

T-Camp

Counselor/Teamer/Co-Chair and Participant Surveys

Aggie Transition Camps (ATC)

Fall 2016

Background

According to its website (<http://t-camp.tamu.edu/>), the mission of Aggie Transition Camps is "...to successfully transition new students into the Aggie Family." T-Camp is an extended (three day), optional orientation camp for students who have previously attended another institution and are transferring to Texas A&M University for the fall semester. Participants travel to Trinity Pines in Trinity, Texas and stay in cabins. T-Camp is led by students currently attending Texas A&M and who have familiarity with transferring. The two sessions available for participants were on August 8-10 and August 12-14, 2016. The camp student staff is made up of directors, co-chairs, teamers, and counselors. Their goal is to help new transfer students establish relationships with fellow students and learn Texas A&M traditions.

Student Life Studies has worked most years with Aggie Transition Camps (ATC) since 2001 to evaluate T-Camp. The evaluation included assessing co-chairs, counselors and participants in effort to improve their overall camp experience.

Method and Sample

The counselor/co-chair/teamer survey was developed and distributed using Qualtrics®, a software program that creates web-based surveys and databases. The survey contained 34 questions; 19 quantitative, 12 qualitative and 3 demographic questions. The counselor/co-chair survey was sent successfully to 131 students on September 15, 2016 through an email invitation, and 90 completed at least some part of the survey, resulting in a 69% response rate. Due to branching technology, not all respondents saw all questions.

The 38-question participant survey was also produced and distributed using Qualtrics®. The participant survey included 29 quantitative, 6 qualitative, and 3 demographic questions. Due to branching technology, not all respondents saw all questions. The participant survey was sent successfully to 379 students through an email invitation on September 15, 2016. Of those who were sent the survey, 167 completed at least some part of the survey, for a 44% response rate.

Data for both surveys was analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, Microsoft Excel® and Word®.

Results

Results will be reported as means, standard deviations (sd), 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%. Tables are in 2016 descending mean or frequency order, unless otherwise specified. Summary themes are reported in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document. Comparisons to 2016 Howdy Camp, and 2015 T-Camp are provided where appropriate. This report contains two sections: Counselor/Teamer/Co-Chair Survey and Participant Survey.

Counselor/Teamer/Co-Chair Survey

When asked what their role was on staff, 89% of the 89 respondents selected counselor, 7% selected teamer and 5% selected co-chair. Only counselors were asked to define the role of their co-chair staff. Many indicated their co-chair staff provided guidance and support as well as directed the counselors to make sure the camp ran smoothly. Some noted that co-chairs were resources that helped keep everything organized to stay on track and were liaisons between the counselors and director staff. Counselors were then questioned as to whether or not they felt supported by their co-chair staff. Of the 75 respondents, 89% said yes and 11% said no; a less positive response than both 2015 T-Camp counselors' response (94% yes, six percent no) and the 2016 Howdy Camp counselors' response (100% yes).

The counselors were asked if their co-chair staff fulfilled their role. Of the 75 respondents, 81% said yes, 8% selected the "don't know" option, and 11% of the respondents selected no; again, a less positive response than

indicated by 2015 T-Camp counselors (94% yes and six percent said no) and 2016 Howdy Camp counselors (97% yes, 3% don't know). Respondents were given the opportunity to explain why or why not. About three-quarters of the 69 comments provided were positive, and included comments indicating co-chairs were supportive, prepared counselors well for camp, organized, communicated well and pushed counselors to succeed. Those who shared less positive responses noted their co-chairs did not work as a team, did not delegate when it would have been beneficial to do so, gave up on the counselors and miscommunicated which caused confusion.

