

Howdy Camp 2017

Counselor/Teamer/Co-Chair and Participant Surveys

Aggie Transition Camps (ATC)

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." Howdy 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 spring semester. Participants travel to Trinity Pines in Trinity, Texas and stay in cabins. Howdy Camp is led by students currently attending Texas A&M and who have familiarity with transferring. Howdy Camp was held on January 7 through January 8, 2017. 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 ATC Camps. The evaluation included assessing co-chairs, counselors, teamers 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 37 questions; 22 quantitative, 12 qualitative and 3 demographic questions. The counselor/co-chair survey was sent successfully to 60 students on February 17th through an email invitation, and 42 completed at least some part of the survey, resulting in a 70% response rate, 12% greater than the 2016 survey. Due to branching technology, not all respondents saw all questions.

The 37-question participant survey was also produced and distributed using Qualtrics®. The participant survey included 29 quantitative, 5 qualitative, and 3 demographic questions. Due to branching technology, not all respondents saw all questions. The participant survey was sent successfully to 115 students through an email invitation on February 17, 2017. Of those who were sent the survey, 49 responded to at least some part of the survey, for a 43% response rate, 3% less than the 2016 survey 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 2017 descending mean or frequency order, unless otherwise specified. Summary themes are provided in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document. Comparisons to 2016 Howdy Camp, and 2016 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, 72% of 39 respondents selected counselor, 15% selected teamer and 13% selected co-chair. Counselors and teamers 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 and teamers were then questioned as to whether or not they felt supported by their co-chair staff. Of the 29 respondents, 100% said yes, which was same as last year's Howdy Camp counselors' response.

The counselors and teamers were asked if their co-chair staff fulfilled their role. Of the 29 respondents, 100% said yes, slightly better than the 2016 Howdy Camp counselors' response. (97% yes, 3% don't know). Respondents were given the opportunity to explain why or why not. All of the 22 comments provided positive feedback, and

included comments indicating co-chairs were supportive, prepared counselors well for camp, organized, communicated well and worked as a team. Many shared that the co-chairs clearly stated expectations for the counselors, provided feedback, were encouraging and available for questions

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 as they had in 2016. This year respondents were least positive about the Child Protective Training (CPT) and diversity training.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2017 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n=31]	2016 T- Camp Mean (sd) [n=76]	2016 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n=31]
I have developed positive relationships that I hope to continue after camp	84%	16%	--	--	--	4.84 (.37)	4.76 (.59)	4.87 (.34)
My camp specific apparel and accessories were sufficient	68%	29%	3%	--	--	4.65 (.55)	4.68 (.55)	4.61 (.62)
The expectations (# of meetings, cost, deadlines) for my role were realistic	42%	55%	3%	--	--	4.39 (.56)	4.22 (.99)	4.45 (.62)
The work days were well organized and helped prepare me for camp	45%	48%	3%	3%	--	4.35 (.71)	4.05 (.89)	4.35 (.76)
The amount of time I had to bond with counselors/co-chairs within my camp was sufficient	42%	45%	10%	13%	--	4.26 (.77)	4.63 (.61)	4.42 (.72)
The guest speakers at the AC meetings helped prepare me for camp and added value to my experience.	45%	42%	7%	3%	3%	4.23 (.96)	‡	‡
The traditions training prepared me for camp	36%	52%	13%	--	--	4.23 (.67)	3.92 (.99)	4.55 (.57)
Refresher was well organized and helped prepare me for camp	39%	52%	3%	3%	3%	4.19 (.91)	4.08 (.78)	4.13 (.89)
The CPT training prepared me for camp	39%	42%	16%	3%	--	4.16 (.82)	‡	‡
The diversity training prepared me for camp	36%	48%	13%	--	3%	4.13 (.89)	4.14 (.88)	4.35 (.66)

Table 1-Counselor, Teamer and Co-Chair Experiences

‡ Questions not asked

When asked about any other training topics that should be included during All Camp (AC) meetings or workdays, half of the 16 responding counselors or teamers did not have any recommendations. The others made recommendations such as requesting conflict management training, disaster protocol, the “why”, the camp schedule and mock DG time.

Camp leaders were also asked to make suggestions regarding ways to improve Howdy Camp (programming, logistics, training, etc.). Suggestions from the 16 who responded included recommending things be done sooner (applications due, training etc...), more traditions training, improved diversity training and more mock DG time for inexperienced counselors. Some provided very detailed, specific suggestions which are included in the attached qualitative report documents. A quarter of respondents indicated N/A or no improvements needed.

