
<td>Fulfills all professional responsibilities and requests (i.e., consistently follows through and meets deadlines).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performs duties with excellence (i.e., high-quality work).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates mature conversations to sit in organizational decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the “Professionalism” competency and outline developmental discussion points for R0: improvement, coaching, and next steps:

---

---

---

---
## Inclusion & Diversity

Building a community that is enriched with diverse views and people of varied backgrounds, races, cultures, and beliefs. This is necessary to promote respect and appreciation for individuality and diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>What others should aspire to</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Creates community-minded curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitors RA curriculum for alignment with resident learning goals, and assists when necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures curriculum fulfills diverse community needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses bias-related incidents with staff and residents as soon as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Builds relationships with residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performs weekly hall walkthroughs to interact with residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listens to and addresses concerns residents have about their living environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fosters an open, respectful, social and safe environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking and Collaboration</td>
<td>Builds and maintains relationships with external and internal to DePaul that help move the mission of DePaul.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicates with other university departments and staff members in formal and informal settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considers how departmental decisions may impact other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develops diplomatic and politically savvy behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Builder</td>
<td>Conducts activities aimed at making the staff more comfortable with each other (e.g., icebreakers).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducts activities to foster group cohesion throughout the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spends time with staff outside of official functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develops a working knowledge of RA philosophy and how it relates to their own staff for functional efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports team members when situations arise that may impede their work performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers for role functions that are not always desirable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leads in with new staff to ease transition into their new role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the "Inclusion & Diversity" competency and outline developmental discussion points for HR improvement, coaching, and next steps:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4.
# Leadership

Envisioning, planning, effecting change within individuals and groups, and identifying and responding to needs within Residential Education and the community. This is necessary to fulfill Residential Education’s mission, vision and departmental goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Performance as Expected</th>
<th>Visionary What others should approach</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediation-Staff Leadership</td>
<td>Briefs a structured agenda to resident, staff and departmental meetings. Actively participates in staff meetings and expressive opinions and ideas for improvement. Commends the successes of residents, staff, peers and supervisors. Holds others accountable for delivering results. Clarifies roles, responsibilities, and expectations for performance. Removes ambiguity for others; makes order out of chaos. Motivates others to overcome obstacles and setbacks. Engages in honest, direct and personal communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Leadership</td>
<td>Communicates the importance of Residential Education’s mission, vision and initiatives. Helps others understand how their efforts fit into the mission and vision of Residential Education. Fosters excitement and commitment to fulfill the Residential Education’s mission, vision and goals. Builds morale and engagement of staff and team. Tailors approach to best serve the needs of residents and Residential Education. Encourages residents to assume meaningful roles in the university or community (i.e., assumes leadership or volunteer positions).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewarding Excellence</td>
<td>Structures and directs the efforts of others. Advocates for mission-driven changes to best serve resident needs and interests. Collaboratively sets goals with residents, staff, peers and the department to achieve excellence. Is willing to express unpopular ideas and challenge the status quo. Leads process improvements to achieve departmental goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Action</td>
<td>Anticipates future and departmental needs and opportunities; adjusts work approach accordingly. Engages in long-term planning around departmental initiatives and direction. Sponsors support for ideas and initiatives. Attracts and recruits talent into Residential Education. Leverages resources (e.g., budget, personnel) to better Residential Education initiatives. Adjusts to team strengths in assigning work and responsibilities (i.e., delegates to improve underdeveloped skills, leverages skill strengths).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the “Leadership” competency and outline developmental discussion points for IC improvement, coaching, and next steps.
## Learning & Development

