

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY RESPONSE**

### **Program Review Koret Health and Recreation Center**

#### **EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

Trey Duval, Director of Campus Recreation and Activities, Loyola Marymount University  
Janice DeMonisi, Director of Recreation, Santa Clara University

#### **CAMPUS VISIT:**

October 12 – 14, 2015

The review team read the materials provided by the department and division; reviewed the standards developed by the appropriate professional association in the field and/or a comparison of best practices; interviewed students, faculty and staff; and met with the Director, Interim Vice Provost and other relevant members of the campus community. Prior to their visit, the reviewers were provided with USF's Vision, Mission, Values Statement, and Student Life's Commitment Statement along with the department's self-study, and other university materials.

- 1. How did the external review committee rate the overall quality of the department- excellent, very good, good, adequate, or poor? How does the department compare with well established/recognized programs nationally? Please provide a brief rationale for the external review committee's rating.**

The review committee regards the Koret Health and Recreation Center as average/good. While initially a state of the art facility and program when built in 1989, the lack of an appropriate plan for facility maintenance as well as the lack of a shared departmental vision and strategic plan has resulted in a program that is underutilized by the student body and undervalued by campus peers.

Failure to innovate has resulted in some stagnation in the department and its programs. Priorities have been placed on revenue generation and use of the space for non-student activities (community members, swim teams/classes, and academic departments) rather than on student development. The staff and center itself are highly regarded by campus peers and thus there is tremendous potential to collaborate cross-divisionally and improve the department and the services it provides.

- 2. What are the most important general issues that emerged from the external review process?**

The reviewers recommended focusing improvements on four main areas:

- Human Resources and staffing structure
- Facilities and space maintenance and planning
- Programming with a renewed focus on services and programs for students
- Institutional support regarding financial expectations and opportunities to collaborate

- 3. What specific recommendations for improving the department's quality has the external review committee made to the supervisor?**

Significant recommendations include reassessing the staffing structure of the department that organizes all staff under two associate directors who would report to the director; one in charge

of facilities and operations and one in charge of programming. Other staff would all report up through these two associate directors. Job descriptions and responsibilities should be reviewed and adapted to reflect this organization and provide a more equal distribution of workload. Student staff positions should be professionalized through consistent training, use of uniforms, and opportunities for para-professional development and growth.

The University should immediately begin planning with the department on immediate needs for improvement on the current facility. Additionally, a deferred maintenance plan must be created and future space planning on campus should incorporate the need for additional recreational space on campus. The university should also re-evaluate the use of Koret space for non-recreational activities.

Regarding programming, the University must consider how they can relieve some space limitations that allow more use of Koret space for recreational activities at times that work for students. Additionally, the department should consider creating a self-governing Club Sports Council that would help formalize the club sports process and set team dues for participation. A strategic focus on rebranding and marketing would also benefit the department.

**4. In the opinion of the external review committee is the department advancing the University's strategic initiatives and the divisional goals and commitments in the programs and services it offers?**

The department is definitely in sync with the goals and initiatives of the University and provides excellent programs and services to students, staff, and community members. Reviewers reported that student satisfaction is high with the facility and its programs. But it was reported that only 40% of Koret use is by students. Therefore, there is great opportunity to strengthen the department's role in the development of students and of the community on campus through expansion of services and collaboration with other departments and divisions.

**5. Is the department in compliance with professionally accepted standards? What best practices have been adopted and implemented?**

There were no compliance concerns expressed by the reviewers and all Koret staff members were connected to their professional organization, NIRSA – Leaders in Collegiate Recreation. Fitness equipment is in excellent shape and well-utilized by the campus and community. Fitness classes are also very popular. Welcome week events are well planned but should collaborate more with other campus groups. There are good aquatic facilities that could be better utilized by students.

**6. Does the department have adequate space, personnel and budget to carry out its programs and services?**

Space is currently a very large issue. Significant facility space is utilized for academic programs. There is only one outdoor field and there are restrictions on its use at night with lights. There is no space for staff meetings or trainings and the massage room is located in a repurposed closet. Ventilation in many of the spaces is poor and not suitable for an office space or for working out.

Personnel are adequate but staffing structure should be reassessed.

The budget is appropriate, albeit perhaps somewhat unclear to management. The pressure to achieve revenue numbers has resulted in greater use of the facility by revenue-generating outside groups rather than students. Reviewers recommended an analysis of fees and the potential consideration of charging faculty, staff, and students some use fees to help generate revenue.

**7. Has the department identified appropriate learning outcomes and implemented assessment strategies to measure progress in this area?**

The department has a “MasterPlan” that many staff members indicated they were not aware of. Individual programs do assessment but it appeared that there was not an overall vision or strategic goals for the department that were developed by and/or shared widely with all staff. Many staff members also reported division in their work and an aversion to working in groups. The department would benefit from collaborative goal-setting and strategic planning.

**8. What is the timetable for the response to the external review committee’s recommendations for program improvement? What can the Vice Provost’s Office do to appropriately respond to the review?**

As this report is written in July, 2016, it is feasible that many of the recommendations could be discussed and planned for implementation in Summer/Fall 2017. The VP for Student Life can aid in facilitating conversations with Business and Finance regarding budget, Facilities regarding space planning and renovation, and with Human Resources with regard to staffing structure.

**9. What general comments or issues, if any, are crucial to understanding the reviewer’s report?**

Please see full External Review report.