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 70% of them spent 10 hours or less per week working on 2017 Howdy Camp in the fall semester. Table presents data in ascending order of hours per week spent.

On average, how much time <i>per week</i> during the Fall semester did you spend working on Howdy Camp?	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=30)
0 hours	--
1-5 hours	37%
6-10 hours	33%
11-15 hours	27%
16-20 hours	3%
21+ hours	1%

Table 2-Hours Spent per Week on Howdy Camp in the Fall Semester

Counselors, teamers and co-chairs also incur some personal costs to work with Howdy Camp beyond their dues. Table 3 highlights that slightly less than half spent more than \$100 dollars on supplies, beyond the money refunded to them. Table presents data in ascending order of dollars spent.

Not including money refunded to you, how much personal money did you spend on camp supplies (not including dues, hangouts, or road trips)?	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=30)
\$0-50	8%
\$51-100	47%
\$101-150	13%
\$151-200	20%
\$201+	13%

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 \$400 beyond the money refunded to them on building relationships with their camp. Table presents data in ascending order of dollars spent.

Not including money refunded to you, how much personal money did you spend building relationships with your camp (road trips, hangouts, etc.)?	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=30)
\$0-100	47%
\$101-200	20%
\$201-300	17%
\$301-400	17%
\$401-500	--
\$500+	--

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, confidence, improving communication, leadership and problem solving skills, and learning how to mentor. Some indicated they learned patience and how to trust and open up to others. One respondent stated that they learned “So much about A&M, so much about leadership in myself and being a friend to others and to strangers I wouldn’t normally be friends with.”

When asked what they were most prepared for at camp, most of the 26 students who responded mentioned performing skits, some noted yells and DG time. Quite a few mentioned feeling most prepared to interact with the campers. They were also asked what they felt least prepared for at camp. DG time and skits were frequently mentioned by the 26 respondents as areas they felt least prepared for, and some mentioned being nervous about dealing with a CPT case. Others indicated not feeling quite prepared for the camp schedule, traditions, and transition times. 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. Quite a few suggested that preparation improvement could include more DG training and mock DG time covering the more serious topics that can arise with campers. Others commented about sufficient time to meet deadlines, awareness of the camp schedule and better communications between liaisons, director staff and chairs while at camp. Teamers seemed to want more time or earlier prep week to feel more prepared.

Howdy Camp 2017 also requested additional general feedback from the counselors, teamers and co-chairs. Most feedback from the 23 who responded included complimentary comments like it successful, a transformational experience and the respondents loved it. A few mentioned specific suggestions, such as introducing director staff to campers, communicating and sticking to timelines and deadlines, and specific suggestions for improving the teamer experience.

Counselors were asked how many activities they planned for their camp or Discussion Group (DG) since camp. Sixty-five percent of the 20 respondents chose six to 10 activities, 15% chose 11 to 15 activities, 10% chose zero to five activities and 10% chose 16-plus 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, dinner, lunch and MSC Open House. Those that selected “other” were provided the opportunity to add in an activity. Responses included Harry’s, game night, ice skating, and sports.

What activities have you planned for your camp/DG since camp?	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=20)	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=65)	2016 Howdy Camp Percent (n=28)
Campus Tour	90%	91%	82%
Dinner	90%	79%	89%
Lunch	85%	88%	79%
MSC Open House	85%	82%	79%
All Camp Hangouts	80%	‡	‡
Howdy Camp Reunion	70%	‡	39%
Sporting Events	70%	80%	68%
Silver Taps	60%	79%	61%
Movies	40%	49%	46%
Bowling	35%	12%	11%
Hanging Out	20%	80%	82%
Other	20%	43%	29%

Table 5-Post Camp Activities Planned

‡ Not listed as an option

The next question asked about the role of a campfire speaker. Three responded, and included comments such as a campfire speaker helps the co-chair and is support staff for the chair. It was also stated that they are an encouraging

outside influence for the camp, and impact the camp as a whole because of their impact on one or more of the chairs. They were described as being an advisor, friend and assistant when needed to make things go smoothly for the team or camp.

Counselors, teamers and co-chairs were asked if they felt supported by the ATC director staff; 93% responded yes and seven percent responded no (n=28). In addition, 86% of the 28 respondents said that the director staff fulfilled their role as a liaison, seven percent did not know and seven percent stated no. When asked why or why not, most of the 22 who commented gave positive comments, such as they were supportive, available for questions, provided feedback and held others accountable. However, other respondents indicated that they did not know or interact with the liaison, or the liaison was not available, although claimed that they would be, and was too authoritative with co-chairs and counselors.