Applying best practices, concepts and principles of the profession and work role, including rigorous assessment of organizational initiatives and goals. This is necessary to encourage the holistic development of students and Residential Education professionals, and guide evidenced-based decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Performance</th>
<th>Visionary Performance</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Directed Learning</td>
<td>Actively seeks feedback and suggestions for improvement. Engages in dialogue around and is receptive to feedback and suggestions. Seeks ways to implement feedback and suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry and Role, Enhancement</td>
<td>Actively participates in role-relevant professional associations. Attends and participates in industry-related conferences. Seeks opportunities to be involved in the field (e.g., seeks presentation and publication opportunities). Reviews industry trends and best practices, including new methods and ideas. Adheres to ethical guidelines of the profession.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices and Assessment</td>
<td>Works to incorporate industry best practices and innovations into department initiatives and operations. Works to integrate theoretical perspectives into the work role. Seeks to find effective ways to assess departmental and personal learning goals. Collects appropriate information to evaluate departmental initiatives and operations. Uses information gathered from assessment of initiatives and operations to improve organizational effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Thinking</td>
<td>Reflectively and consciously challenges ideas to ensure sound decision-making and implementation. Identifies issues and safety offers solution-oriented comments and ideas. Seeks to be a thought leader: applies skills and knowledge for continuous operational improvement. Leverages new methods to perform current responsibilities (e.g., social media, new technology).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the “Learning & Development” competency and outline developmental discussion points for BD improvement, coaching, and next steps:
## Advising & Mentoring

Providing counseling and advising support, direction, feedback, referral, and guidance to individuals and groups. This is necessary to encourage healthy, safe, and community-minded decision making among students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Foundational Perform as expected</th>
<th>Visionary What others should begin to</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Support</td>
<td>Helps residents to recognize the impact and take ownership of their actions (i.e., develop accountability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forms meaningful relationships with residents in order to better support their needs and refer to appropriate resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocates for residents' best interests in policy situations when appropriate (e.g., policy violations, modifications, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates meaningful interactions with residents in order to better support their needs and refer to appropriate resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps residents to recognize the impact and take ownership of their actions (i.e., develop accountability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RA Support      | Helps RAs to understand (e.g., helps RA to problem-solve community issues) |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |
| RA Support      | Takes an approach to provide support to address social, emotional, and practical needs |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |
| RA Support      | Encourages RAs to identify their educational and professional goals |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |
| RA Support      | Provides RAs with opportunities to develop and practice (e.g., RA leadership workshops) |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |
| RASupport & Development | Engages in professional development experiences with staff (e.g., training, RA workshops) |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |
| RASupport & Development | Encourages RAs to reflect on and articulate the transferrable skills they have developed. |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |
| RA Support & Development | Provides RAs with feedback and coaching for performance improvement and ongoing development (e.g., RA leadership workshops) |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |
| RA Support & Development | Engages RAs in future-focused conversations to identify skills and potential career paths (e.g., career workshops). |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |
| RA Support & Development | Connects RAs to developmental opportunities to advance their career aspirations and address gaps in their skill set. |                                  |                                        |                         |                          |

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the “Advising & Mentoring” Competency and outline developmental discussion points for RA improvement, coaching, and next steps.
# Readiness

Maintaining personal health and wellness, being self-reflective, passionate for the welfare of others, comfortable with ambiguity, and adaptable. This is necessary to prepare oneself for the demands of the role, Residential Education, and its constituents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Cluster</th>
<th>Behavioral Examples</th>
<th>Visionary Performance</th>
<th>Visionary What others should aspire to</th>
<th>Behavioral Justification</th>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reflection</td>
<td>Understands and recognizes one’s own role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grows when to transition from advising to offering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitors commitments to avoid over-enrollment and burnout.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes time to reflect on current personal, professional and departmental relationships, goals, and direction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Outreach</td>
<td>Displays a passion for the welfare and development of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates enthusiasm for the department and its initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates empathy for others; shows an interest in others’ lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains self-confidence to succeed in work and beyond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Motivation</td>
<td>Maintains composure under stressful situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains an approachable, engaging, friendly and accessible demeanor at all times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains flexibility and adapts to the situation at hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains consistency in demeanor at all hours of the day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-Balance</td>
<td>Manages time effectively to maintain a healthy work-life balance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes personal time to re-energize.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans ahead to minimize work interference with personal life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands the reality of non-traditional work hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area provided below, please summarize performance on the “Readiness” competency and outline developmental discussion points for IO improvement, coaching, and developmental plans:
Overview and Next Steps