Counselors, teamers and co-chairs were asked to indicate their level of agreement to statements which described training for their roles at camp. Table 1 indicates that respondents felt the most positive about the relationships that they hope to continue after camp, and having sufficient camp specific apparel. This year respondents were least positive about the traditions training and the workdays and refresher being well organized and helpful in preparing them for camp.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2016 T- Camp Mean (sd) [n=76]	2016 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n=31]	2015 T- Camp Mean (sd) [n=77]
I have developed positive relationships that I hope to continue after camp	83%	12%	4%	1%	--	4.76 (.59)	4.87 (.34)	4.78 (.53)
My camp specific apparel and accessories were sufficient	72%	24%	4%	--	--	4.68 (.55)	4.61 (.62)	4.68 (.60)
The amount of time I had to bond with counselors/co-chairs within my camp was sufficient	68%	28%	3%	1%	--	4.63 (.61)	4.42 (.72)	4.65 (.56)
The expectations (# of meetings, cost, deadlines) for my role were realistic	50%	32%	12%	4%	3%	4.22 (.99)	4.45 (.62)	4.19 (.92)
The diversity training prepared me for camp	40%	41%	16%	3%	1%	4.14 (.88)	4.35 (.66)	4.38 (.71)
Refresher was well organized and helped prepare me for camp	33%	43%	22%	1%	--	4.08 (.78)	4.13 (.89)	4.06 (.95)
The work days were well organized and helped prepare me for camp	34%	43%	17%	4%	1%	4.05 (.89)	4.35 (.76)	4.30 (.67)
The traditions training prepared me for camp	30%	43%	17%	7%	3%	3.92 (.99)	4.55 (.57)	4.29 (.81)

Table 1-Counselor, Teamer and Co-Chair Experiences

When asked about any other training topics that should be included during AC meetings or workdays, nearly half of the responding counselors did not have any recommendations. The others made recommendations such as requesting better training in Traditions, more Discussion Group (DG) mock times and camp specific training, and tactics to help non-traditional students and quieter campers feel welcomed and included.

T- Camp leaders were also asked to make suggestions regarding ways to improve T-Camp (programming, logistics, training, etc.). Suggestions from the 58 who responded included better planning and organization of training and

workdays (reserving rooms, giving out information etc...), clearly communicating personal costs and more Traditions training. Others expressed concern about co-chair and counselor role expectations, and how chair staff were selected. Some provided very detailed, specific suggestions which are included in the attached qualitative report documents.

The next set of questions asked about resources (hours and money) counselors, teamers and co-chairs expended to prepare for camp. Table 2 shows that 83% of the them spent 10 hours or less per week working on 2016 T Camp in the spring and summer semesters.

On average, how much time per week during the Spring and Summer semesters did you spend working on T-Camp?	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=76)
0 hours	--
1-5 hours	38%
6-10 hours	45%
11-15 hours	9%
16-20 hours	7%
21+ hours	1%

Table 2-Hours Spent on T-Camp Spring and Summer Semesters

Counselors, teamers and co-chairs also incur some personal costs to attend T Camp beyond their dues. Table 3 highlights that almost two-thirds spent more than \$101 dollars on supplies, beyond the money refunded to them.

Not including money refunded to you, how much personal money did you spend on camp supplies (not including dues, hangouts, or road trips)?	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=76)
\$0-50	12%
\$51-100	24%
\$101-150	33%
\$151-200	26%
\$201+	5%

Table 3-Personal Money Spent on Camp Supplies

A similar question asked about the amount of money spent on building relationships with their peers (road trips, hangouts, etc.). According to Table 4, over half spent \$101 to \$300 beyond the money refunded to them on building relationships with their camp.

Not including money refunded to you, how much personal money did you spend building relationships with your camp (road trips, hangouts, etc.)?	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=76)
\$0-100	33%
\$101-200	36%
\$201-300	21%
\$301-400	7%
\$401-500	--
\$500+	4%

Table 4-Personal Money Spent on Camp Relationships

All respondents were asked what they learned or personally gained through their role. Responses included gaining friendships and confidence, improving communication, leadership and conflict resolution skills, and learning how

to mentor. Some indicated they learned more about Texas A&M and its traditions. Quite a few of the 66 commented that they learned to more positively and skillfully interact with diverse types of people, specifically engaging with people who express different opinions and beliefs than their own. One respondent stated that “I found out that I can be friends with people I fundamentally disagree with on almost everything, because their actions during camp spoke to me more about their character than their opinions.”