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 24 responses were complimentary. About a quarter of the responses referred to the helpful feedback received during skit practice and a few others said they felt supported because director and co-chair staff answered questions, were available and seemed to care about their wellbeing. A few respondents shared that they felt unsupported as they thought director staff too inclusive and authoritative towards co-chairs staff during Hell week. Some of the both positive and more negative comments called out specific staff; all responses can be referenced in the attached qualitative data document. Others found the question repetitive to the previous question and stated “refer to the above.”

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. The choice of “other” and ATC website dropped by more than half compared to last year. Almost all who chose “other” answered that they found out from being attending camp, their DG mom and email.

How did you find out about the application process to become a counselor/co-chair?	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=28)	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=71)	2016 Howdy Camp Percent (n=27)
Friends	82%	72%	78%
Social Media	23%	21%	48%
MSC Open House	13%	13%	33%
Information tables at the MSC	11%	7%	19%
Other	9%	48%	30%
ATC website	8%	25%	52%

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 82% responded yes, 18% indicated no and no one selected “not sure” (n=28).

Counselors were requested to identify their camp color/name. Table 7 demonstrates that the camps were nearly equally represented among the counselor respondents.

Camp Color/Name	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=23)
Red-Camp Vanadore	52%
Purple-Camp Allen	48%

Table 7-Camp Color/Name

The majority of demographic 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, the most frequent survey responders were white only, female, seniors, not first generation students and in the College of Liberal Arts; more seniors, females and Liberal Arts majors responded to the survey than were represented within all Howdy Camp staff. Frequencies presented in Table 8 are in descending order by all the camp counselors, teamers and co-chairs.

	2017 All Counselors/ Teamers/ Co-chairs Percentage (n=60)	2017 Respondents Percentage (n=42)
Classification		
Junior	47%	33%
Senior	35%	50%
Sophomore	12%	17%
Not Available	2%	--
Academic College		
Liberal Arts	35%	43%
Education and Human Development	17%	14%
Agriculture and Life Sciences	15%	14%
Engineering	15%	14%
Business	8%	7%
Architecture	3%	--
Geosciences	3%	5%
General Academic Programs	2%	2%
Not Available	2%	--
Ethnic Origin		
White Only	77%	79%
Hispanic or Latino of any Race	18%	19%
2 or more/excluding Black	3%	2%
Not Available	2%	--
Black Only + 2 or more/1 Black	--	--
Asian Only	--	--
American Indian Only	--	--
First Generation Student		
Not First Generation	75%	74%
First Generation	22%	24%
Unknown	2%	2%
Sex		
Female	57%	69%
Male	42%	31%
Not Available	2%	--

Table 8- Demographics from Official Records

Within the survey, counselors, teamers and co-chairs were asked to share their gender and classification. Most of the 28 respondents self-reported as female (68%), 29% reported themselves as male, no one reported themselves as transgender and four percent preferred not to answer. Of the 28 students who responded, 43% reported themselves as juniors, 32% seniors, 11% sophomores and 11% freshmen.

Participant Survey

Howdy Camp participants were asked to reflect on how well camp accomplished its goals. Table 9, on the next two pages, indicates that the majority felt positive about their Howdy Camp experience, and were most positive about