Consider all of the competencies and behaviors reviewed so far. If possible, determine three areas of strength where the RD’s behavior serves as a visionary example for other RDs, and that could be used to train RDs to be more effective. Then consider three areas where the RD displays the most opportunity for improvement, and what behaviors they can change for improvement. Try to be as behavioral as possible. Finally, set up an appointment to revisit and monitor progress; this could be either a follow-up meeting, a date you’d like to see change by, a self-assessment on a certain competency, etc...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary Examples</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Opportunities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for Follow-Up</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations, actions to be revisited, and/or timeline:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratee Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled follow-up:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Residential Education Organizational Development Intervention Across Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSSE Survey</th>
<th>PILLAR Competency Modeling Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2001-2009</td>
<td>NSSE Annual Survey Conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Consultants Engaged to Identify Departmental Mission, Vision, Values &amp; Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2010</td>
<td>PILLAR Competency Model Created with implementation recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>NSSE Annual Survey Conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>RA PILLAR Position study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2011</td>
<td>RA coaching tool and performance model presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAs trained on model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RD PILLAR Position study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>NSSE Annual Survey Conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New RAs selected with model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>New RDs trained with model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAs trained by model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>RAs/RDs receive coaching on model bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD PILLAR Position study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2012</td>
<td>RAs/RDs receive coaching on model bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD PILLAR Model presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director PILLAR Position study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>RAs/RDs selected and trained with model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAs/RDs receive coaching on model bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Tool presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ResED Satisfaction Survey Collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSSE Annual Survey Conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>RAs/RDs selected and trained with model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAs/RDs receive coaching on model bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Tool receive coaching on model regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSSE Annual Survey Conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>RAs/RDs selected and trained with model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAs/RDs receive coaching on model bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Tool receive coaching on model regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSSE Annual Survey Conducted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pre-Intervention Survey = X; Post Intervention Survey = O
Appendix J

RA PILLAR Evaluation Form

These evaluations are confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Individual evaluations will not be disclosed to anyone besides researchers engaged with Department of Residential Education.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please rate the RA’s level of performance on each PILLAR competency listed on the evaluation form. When completing the form please use the following guidelines.

- Please review the PILLAR competency definitions and RA behavioral clusters provided in the RA coaching tool prior to completing this survey. This survey should take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete per RA. When rating, please use the complete range of the scale when applicable (i.e., poor to outstanding).
  - Outstanding/Strength: Performs at a level other RAs should aspire to, or at the top 15% of all RAs; demonstrates truly exceptional performance.
  - Adequate/Competent: Performs as expected, or at the level of 70% of RAs; has some room for improvement.
  - Poor/Unsatisfactory: Performance needs significant improvement to succeed in role; performs at the bottom 15% of all RAs.

- Please consider each RA individually, and focus only on the RA’s behavior and accomplishments at work. As always, remember that you are rating the person's performance, not the person. Great care must be taken to make sure that factors such as race, gender, religion, and age do not affect your ratings.

- After rating performance for each competency, you will be asked to rate the RA’s overall performance. This overall rating does not need to be a strict average of the previous ratings, since you may consider some individual areas more important than others.

- If you have any questions regarding this process, please contact the Director of Residential Education. Please return completed forms to the Director of Residential Education.
Basic Information

RD’s Name: ________________________________________________________

RA’s Name: ________________________________________________________

RA’s length of time in position:

☐ 1st year  ☐ 2nd Year  ☐ 3rd Year  ☐ 4th Year  ☐ 5th Year

Length of time supervising this RA:

☐ Less than 3 months  ☐ 3 – 6 months  ☐ 7 – 11 months  ☐ 1 years  ☐ 2 years  ☐ 3 years  ☐ 4 years or more

How familiar are you with this employee’s performance?:

☐ Not at all familiar  ☐ Barely familiar  ☐ Somewhat familiar  ☐ Familiar  ☐ Extremely familiar