When asked what they were most prepared for at camp, most of the 69 students who responded mentioned performing skits, some noted yells and DG time and interacting with the campers. Some counselors, co-chairs and teamers stated they were most prepared in their knowledge of traditions, and really prepared for all of camp. They were also asked what they felt least prepared for at camp. DG time was the most frequent response from the 67 respondents, but quite a few also indicated they were not as prepared as they would have liked for interacting with the campers, explaining traditions, skits and the schedule. A few noted there was nothing that they felt unprepared for at camp.

Counselors, teamers and co-chairs were then asked to make suggestions for improvement of the preparation for their roles. Sixty-four responded and quite a few suggested more DG planning, training and mock DG time would be a preparation improvement. Others commented that more traditions training would be helpful. More skit preparation and more training for inexperienced counselors around camper interactions would improve counselor preparation as well. Some indicated that better organization and communication by the co-chairs regarding preparation, and training activities timelines would also be helpful.

T-Camp also requested additional general feedback from the counselors, teamers and co-chairs. Most feedback from the 49 who responded included complimentary comments like it was awesome, a life changing experience and the respondents loved T-Camp. A few mentioned that camp was expensive, and that they could have used more counselor training.

Counselors were asked to write in how many activities they planned for their camp or Discussion Group since camp. The most frequent answers were five to 10 activities, and next most frequent answers were 11 to 15 activities. About 20% indicated they planned more than 15 activities. In a check all that apply question, students were asked which activities they planned for their camp or DG since camp. Table 5 illustrates that the counselors’ most popular planned activities were a campus tour, lunch, Midnight Yell and MSC Open House. Those that selected “other” were provided the opportunity to add in an activity. Common responses included Harry’s, game night, ice skating, Breakaway, watching football and study groups.

What activities have you planned for your camp/DG since camp?	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=65)	2016 Howdy Camp Percent (n=28)	2015 T-Camp Percent (n=75)
Campus Tour	91%	82%	71%
Lunch	88%	79%	87%
Midnight Yell	88%	*	75%
MSC Open House	82%	79%	85%
Hangout	80%	82%	76%
Sporting Events	80%	68%	91%
Dinner	79%	89%	84%
Silver Taps	79%	61%	73%
Backyard Bash	66%	*	76%
Movies	49%	46%	28%
Other	43%	29%	23%
Bowling	12%	11%	9%

Table 5-Post Camp Activities Planned

*Not listed as an option

Counselors, teamers and co-chairs were asked if they felt supported by the ATC director staff; 99% responded yes and one percent responded no (n=71). In addition, 92% of the 71 respondents said that the director staff fulfilled their role as a liaison, seven percent did not know and one percent stated no. When asked why or why not, most of the 60 who commented gave positive comments, such as they communicated well, were supportive, involved, and provided answers when asked. However, some of the respondents indicated that they did not know or interact with the liaison and that the liaison was spread a bit thin near the end and was not around a lot.

Respondents were asked to provide examples of when they felt supported or unsupported by advisors, directors, and/or co-chairs. In general, the majority of the 55 responses were complimentary, and many said they always felt generally supported, that director and co-chair staff answered questions thoroughly, were available to talk and asked about their wellbeing. A few respondents shared that they felt unsupported due to lack of organization, consideration, and communication from their co-chairs. Some of the both positive and more negative comments called out specific staff; all responses can be referenced in the attached qualitative data document.

Respondents were asked how they found out about the application process to become a counselor/teamer/co-chair in a select all that apply format. Table 6 indicates that most people found out about the process through friends, similar to last year. Almost all who chose “other” answered that they found out from being a previous camper, their DG parents and email.