feeling welcomed to the University after attending. Mean students' responses to the before statements were lower than those from T-Camp and Howdy Camp 2016 before statement responses. All means of the before to the after questions increased, and were greater than those from T-Camp 2016. Students were least positive about feeling prepared to start at Texas A&M. Table 9 data is presented in order of decreasing means per the "after attending camp" results.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2017 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2016 T- Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2016 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n=57]
Before attending camp, I feel welcomed into the University	8%	30%	43%	13%	8%	3.18 (1.01) [40]	3.46 (1.03) [144]	3.78 (1.07)
After attending camp, I feel welcomed into the University	83%	17%	--	--	--	4.83 (.38) [41]	4.69 (.74) [143]	4.86 (.35)
Before attending camp, I knew Texas A&M traditions	3%	25%	35%	28%	10%	2.83 (1.01) [40]	3.12 (1.11) [144]	3.32 (1.28)
After attending camp, I know Texas A&M traditions	83%	17%	--	--	--	4.83 (.38) [41]	4.63 (.86) [142]	4.82 (.50)
Before attending camp, I have positive relationships with members at Texas A&M	5%	28%	38%	15%	15%	2.93 (1.12) [40]	3.20 (1.09) [144]	3.70 (1.15)
After attending camp, I have positive relationships with members at Texas A&M	81%	17%	2%	--	--	4.78 (.48) [41]	4.62 (.74) [143]	4.82 (.38)
Before attending camp, I feel connected to the Aggie family	10%	10%	33%	40%	8%	2.75 (1.08) [40]	2.97 (1.06) [144]	3.16 (1.27)
After attending camp, I feel connected to the Aggie family	81%	17%	2%	--	--	4.78 (.48) [41]	4.59 (.78) [143]	4.82 (.38)
Before attending camp, I understand the importance of giving back to the Aggie Family & Texas A&M	13%	15%	45%	23%	5%	3.08 (1.05) [40]	3.35 (1.11) [144]	3.35 (1.13)
After attending camp, I understand the importance of giving back to the Aggie Family & Texas A&M	81%	15%	5%	--	--	4.76 (.54) [41]	4.65 (.75) [143]	4.72 (.53)
Before attending camp, I know of opportunities to get involved on campus	--	13%	30%	48%	10%	2.45 (.85) [40]	2.80 (1.07) [144]	2.88 (1.18)
After attending camp, I know of opportunities to get involved on campus	76%	20%	5%	--	--	4.71 (.56) [41]	4.52 (.78) [143]	4.70 (.53)
Before attending camp, I know Texas A&M yells	3%	13%	15%	28%	43%	2.05 (1.15) [40]	2.35 (1.23) [144]	2.77 (1.35)
After attending camp, I know Texas A&M yells	68%	32%	--	--	--	4.68 (.47) [41]	4.59 (.74) [143]	4.84 (.37)

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

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2015 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2016 T-Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2016 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n=57]
Before attending camp, I am confident and prepared to achieve my personal goals at Texas A&M	7%	28%	25%	28%	13%	2.90 (1.17) [40]	3.27 (1.07) [144]	3.46 (1.07)
After attending camp, I am confident and prepared to achieve my personal goals at Texas A&M	78%	15%	5%	--	2%	4.66 (.79) [41]	4.55 (.78) [143]	4.72 (.45)
Before attending camp, I am aware of resources and opportunities available to me at Texas A&M	--	10%	35%	40%	15%	2.40 (.87) [40]	2.65 (1.14) [143]	2.75 (1.20)
After attending camp, I am aware of resources and opportunities available to me at Texas A&M	71%	27%	--	2%	--	4.66 (.62) [41]	4.46 (.79) [143]	4.75 (.47)
Before attending camp, I feel prepared to begin at Texas A&M	--	13%	30%	38%	20%	2.35 (.95) [40]	2.80 (1.06) [144]	2.91 (1.18)
After attending camp, I feel prepared to begin at Texas A&M	68%	29%	--	2%	--	4.63 (.62) [41]	4.48 (.82) [143]	4.75 (.47)

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

Table 10 details participants' experiences with Howdy 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. Participants were also more positive regarding the preparation afforded by the confirmation email, than the packet received prior to the 2016 ATC camps.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2017 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n=42]	2016 T-Camp Mean (sd) [n]	2016 Howdy Camp Mean (sd) [n]
My counselors created a comfortable and welcoming environment	88%	12%	--	--	--	4.88 (.33) [42]	4.72 (.63) [148]	4.84 (.37) [51]
I am comfortable using my counselors, co-chairs, directors, and namesakes as resources	76%	19%	5%	--	--	4.71 (.55) [42]	4.58 (.77) [149]	4.66 (.63) [50]
My counselors were knowledgeable about campus and community resources	71%	26%	2%	--	--	4.69 (.52) [42]	4.64 (.59) [149]	4.76 (.47) [51]
The confirmation email prepared me for Camp	62%	24%	12%	2%	--	4.45 (.80) [42]	4.24 (.73) [147]	4.10 (.78) [51]
The online registration process was user-friendly	41%	50%	10%	--	--	4.31 (.64) [42]	4.40 (.59) [149]	4.25 (.63) [51]

Table 10-Participant Responses about Counselors and Registration

‡ Packets were listed in 2016, replaced by email in 2017

Respondents were asked to describe how their Discussion Group (DG) leaders contributed to their camp experience. Comments were all positive and many of the respondents talked about how the counselors made them feel 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 them feel more connected to the counselors, to other campers and to A&M. Some commented that it was nice to know they were not alone, and that everyone struggles. One participant shared, “It let me know that there were a wide variety of different people with different backgrounds. I loved it because it showed no matter who you are, you’re a part of the Aggie family.”