PILLAR Competency Ratings

Based on your assessment of the RA’s performance on each of the PILLAR competencies, please provide a rating listed below on a scale of 1-9 (i.e., poor to outstanding).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being accountable for work role responsibilities, following through with professional commitments, supporting ResEd initiatives, and striving for continuous personal and organizational improvement. This is necessary to accomplish one’s job duties while meeting all standards of ethics and excellence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR /</th>
<th>ADEQUATE /</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusion & Diversity

Building a community that is enriched with diverse views and people of varied backgrounds, races, cultures, and beliefs. This is necessary to promote respect and appreciation for individuality and diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR /</th>
<th>ADEQUATE /</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership

Envisioning, planning, effecting change within individuals and groups, and identifying and responding to needs within Residential Education and the community. This is necessary to fulfill Residential Education’s mission, vision and departmental goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR /</th>
<th>ADEQUATE /</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning & Development

Applying best practices, concepts and principles of the profession and work role, including rigorous assessment of organizational initiatives and goals. This is necessary to encourage the holistic development of students and Residential Education professionals, and guide evidenced-based decision-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR /</th>
<th>ADEQUATE /</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advising & Mentoring

Providing counseling and advising support, direction, feedback, referral, and guidance to individuals and groups. This is necessary to encourage healthy, safe, and community-minded decision making among students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR /</th>
<th>ADEQUATE /</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Readiness

Maintaining personal health and wellness, being self-reflective, passionate for the welfare of others, comfortable with ambiguity, and adaptable. This is necessary to prepare oneself for the demands of the work role, Residential Education, and its constituents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR /</th>
<th>ADEQUATE /</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Ratings

Overall Job Performance

Please rate this RA’s current performance on the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POOR /</th>
<th>ADEQUATE /</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING /</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance in Relation to Others

Based on your knowledge of this RA’s work skills and abilities, how would you rate this RA compared to others who perform this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bottom 10%</th>
<th>Bottom 30%</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Top 30%</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Residential Satisfaction Survey 2012

Thank you for taking the time to complete the Department of Residential Education’s Residential Satisfaction Survey! We appreciate your feedback!

At the end of the survey, you will be automatically redirected to our prize drawing form - enter your name and information to be entered to win our prizes, including an iPad 2! Your name and information from the prize drawing cannot be connected back to your responses in this survey - it is completely anonymous.

1. My current hall/area is:
   - A Hall
   - B Hall
   - C Hall
   - D Hall
   - E Hall
   - F Hall
   - G Hall
   - H Hall
   - I Hall
   - J Hall
   - K Hall
   - L Hall

2. Please select your RA’s name:

3. How many quarters have you lived in residence halls and/or apartments?
   - 1 - 2 quarters
   - 3 - 4 quarters
   - 5 - 7 quarters
   - More than 8 quarters

4. Gender
   - Female
   - Male
   - Transgender

5. Age
   - 17
   - 18
   - 19
   - 20
   - 21
   - 22
   - 23
   - 24 or over
6. Ethnicity
   - Asian
   - Black/African American
   - International
   - Hispanic/Latino(a)
   - Native American
   - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Island
   - White
   - Biracial/Multiracial

7. Current Academic/Class Standing
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - 5th or 6th year Senior

8. Are you a transfer student this year?
   - Yes
   - No

9. What is your cumulative GPA?
   - Below 2.0
   - 2.0 - 2.5
   - 2.5 - 3.0
   - 3.0 - 3.5
   - 3.5 - 4.0

10. What is the average number of hours you spent studying per week during the past academic year?
    - 1-5 hours per week
    - 6-10 hours per week
    - 11-15 hours per week
    - 16-20 hours per week
    - More than 20 hours per week

11. What is the average number of hours you spent working per week during the past academic year?
    - 1-5 hours per week
    - 6-10 hours per week
    - 11-15 hours per week
    - 16-20 hours per week
    - More than 20 hours per week

12. Did you choose your roommates or apartment-mates?
    - Yes
    - Yes - used "Roommate Gateway", provided by Housing Services
    - No - random placement
These questions provide feedback about the student and professional staff in the Department of Residential Education.