How did you find out about the application process to become a counselor/co-chair?	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=71)	2016 Howdy Camp Percent (n=27)	2015 T-Camp Percent (n=74)
Friends	72%	78%	66%
Other	48%	30%	30%
ATC website	25%	52%	41%
Social Media	21%	48%	27%
MSC Open House	13%	33%	22%
Information tables at the MSC	7%	19%	10%

Table 6-Methods of Finding out about Applications

Counselors, teamers and co-chairs were asked if they plan on being a part of Howdy Camp or T-Camp in the future and 75% responded yes, 18% indicated not sure and seven percent said no (n=71).

Counselors and co-chairs were requested to identify their camp color/name. Table 7 demonstrates that most of the camp representation of respondents came from Green- Camp Wiggs and Blue-Camp McCoy.

Camp Color/Name	2016 Percent (n=67)
Green-Camp Wiggs	24%
Blue-Camp McCoy	19%
Yellow-Camp Tobin	18%
Purple-Camp Sandlin	15%
Aqua-Camp Strong	12%
Red-Camp Hudson	10%
Maroon-Team KJ	2%

Table 7-Camp Color/Name

The majority of demographics information for counselors, teamers and co-chairs this year was collected through official student records using each student’s UIN. As reported in Table 8, on the next page, most respondents were Caucasian, female, Juniors, not first generation students and in the College of Liberal Arts, similarly reflecting all

T-Camp counselors, co-chairs and teamers. . Frequencies presented in Table 8 are in descending order by all the camp counselors, teamers and co-chairs.

	2016 All Counselors/ Teamers/ Co-chairs Percentage (n=133)	2016 Respondents Percentage (n=89)
Classification		
Senior	43%	40%
Junior	41%	42%
Sophomore	15%	17%
Masters	1%	1%
Freshman	--	--
Academic College		
Liberal Arts	30%	37%
Agriculture and Life Sciences	20%	21%
Engineering	14%	14%
Education and Human Development	14%	10%
Business	8%	5%
Architecture	5%	3%
Science	4%	5%
Geosciences	2%	3%
General Academic Programs	2%	--
Veterinary Medicine	2%	--
Ethnic Origin		
White Only	74%	72%
Hispanic or Latino of any Race	19%	21%
Asian Only	2%	2%
2 or more/excluding Black	2%	2%
Black Only + 2 or more/1 Black	2%	1%
American Indian Only	1%	1%
International	--	--
First Generation Student		
Not First Generation	77%	73%
First Generation	21%	25%
Unknown	2%	2%
Sex		
Female	58%	61%
Male	42%	39%

Table 8- Demographics from Official Records

Within the survey, counselors, teamers and co-chairs were asked to share their gender. Most of the 71 respondents self-reported as female, representing 58% of the respondents. Thirty-nine percent (39%) reported themselves as male, 1% reported transgender and 1% preferred not to answer.