Participants were also asked what they wish they knew about Howdy Camp before they attended. Quite a few of those who responded said nothing and that they were prepared through the email, and a few wished they had known about the relationships they would make, and how amazing they found the experience. A few mentioned they would have liked to know about Hell Hill, the constant activity, and lack of sleep. Others commented that they would have liked to been better prepared for the cold, bringing their own snacks, and more appropriate attire for the dress up events.

Attendees were then questioned as to what was their least favorite part of T-Camp. Responses included the lack of free time, quality of the food, lack of sleep, and Hell hill. 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 outside their DG groups.

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 participants stated most frequently that counselors planned dinner, hanging out, lunch, MSC Open House, and campus tours. Those who selected “other” indicated ice skating, game night, Girls’ night, Harry’s dancing and studying as the activities planned but not listed.

What activities have your counselors planned since camp to help you stay connected?	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=36)	2016 T-Camp Percent (n=126)	2016 Howdy Camp Percent (n=47)
Dinner	97%	76%	72%
Campus Tour	92%	80%	87%
MSC Open House	92%	80%	85%
Hanging Out	92%	75%	83%
Lunch	81%	71%	68%
Howdy Camp Reunion	78%	‡	40%
Bowling	67%	20%	11%
All Camp Hangouts	67%	‡	‡
Sporting Events	64%	84%	83%
Silver Taps	64%	74%	57%
Movies	58%	37%	43%
Other	31%	18%	26%

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 on the next page, students most frequently selected dinner, hanging out, lunch and Howdy Camp Reunion. Those who selected “other” indicated ice skating, Girls’ night, and Harry’s dancing 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.	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=26)
Dinner	83%
Hanging out	75%
Lunch	67%
Howdy Camp Reunion	64%
Campus Tour	58%
MSC Open House	56%
All Camp Hangouts	50%
Sporting Events	47%
Silver Taps	44%
Movies	42%
Bowling	36%
Other	22%

Table 12-Post Camp Activities Participation

The respondents then were asked if they were still interacting with members of their Discussion Group (DG). Ninety-five percent (95%) of 37 respondents indicated they were still interacting with members of their Discussion Group (DG) after camp, a 1% increase over last year's answers from Howdy 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 Howdy Camp or covered in greater depth. Many of the participants said nothing else needed to be covered or N/A. Some participants mentioned adding more information about student organizations, jobs on campus, veteran services, time management and the challenge of Texas A&M coarse load, and that classes were more difficult than at community college. When asked, all of the 36 respondents indicated they would recommend Howdy Camp to incoming transfer students.

Participants were then asked to indicate which camp color/name of which they were a participant. Table 13 illustrates that survey respondents evenly represented the camps.

Camp Color/Name	2017 Percent (n=36)
Purple-Camp Vanadore	50%
Red-Camp Allen	50%

Table 13—Camp Color/Name

The majority of demographic information for participants this year was collected through official student records using the participants' UIN. Table 14, on the next page, demonstrates that participants who responded to the survey were primarily female, sophomores, white only and were in the College of Liberal Arts, similar to that of 2016 ATC camps' respondents, except more females responded than in 2016. Frequencies presented in Table 14 are in descending order by 2017 Howdy Camp participants who responded to the survey.

	2017 Howdy Camp Percent (n=49)	2016 T- Camp Percent (n=167)	2016 Howdy Camp Percent (n=59)
Classification			
Sophomore	59%	52%	53%
Junior	20%	34%	17%
Freshman	14%	12%	25%
Senior	4%	3%	3%
Masters	2%	--	2%
Academic College			
Liberal Arts	27%	31%	27%
Agriculture & Life Sciences	22%	20%	25%
Education & Human Development	18%	21%	22%
Architecture	12%	10%	3%
Engineering	8%	7%	14%
Science	6%	4%	--
Business	2%	3%	2%
Geosciences	2%	3%	5%
Vet Med	2%	--	2%
Nursing	--	1%	--
Rural Public Health	--	1%	--
Sex			
Female	80%	65%	66%
Male	20%	35%	34%
Ethnic Originⁱ			
White Only	78%	69%	85%
Hispanic or Latino of any Race	14%	25%	12%
Black Only + 2 or more/1 Black	2%	2%	--
2 or more/excluding Black	2%	1%	--
Asian Only	2%	2%	3%
American Indian Only	2%	--	--
International	--	1%	--
Native Hawaiian Only	--	1%	--
First Generation College Student			
Not First Generation	71%	75%	‡
First Generation	29%	24%	‡
Unknown	--	1%	‡