How satisfied have you been this academic year with the...

| Efforts of the Resident Advisor (RA) to get to know you? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Communication of policies and procedures to you by the Resident Advisor (RA)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Availability of your Resident Advisor (RA)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Visibility of the Resident Advisor (RA) on your floor/area? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Promotion of respect in the community by the Resident Advisor (RA)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Ability of the Resident Advisor (RA) to gain your respect? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Enforcement of University policies by the Resident Advisor (RA)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Treatment of all residents equitably by the Resident Advisor (RA)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Organization of floor programs and events by the Resident Advisor (RA)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall performance of your Resident Advisor (RA)? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Please provide any feedback or comments you would like to share in regards to your experience with the Resident Advisor (RA) for your floor or area.

Please keep in mind that feedback provided here will be utilized to improve our department and incorporated into various training and development opportunities for our staff.
How satisfied have you been this academic year with the...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of the Residence Director (RD)?</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of the Residence Director (RD) in your area or building?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely response to my concerns by the Residence Director (RD)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of respect in the community by the Residence Director (RD)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of University policies by the Residence Director (RD)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of all residents equitably by the Residence Director (RD)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall performance of your Residence Director (RD)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any feedback or comments you would like to share in regards to your experience with the Residence Director (RD) for your building or area.

Please keep in mind that feedback provided here will be utilized to improve our department and incorporated into various training and development opportunities for our staff.

How satisfied are you with...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your ability to study in your room?</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your ability to sleep without interruption?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How safe do you feel...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your room?</th>
<th>Very Unsafe</th>
<th>Unsafe</th>
<th>Occasionally Unsafe</th>
<th>Somewhat Safe</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Very Safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your residence hall or apartment building?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would recommend living on campus to new students.</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>On Occasion</th>
<th>Consistently</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Please rate your agreement with the following statements....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have been able to contribute positively to my residence hall community.*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have been provided opportunities to reflect upon my decisions and consider alternative action in the future.*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The residence halls have given me opportunities to learn how to maintain a healthy lifestyle.*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have been able to develop strong relationships with others while living in the halls.*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have been able to engage in dialogue with others different from me.*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have learned from my peers while in dialogue with them.*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I see the ways in which RAs and RDs can contribute to my success at the University.*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regardless of my agreement with them, I understand why student housing policies are necessary.*</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living on campus has enhanced my learning experience at the University.</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>On Occasion</th>
<th>Consistently</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L

National Student Engagement Survey 2012

1) In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Made a class presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Come to class without completing readings or assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Worked with other students on projects during class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
n) Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor

o) Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor

p) Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class

q) Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance

r) Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations

s) Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)

t) Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)

u) Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own

v) Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values

---

2) During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships

d) Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions

e) Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations

---

3) During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>More than 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4) In a typical week, how many homework problem sets do you complete?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of problem sets that take you more than an hour to complete</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>More than 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Number of problem sets that take you less than an hour to complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Mark the box that best represents the extent to which your examinations during the current school year have challenged you to do your best work:

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Attended an art exhibit, play, dance, music, theater, or other performance

b) Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities

c) Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)

d) Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue

e) Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective

f) Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept

7) Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment

b) Community service or volunteer work

c) Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together
d) Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of alienation</td>
<td>Friendly, Supportive, to Sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Mark the box that best represents the quality of your relationships with people at your institution.

a) Relationships with other students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable, Unhelpful, Unsympathetic</td>
<td>Available, Helpful, Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Relationships with faculty members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unhelpful, Inconsiderate, Rigid</td>
<td>Helpful, Considerate, Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Relationships with administrative personnel and offices:
9) About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?

a) Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)

   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26-30
   - More than 30

b) Working for pay on campus Hours per week

   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26-30
   - More than 30

c) Working for pay off campus Hours per week

   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26-30
   - More than 30

d) Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)

   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26-30
   - More than 30

e) Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, etc.)

   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26-30
   - More than 30

f) Providing care for dependents living w/ you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)

   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26-30
   - More than 30

g) Commuting to class (driving, walking, etc.)

   - 0
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21-25
   - 26-30
   - More than 30

10) To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following?