Participant Survey

The first set of questions asked participants to reflect on how well T-Camp accomplished its goals. Table 9, on the next two pages, indicates that the majority of students felt positive about their T-Camp experience. All of the means increased from the before to the after questions, but the after means were lower than Howdy Camp 2016 and T-Camp 2015. Students were least positive about their awareness regarding resources and opportunities on campus. Data is presented in Table 9 in order of decreasing means per the “after attending camp” results.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2016 T- Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2016 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n=57]	2015 T- Camp Mean (sd) [n]
Before attending camp, I felt welcomed into the University	17%	31%	38%	9%	5%	3.46 (1.03) [144]	3.78 (1.07)	3.99 (.95) [155]
After attending camp, I feel welcomed into the University	80%	14%	4%	--	2%	4.69 (.74) [143]	4.86 (.35)	4.81 (.41) [154]
Before attending camp, I understood the importance of giving back to the Aggie Family & Texas A&M	17%	29%	33%	15%	6%	3.35 (1.11) [144]	3.35 (1.13)	3.65 (1.11) [155]
After attending camp, I understand the importance of giving back to the Aggie Family & Texas A&M	76%	18%	4%	--	2%	4.65 (.75) [143]	4.72 (.53)	4.69 (.59) [153]
Before attending camp, I knew Texas A&M traditions	8%	34%	29%	19%	10%	3.12 (1.11) [144]	3.32 (1.28)	3.25 (1.19) [156]
After attending camp, I know Texas A&M traditions	75%	20%	--	--	4%	4.63 (.86) [142]	4.82 (.50)	4.83 (.40) [155]
Before attending camp, I have positive relationships with members at Texas A&M	10%	31%	37%	13%	9%	3.20 (1.09) [144]	3.70 (1.15)	3.43 (1.06) [54]
After attending camp, I have positive relationships with members at Texas A&M	71%	25%	3%	--	2%	4.62 (.74) [143]	4.82 (.38)	4.69 (.51) [54]
Before attending camp, I knew Texas A&M yells	7%	13%	19%	31%	30%	2.35 (1.23) [144]	2.77 (1.35)	2.60 (1.36) [155]
After attending camp, I know Texas A&M yells	69%	29%	1%	1%	2%	4.59 (.74) [143]	4.84 (.37)	4.77 (.44) [154]
Before attending camp, I felt connected to the Aggie family	9%	19%	38%	26%	8%	2.97 (1.06) [144]	3.16 (1.27)	3.40 (1.20) [156]
After attending camp, I feel connected to the Aggie family	71%	21%	6%	--	2%	4.59 (.78) [143]	4.82 (.38)	4.74 (.51) [153]
Before attending camp, I was confident and prepared to achieve my personal goals at Texas A&M	15%	26%	36%	19%	4%	3.27 (1.07) [144]	3.46 (1.07)	3.59 (1.12) [54]
After attending camp, I am confident and prepared to achieve my personal goals at Texas A&M	66%	28%	3%	2%	1%	4.55 (.78) [143]	4.72 (.45)	4.70 (.60) [54]

Table 9-Before and After Attending T- Camp Comparisons (continue to next page)

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2016 T-Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2016 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n=57]	2015 T-Camp Mean (sd) [n]
Before attending camp, I knew of opportunities to get involved on campus	8%	15%	35%	33%	9%	2.80 (1.07) [144]	2.88 (1.18)	3.03 (1.15) [156]
After attending camp, I know of opportunities to get involved on campus	64%	29%	5%	--	2%	4.52 (.78) [143]	4.70 (.53)	4.63 (.56) [153]
Before attending camp, I felt prepared to begin at Texas A&M	8%	13%	44%	24%	12%	2.80 (1.06) [144]	2.91 (1.18)	3.28 (1.13) [156]
After attending camp, I feel prepared to begin at Texas A&M	63%	26%	8%	1%	1%	4.48 (.82) [143]	4.75 (.47)	4.63 (.55) [153]
Before attending camp, I was aware of resources and opportunities available to me at Texas A&M	8%	13%	28%	36%	15%	2.65 (1.14) [143]	2.75 (1.20)	3.12 (1.07) [155]
After attending camp, I am aware of resources and opportunities available to me at Texas A&M	58%	35%	4%	2%	1%	4.46 (.79) [143]	4.75 (.47)	4.60 (.54) [153]

Table 9-Before and After Attending T- Camp Comparisons (continued)