Table 14-Demographics of Survey Respondents
‡Not reported

Within the survey, participants were asked to share their gender and age. Most of the respondents self-reported as female, representing 75% of the 36 respondents. Twenty-two (22%) reported themselves as male, and 3% selected “not listed.” Those who selected “not listed” could write in a response and the respondent wrote in “shawn.” No one reported themselves as transgender, or selected the preferred not to answer response. Of 36 respondents, 47% reported themselves between the ages of 17 and 19, 47% were 20 to 22, and six percent were 23 to 25. No one selected the option of age 26 or older, or the preferred not to answer response.

Table 15, on the next page, illustrates the demographics of all 2017 Howdy Camp participants, as well as those who responded to the survey. More females, sophomores, and fewer engineering students responded to the survey than

were represented in the Howdy Camp participant population. Frequencies presented in Table 15 are in descending order by all Howdy Camp participants.

Howdy Camp 2017 Participants	All Participants Percentage (n=115)	Survey Respondents Percentage (n=49)
Classification		
Sophomore	51%	59%
Junior	30%	20%
Freshman	17%	14%
Senior	2%	4%
Masters	1%	2%
Academic College		
Liberal Arts	30%	27%
Agriculture & Life Sciences	19%	22%
Engineering	14%	8%
Education & Human Development	13%	18%
Architecture	9%	12%
Science	5%	6%
Geosciences	4%	2%
Business	4%	2%
Vet Med	2%	2%
Rural Public Health	1%	--
Nursing	1%	--
Sex		
Female	67%	80%
Male	33%	20%
Ethnic Origin		
White Only	77%	78%
Hispanic or Latino of any Race	17%	14%
Asian Only	3%	2%
2 or more/excluding Black	2%	2%
Black Only + 2 or more/1 Black	1%	2%
American Indian Only	1%	2%
International	1%	--
First Generation Student		
Not First Generation	73%	71%
First Generation	26%	29%
Unknown	1%	--

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

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, participants, counselors, teamers and co-chairs of 2017 Howdy Camp reported a positive experience. Counselors and teamers generally indicated feeling prepared for Howdy Camp. Correspondingly, the camp participants felt welcomed, learned about traditions, and were confident in their relationships with the camp staff. Overall, Howdy 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. Although counselors and teamers were generally more satisfied with their overall training than those participating in T-Camp 2016, diversity and traditions training remain the areas counselors and teamers seem least satisfied.

All the responding counselors and teamers thought their co-chairs fulfilled their roles compared to Howdy Camp 2016 and T-Camp 2016. They felt supported and said they were informed of expectations and received feedback. Still they indicated they would like to see more traditions and mock DG trainings and more time to meet preparation deadlines, if possible. Some uncertainty regarding the training for teamers also seemed to emerge from the qualitative responses. There was also some indication of discord or lack of support between the director staff, liaisons and co-chairs which the counselors noticed during camp. Finally, the survey's qualitative questions seemed repetitive to the survey takers, specifically those focusing on support from the director staff, liaisons and overall support for the counselors. If a survey continues to be the means of assessing ATC staff experiences, and in effort to increase the number of survey takers who respond to all questions, those responsible for the assessment should review the survey questions, and streamline the qualitative questions that result in similar responses from survey responders.

The 2017 Howdy Camp participants reported a welcoming experience during and after camp and would recommend it to other transfer students. However, compared to previous year's participants, this year's campers reported being less familiar with and feeling less prepared to begin at Texas A&M prior to attending Howdy Camp. When asked what topics should be covered or covered in greater depth at Howdy Camp, like their T-Camp 2016 counterparts, these participants were interested in learning more about practical on-campus resources, like Veteran Services, on-campus jobs, student organization choice, time management tips and where to find academic assistance resources. 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 Howdy Camp 2017.

Report Prepared for: Kyle Carpenter and Sarah Edwards, Student Activities -Aggies Transition Camps
Report Prepared by: Susan Fox- Forrester, Student Life Studies
Report Prepared on: March 14, 2017
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!***