   Very  Some  Quite  Very
a) Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>little</th>
<th>a bit</th>
<th>much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b) Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically

d) Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)

e) Providing the support you need to thrive socially

g) Using computers in academic work

---

11) To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Acquiring a broad general education

b) Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills

c) Writing clearly and effectively

d) Speaking clearly and effectively

e) Thinking critically and analytically

f) Analyzing quantitative problems

g) Using computing and information technology

h) Working effectively with others

i) Voting in local, state, or national elections

j) Learning effectively on your own

k) Understanding Yourself

l) Developing a personal code of values and ethics

m) Contributing to the welfare of your community

n) Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds
o) Solving complex real-world problems
p) Developing a deepened sense of spirituality

12) Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?

13) How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?

14) If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?

15) Enter your year of birth (e.g., 1994):

16) Your sex:

17) Are you an international student or foreign national?

18) What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Mark only one.)

19) What is your current classification in college? Responses:
20) Did you begin college at your current institution or elsewhere?

- [ ] Started here
- [ ] Started Elsewhere

21) Since graduating from high school, which of the following types of schools have you attended other than the one you are attending now? (Mark all that apply.)

- [ ] Vocational or technical school
- [ ] Community or junior college
- [ ] 4-year college other than this one
- [ ] None
- [ ] Other

22) Thinking about this current academic term, how would you characterize your enrollment?

- [ ] Full-time
- [ ] Less than Full time

23) Are you a member of a social fraternity or sorority?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

24) Are you a student-athlete on a team sponsored by your institution’s athletics department?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

25) What have most of your grades been up to now at this institution?

- [ ] A
- [ ] B+
- [ ] C+
- [ ] A-
- [ ] B
- [ ] C
- [ ] B-
- [ ] C- or lower

26) Which of the following best describes where you are living now while attending college?

- [ ] Dormitory or other campus housing (not fraternity/sorority house)
- [ ] Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within walking distance of the institution
- [ ] Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within driving distance of the institution
- [ ] Fraternity or sorority house
- [ ] None of the above

27) What is the highest level of education that your parent(s) completed?

Father

- [ ] Did not finish high school
- [ ] Graduated from high school

Mother

- [ ] Did not finish high school
- [ ] Graduated from high school
Attended college but did not complete degree
Completed an associate’s degree (A.A., A.S., etc.)
Completed a bachelor’s degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
Completed a master’s degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
Completed a doctoral degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)

28) Please print your major(s) or your expected major(s).
   □ Primary major (Print only one.):
   □ If applicable, second major (not minor, concentration, etc.):
Appendix M

National Student Engagement Survey 2014

1. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Come to class without completing readings or assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance (dance, music, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Asked another student to help you understand course material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Explained course material to one or more students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Worked with other students on course projects or assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Gave a course presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Connected your learning to societal problems or issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective
f) Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept
g) Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge
h) Talked about career plans with a faculty member
i) Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)
j) Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class
k) Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member

3. During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Memorizing course material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. During the current school year, to what extent have your instructors done the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Taught course sessions in an organized way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress

5. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)

b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)

c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information

6. During the current school year, about how many papers, reports, or other writing tasks of the following lengths have you been assigned? (Include those not yet completed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>More than 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 5 pages</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 6 and 10 pages</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 pages or more</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people from the following groups?

a) People of a race or ethnicity other than your own

b) People from an economic background other than your own

c) People with religious beliefs other than your own

d) People with political views other than your own
8. During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Identified key information from reading assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reviewed your notes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Identified key information from reading assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reviewed your notes after class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. During the current school year, to what extent have your courses challenged you to do your best work?