Table 10 details participants' experiences with T-Camp registration and their interaction with counselors. Similar to last year, the participants were most positive about the counselors creating a comfortable and welcoming environment and were least positive regarding the preparation provided by the T-Camp confirmation packet.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2016 T-Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2016 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2015 T-Camp Mean (sd) [n]
My counselors created a comfortable and welcoming environment	78%	17%	3%	1%	1%	4.72 (.63) [148]	4.84 (.37) [51]	4.73 (.60) [142]
My counselors were knowledgeable about campus and community resources	69%	28%	2%	1%	--	4.64 (.59) [149]	4.76 (.47) [51]	4.70 (.57) [142]
I am comfortable using my counselors, co-chairs, directors, and namesakes as resources	71%	22%	5%	1%	1%	4.58 (.77) [149]	4.66 (.63) [50]	4.57 (.74) [141]
The online registration process was user-friendly	46%	49%	5%	--	--	4.40 (.59) [149]	4.25 (.63) [51]	4.46 (.62) [142]
The confirmation packet prepared me for Camp	38%	50%	10%	1%	1%	4.24 (.73) [147]	4.10 (.78) [51]	4.34 (.72) [142]

Table 10-Participant Responses about Counselors and Registration

Those participants who selected disagree or strongly disagree regarding their experiences with T-Camp registration and counselor interaction were asked to share why they made those selections. Only one provided that feedback, indicating that they were never sent a confirmation email and had to reach out to the director.

Respondents were asked to describe how their Discussion Group (DG) leaders contributed to their camp experience. Comments were generally positive and many of the respondents talked about how the counselors made them feel included, safe, comfortable, and welcomed. Others indicated the counselors were fun, personable, answered questions and helped the campers to open up to others in their DG groups.

Students were also requested to explain how the Community of Respect program contributed to their camp experience. Participants mentioned that the program made the camp more connected, and a more accepting, inclusive experience. Some commented that it was nice to know they were not alone, and that it made them feel okay to speak out about themselves. One participant shared “The defining moment made me realize that I wasn’t alone in my struggles in getting into A&M. It was comforting knowing that other people had very similar stories to mine.” Another said “It made me realize that the majority of people who attend Texas A&M are completely different and more welcoming than those I used to go to school with.”

Participants were also asked what they wish they knew about T-Camp before they attended. Quite a few of those who responded said nothing, but many mentioned Hell Hill, the constant activity and lack of sleep. Others commented that they would have liked to been better prepared for the heat, food and activities, bringing their own snacks, water and more appropriate attire.

Attendees were then questioned as to what was their least favorite part of T-Camp. Responses included the quality of the food, lack of sleep, the hill and the rain. A few mentioned their least favorite part was feeling awkward on the first day, being treated like kids, the inside jokes and the counselors’ being more interested in interacting with one another than interacting with the campers. Students were then asked to follow up by making suggestions for improvement. Suggestions included having more free time/breaks, more rest and more interactive activities to get to know other campers.

In a select-all-that-apply format, participants were requested to share what activities their camp counselors planned since camp to help them stay connected to the other campers. As noted on Table 11, on the next page, participants stated most frequently that counselors planned Midnight Yell, sporting events, MSC Open House, and campus tours. Those who selected “other” indicated ice skating, pond hopping and study group sessions as the activities planned but not listed.

What activities have your counselors planned since camp to help you stay connected?	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=126)	2016 Howdy Camp Percent (n=47)	2015 T-Camp Percent (n=127)
Midnight Yell	87%	*	73%
Sporting Events	84%	83%	76%
Campus Tour	80%	87%	57%
MSC Open House	80%	85%	75%
Dinner	76%	72%	67%
Hangout	75%	83%	74%
Silver Taps	74%	57%	68%
Lunch	71%	68%	65%
Backyard Bash	62%	*	65%
Movies	37%	43%	24%
Bowling	20%	11%	13%
Other	18%	26%	16%

Table 11: Post Camp Activities
*Option not provided

When asked to pick, in a select-all-that-apply format, which activities they were able to participate in, as noted in Table 12, students most frequently selected sporting events, Midnight Yell, dinner and lunch. Those who selected “other” indicated ice skating, pond hopping and study group sessions as the activities they participated in but were not listed.

