Background
The Department of Residence Life employs graduate, assistant, and full-time Hall Directors (GHDs, AHDs, and HDs) (in this report called Hall Directors) that attend intensive training each August to prepare to operate a residence hall and supervise a staff. This is the fifth year that Student Life Studies assisted with the evaluation process.

Method and Sample
All Graduate Hall Directors, full-time Hall Directors, and Assistant Hall Directors received the evaluation to complete at the end of training. All of the 27 people who attended training completed the survey, yielding a 100% response rate. Forty percent of the staff was new while the remaining 60% were returning staff. Eight people indicated they were full-time, seventeen people were graduate students, and one person was an undergraduate.

The 42-question survey was developed using Teleform®, survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. Forty of the questions were quantitative in nature, with two questions that asked for qualitative responses. The data was analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, and Microsoft® Excel.

Results
Results will be reported as means and frequency percentages for the number of people (n) who responded to the question. For ease of reading, frequency percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent, so totals may not add up to exactly 100%. Qualitative themes are reported here; the entire list can be found in a separate document. Analysis comparing new staff and returning staff was completed: highlights are described in this report. In addition, standard deviations and confidence intervals, which describe the spread of the data, are found in the statistical tables in a separate document, as are crosstabulations that compare new and returning staff.

The scale for the first 38 questions was 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree. Table 1, on the following page, indicates the responses (in descending mean order) to the questions about learning outcomes and training objectives. Most of the questions received a mean rating of 4.00 or better on a 5-point scale. The 2004 responses are reported for repeat questions.
Only one question indicated a statistical difference in responses between new and returning staff, based on a 95% confidence interval. Question 30, about the key database, revealed a mean of 3.10 for new staff and 4.47 for returning staff. Returning staff had a better understanding of the key database system than new staff.

New and returning staff were asked a couple questions about the buddy system, which was created to allow new staff members to learn from more experienced Hall Directors. Table 2, on the following page, indicates the responses. There seemed to be different perceptions about the system: new staff rated it much higher than returning staff.
### Table 2—Responses about the GHD Training Buddy System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For New Staff (n=10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My buddy was an effective resource during training</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My buddy utilized the task list given to him/her</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Returning Staff (n=15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I utilized the task list given to me</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The one-on-one buddy system is an effective training method</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hall Directors were asked to reflect back on training and indicate which topics were not covered during training that would have been helpful. Of the twelve responses, there were no specific themes. They listed a variety of topics including a tour of the area halls and the area offices, FERPA, campus traditions, duty changes, the key database, hall culture, listening skills, presentation skills, time management, the student information management system, hall council, hall constitutions, and the Residence Hall Association (funding from).

In addition, staff members were asked what could be done to improve training. Most of the suggestions centered on time: increase the total training time, shorten training days or have them strategically organized to give some flexible time during business hours, have more in hall time, extend time between this training and Resident Advisor training, and have more breaks/end sessions on time. In terms of sessions, several people indicated that information was repeated in supervision and programming. A few returners would like to have some separate sessions or be excused from basic sessions.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, training seemed to prepare staff for opening and operating their buildings. There may be some additional training needed on the Alcohol and Drug Education referral process. New Hall Directors should be asked about their ability to use the key database now that they have had a month to use it. There may need to be follow-up with Area Coordinators about how they used sub-area time and discussion with the Hall Directors who did not use the designated hall time to prepare for opening. That feedback may inform next year’s schedule.

The Associate Director for Residence Education could facilitate a discussion with Area Coordinators at one of their upcoming staff meetings to reflect back on how the semester is going in terms of Hall Director/staff performance as a whole. Are the Hall Directors supervising their staffs well, are keys up to date, are incidents reports well written and thorough, are they using resources available to them?

The response rate from this evaluation was excellent. Having staff return the forms at the last session of training and/or following up with them makes a difference in the response rate and the usefulness of the information. On the other hand, there were several staff members who completed both sets of buddy questions, so they may not have been paying attention to details.
For next year’s (or spring) training, there may be opportunity to have additional real-time assessment. *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers* provides easy, brief, immediate assessment tools that can help determine if staff are learning important information. Some examples include the Muddiest Point, where staff could write on a 3x5 index card a concept they did not fully understand, or the One Minute Paper, where staff can write what they learned, what one question they still have, and in future training sessions what should be started, continued, or stopped. Those are just a few examples of many that could be adapted for this setting. The Department of Student Life Studies and the Center for Teaching Excellence have copies of the publication.

The training committee received several compliments in the evaluations about training, so their peers recognize the effort that goes into the endeavor. Be sure to celebrate the success of the event.