- 1: Not at all
- 2: Very Much

10. Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done or in progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Participate in a study abroad program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Work with a faculty member on a research project

e) Complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)

11. About how many of your courses at this institution have included a community-based project (service-learning)?
   a. All
   b. Most
   c. Some
   d. None

12. Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Executive</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other administrative staff and offices (Registrar, financial aid, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How much does your institution emphasize the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Providing support to help students succeed academically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially

f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)

g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)

h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)

i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues

14. About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours per week</th>
<th>More than 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)</td>
<td>0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30</td>
<td>More than 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Working for pay on campus</td>
<td>0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30</td>
<td>More than 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Working for pay off campus</td>
<td>0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30</td>
<td>More than 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Doing community service or volunteer work</td>
<td>0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30</td>
<td>More than 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)</td>
<td>0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30</td>
<td>More than 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Relaxing and socializing (time with friends, video games, TV or videos, keeping up with friends online, etc.)</td>
<td>0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30</td>
<td>More than 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Of the time you spend preparing for class in a typical 7-day week, about how much is on assigned reading?
   - Very little
   - Some
   - About half
   - Most
   - Almost all

16. How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

   a) Writing clearly and effectively
   b) Speaking clearly and effectively
   c) Thinking critically and analytically
   d) Analyzing numerical and statistical information
   e) Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills
   f) Working effectively with others
   g) Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics
   j. Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)
   k. Solving complex real-world problems
   l. Being an informed and active citizen
17. How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Fair
   - Poor

18. If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?
   - Definitely no
   - Probably no
   - Probably yes
   - Definitely yes

19. How many majors do you plan to complete? (Do not count minors.)
   - One
     - Please enter your major or expected major:
   - More than one
     - Please enter up to two majors or expected majors

20. What is your class level?
   - Freshman/first-year
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - Unclassified

21. Thinking about this current academic term, are you a full-time student?
   - Yes
   - No

22. How many courses are you taking for credit this current academic term?
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6
   - 7 or more

23. Of these, how many are entirely online?
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6
   - 7 or more

24. What have most of your grades been up to now at this institution?
   - A
   - A-
   - B+
   - B
   - C+
   - C
   - B-
   - C- or lower
25. Did you begin college at this institution or elsewhere?
   a. Started here
   b. Started elsewhere

26. Since graduating from high school, which of the following types of schools have you attended other than the one you are now attending? (Select all that apply.)
   - Vocational or technical school
   - Community or junior college
   - 4-year college or university other than this one
   - None
   - Other

27. What is the highest level of education you ever expect to complete?
   - Some college but less than a bachelor’s degree
   - Bachelor’s degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
   - Master’s degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
   - Doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)

28. What is the highest level of education completed by either of your parents (or those who raised you)?
   - Did not finish high school
   - High school diploma or G.E.D.
   - Attended college but did not complete degree
   - Associate’s degree (A.A., A.S., etc.)
   - Bachelor’s degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
   - Master’s degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
   - Doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)

29. What is your gender identity?
   - Man
   - Woman
   - Another gender identity, please specify:
   - I prefer not to respond

30. Enter your year of birth (e.g., 1994): ________

31. Are you an international student or foreign national?
   - Yes
   - No

32. What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Select all that apply.)
   - American Indian or Alaska Native
   - Asian, Black or African American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Other
   - I prefer not to respond
33. Are you a member of a social fraternity or sorority?
   □   □
   Yes   No

34. Which of the following best describes where you are living while attending college?
   □   Dormitory or other campus housing (not fraternity or sorority house)
   □   Fraternity or sorority house
   □   Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within walking distance to the institution
   □   Residence (house, apartment, etc.) farther than walking distance to the institution
   □   None of the above

35. Are you a student-athlete on a team sponsored by your institution’s athletics department?
   □   □
   Yes   No

36. Are you a current or former member of the U.S. Armed Forces, Reserves, or National Guard?
   □   □
   Yes   No

37. Have you been diagnosed with any disability or impairment?
   □   □   □
   Yes   No   I prefer not to respond

38. [If answered “yes”] Which of the following has been diagnosed? (Select all that apply.)
   □   A sensory impairment (vision or hearing)
   □   A mobility impairment
   □   A learning disability (e.g., ADHD, dyslexia)
   □   A mental health disorder
   □   A disability or impairment not listed above

38. Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?
   □   Heterosexual
   □   Gay
   □   Lesbian
   □   Bisexual
   □   Another sexual orientation, please specify:
   □   Questioning or unsure
   □   I prefer not to respond