What activities that the counselors planned have you participated in or plan to participate in since camp.	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=126)
Sporting Events	67%
Midnight Yell	64%
Dinner	62%
Lunch	60%
Hangout	59%
Campus Tour	53%
MSC Open House	48%
Silver Taps	47%
Backyard Bash	37%
Movies	20%
Other	13%
Bowling	7%
No activities have been planned	1%

Table 12-Post Camp Activities Participation

The respondents then were asked if they were still interacting with members of their Discussion Group (DG). Ninety-three percent (93%) of 125 respondents indicated they were still interacting with members of their Discussion Group (DG) after camp, a 3% increase over last year’s answers from T-Camp respondents.

Now that the students have been at Texas A&M for several weeks, they were asked what topics they feel should be covered at T-Camp or covered in greater depth. Many of the participants said T-Camp was thorough and nothing else needed to be covered. Some participants mentioned more information about bus routes, different offices and resources on campus, and explaining the process of joining organizations on campus planning classes would have been helpful. A few others would have liked the sports pass/ticket pull process more thoroughly explained.

Ninety-eight percent (98%) of 126 respondents indicated they would recommend T-Camp incoming transfer students.

Participants were then asked to indicate which camp color/name of which they were a participant. Table 13 illustrates that Camp Sandlin was the camp with the most survey respondents.

Camp Color/Name	2016 Percent (n=126)
Purple-Camp Sandlin	22%
Blue-Camp McCoy	19%
Green-Camp Wiggs	18%
Red-Camp Hudson	15%
Aqua-Camp Strong	14%
Yellow-Camp Tobin	13%

Table 13—Camp Color/Name

The majority of demographics information for participants this year was collected through official student records using the students' UIN; previous year's demographic information was collected through survey responses. Table 14, on the next page, demonstrates that participants who responded to the survey were primarily female, sophomores, Caucasian, lived off campus, and were in the College of Liberal Arts. Frequencies presented in Table 14 are in descending order by 2016 T-Camp participants who responded to the survey.

	2016 T- Camp Percent (n=167)	2016 Howdy Camp Percentage (n=59)	2015 T- Camp Percent (n=128)
Classification			
Sophomore	52%	53%	49%
Junior	34%	17%	47%
Freshman	12%	25%	--
Senior	3%	3%	3%
Masters	--	2%	1%
Academic College			
Liberal Arts	31%	27%	33%
Education & Human Development	21%	22%	15%
Agriculture & Life Sciences	20%	25%	17%
Architecture	10%	3%	6%
Engineering	7%	14%	15%
Science	4%	--	8%
Business	3%	2%	4%
Geosciences	3%	5%	2%
Nursing	1%	--	--
Rural Public Health	1%	--	--
Sex			
Female	65%	66%	69%
Male	35%	34%	32%
Ethnic Originⁱ			
White Only	69%	85%	77%
Hispanic or Latino of any Race	25%	12%	13%
Black Only + 2 or more/1 Black	2%	--	1%
Asian Only	2%	3%	1%
American Indian Only		--	--
International	1%	--	--
Native Hawaiian Only	1%	--	--
2 or more/excluding Black	1%	--	--
First Generation College Student			
Not First Generation	75%	*	*
First Generation	24%	*	*
Unknown	1%	*	*

Table 14-Demographics of Survey Respondents

*Not asked

Within the survey, participants were asked to share their gender and age. Most of the respondents self-reported as female, representing 63% of the 126 respondents. Thirty-seven percent (37%) reported themselves as male, and no one reported themselves as transgender, nor selected the preferred not to answer response. Of 126 respondents, 42% reported themselves between the ages of 17 and 19, 52% were 20 to 22, four percent were 23 to 25, two percent were age 26 or older, and one percent preferred not to answer.

Table 15, on the next page, illustrates the demographics of all 2016 T-Camp participants, as well as those who responded to the survey. Respondents' demographic characteristics were similar to those of all participants

(+/- 5%), except nine percent more females and six percent more juniors responded to the survey than were represented in the participant population. Frequencies presented in Table 15 are in descending order by all T-Camp participants.

	2016 All Participants Percentage (n=385)	2016 Survey Respondents Percentage (n=167)
Classification		
Sophomore	56%	52%
Junior	28%	34%
Freshman	13%	12%
Senior	3%	3%
Masters	1%	--
Postbac UG	<1%	--
Academic College		
Liberal Arts	26%	31%
Agriculture & Life Sciences	24%	20%
Education & Human Development	19%	21%
Architecture	12%	10%
Engineering	8%	7%
Science	5%	4%
Geosciences	4%	3%
Business	3%	3%
Nursing	<1%	1%
Rural Public Health	<1%	1%
Sex		
Female	56%	65%
Male	44%	35%
Ethnic Origin		
White Only	68%	69%
Hispanic or Latino of any Race	25%	25%
Black Only + 2 or more/1 Black	2%	2%
Asian Only	2%	2%
American Indian Only	<1%	--
International	<1%	1%
Native Hawaiian Only	<1%	1%
2 or more/excluding Black	2%	1%
Unknown or Not Reported	<1%	--
First Generation Student		
Not First Generation	71%	75%
First Generation	28%	24%
Unknown	1%	1%

Table 15- Demographic Comparison of All T-Camp Participants and Respondents

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, participants, counselors, teamers and co-chairs of 2016 T-Camp reported a positive experience. Most counselors indicated feeling prepared for T-Camp. Correspondingly, the camp participants felt welcomed, learned about traditions, and were confident in their relationships with the camp staff. Overall, T-Camp seems to ease participating transfer students' transition into Texas A&M University.

Counselors, teamers and co-chairs also indicated that they felt supported through their training and camp experiences, however counselors and teamers were less satisfied with their overall training than Howdy Camp 2016 and T-Camp 2015 counselors. Also, more thought their co-chairs did not fulfill their roles compared to Howdy Camp 2016 and T-Camp 2015. Their comments support the need for ATC planning staff to review trainings and see if more effective conflict resolution, traditions and mock DG trainings can be included during preparation activities. There also seemed to be some discord or miscommunication between co-chairs, which the counselors experienced as communication break down and disorganization of both training and camp events. Addressing processes that may provide more formal communication channels regarding training, and perhaps, some team building exercises for the co-chairs may be considered as preventive measures going forward.

The 2016 T-Camp participants reported a welcoming experience during and after camp. However, compared to previous year's participants, this year's campers reported being slightly less prepared to begin at Texas A&M and lesser aware of resources and opportunities available to them as a result of attending T-Camp. Some mentioned that their least favorite part of T-Camp was feeling awkward at the beginning, and overall, how some counselors treated them like kids and were more interested in interacting with each other than the campers. Participants also wanted to learn more about practical, on – campus resources, like scheduling classes and the bus routes on campus. Again, ATC staff may want review the counselor and co-chair training to address both the counselor- camper interactions, especially how those interactions may need to differ from Fish Camp counselor-camper interactions, and resource information sharing opportunities during future camps.

It is also recommended that ATC share this report with all stakeholders involved in planning and executing both T-Camp and Howdy Camp. Also, thorough review of the qualitative responses is recommended to provide further insight into both the counselor, teamer, co-chair and participant experiences in T-Camp 2016.

Report Prepared for: Elizabeth Duggan and Sarah Edwards, Student Activities -Aggies Transition Camps
Report Prepared by: Susan Fox – Forrester and Tyler Harkrider, Student Life Studies
Report Prepared on: November 29, 2016
Analysis Prepared by: Dan Yin, Student Life Studies
Surveys Created by: Tyler Harkrider, Student Life Studies

***Services provided by Student Life Studies are funded, in total, by Texas A&M University Advancement Fees.
Find Student Life Studies on Facebook!***