

# **Department of Residence Life**

## **On-Campus Living and Learning Assessment**

### **Spring 2018**

#### **Background**

Residence Life provides a variety of housing options for approximately 11,000 undergraduates, graduates, and members of the Corps of Cadets each year; 8,500 of these students live in traditional residence halls and apartments and 2,500 in the Corps of Cadets. According to its website ([reslife.tamu.edu](http://reslife.tamu.edu)), “the vision of the Department of Residence Life is to offer Texas A&M University students a world-class on-campus student living and learning experience.” Residence Life seeks to reach their mission to provide a welcoming, educational, and sustainable community living system through cultivating an environment where students:

- engage, challenge, and grow together,
- feel respected and supported,
- focus on their academic goals, and
- create positive, memorable experiences, and lifelong friendships

Residence Life wanted to explore how living on-campus contributed to students’ experience at Texas A&M University. These results will be used by Residence Life to make improvements to the on-campus learning experience. This is the third time that Student Life Studies and Residence Life have worked together on this project.

#### **Method and Sample**

The assessment was developed using Qualtrics®, a survey design software that creates web-based forms and databases, and analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, and Microsoft Excel®. The 68-question survey included 62 quantitative questions and six qualitative questions. Additionally, demographic information was collected from the Residence Life database and the University student database. Due to branching technology, not all the respondents saw all questions.

The electronic survey link was originally sent to a sample of students living in traditional residence halls (not students in the Corps of Cadets) on March 22, 2018. Non-respondents received up to four reminders before the survey closed on April 6, 2018. Of the 2,000 residents who were invited to take the survey, 255 completed some part of the survey, yielding a 13% response rate (up 2% compared to 2017).

#### **Results**

Results will be reported as means, standard deviation (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 nearest whole percent, so totals may not add up to exactly 100%. Tables are in descending 2018 mean or frequency order unless otherwise stated. Additionally, summary themes for the qualitative questions are contained in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document. Comparisons will be made to the previous year where applicable. This report is divided into six sections: Demographics, Academic Support/Environment, Community/Communication/Civility, Education/Learning, Staffing, and Overall Experience.

## Demographics

Demographics for the sample and respondents can be found in Table 1, which is in descending order for the 2018 survey respondents for each category. Most students living on-campus and responding to the survey were white, female, freshmen or sophomores in the College of Engineering. The demographics were fairly similar when comparing the survey sample to respondents. A couple differences include an increase in sophomores with a decrease in freshmen, an increase in Engineering students, and an increase of females to the decrease of males. Additionally, data on the residence hall students lived in were gathered; this can be found in separate documents.

	2018 Survey Sample [n=2,000]	2018 Survey Respondents [n=254]	2017 Survey Sample [n=1,997]	2017 Survey Respondents [n=219]
<b>Classification</b>				
Sophomore	38%	43%	40%	41%
Freshman	45%	38%	44%	42%
Junior	11%	13%	10%	11%
Senior	6%	5%	6%	6%
Masters/Doctoral/Non-degree	<1%	1%	<1%	0%
<b>College</b>				
Engineering	34%	39%	34%	30%
Liberal Arts	12%	13%	11%	11%
General Studies	10%	12%	9%	8%
Agricultural & Life Sciences	8%	11%	8%	12%
Mays Business School	9%	9%	10%	10%
Science	7%	8%	7%	9%
Education & Human Development	8%	8%	8%	8%
Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences	6%	6%	7%	6%
Architecture	4%	2%	3%	4%
Geosciences	1%	2%	1%	3%
George Bush School of Government	<1%	<1%	<1%	0%
Public Health	1%	0%	<1%	1%
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	52%	65%	50%	69%
Male	48%	35%	50%	31%
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
White	53%	55%	53%	59%
Hispanic or Latino	29%	26%	28%	27%
Asian	10%	11%	10%	4%
African American/Black	4%	4%	6%	6%
Multi-Racial, excluding Black	2%	2%	2%	2%
American Indian	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%
International	1%	1%	1%	1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	<1%	0%	<1%	0%
<b>First Generation</b>				
No	72%	73%	69%	72%
Yes	27%	26%	28%	27%
Unknown	2%	1%	2%	1%

Table 1—Demographics

**Academic Support/Environment**

Residents were asked a series of questions about their on-campus living environment supporting their academics. Table 2 illustrates students were most positive about their living environment providing academic resources for success. However, students were not as positive about the residence halls creating opportunities to interact with faculty members. Students were more agreeable about several statements this year compared to last year.

Living on-campus...	Strongly Agree (7)	Agree (6)	Somewhat Agree (5)	Neutral (4)	Somewhat Disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2018 Mean (sd) [n]	2017 Mean (sd) [n]
Provided me with academic resources for success	17%	28%	19%	25%	3%	5%	4%	5.01 (1.53) [221]	4.92 (1.58) [191]
Provided academic programming to support academic success	12%	30%	22%	25%	3%	3%	5%	4.96 (1.46) [221]	4.76 (1.52) [191]
Enhanced my academic performance	15%	23%	25%	22%	5%	5%	6%	4.82 (1.61) [221]	4.84 (1.52) [191]
Improved my overall academic experience at Texas A&M University	16%	29%	14%	22%	7%	2%	10%	4.81 (1.77) [221]	4.84 (1.61) [189]
Maintained an environment where I could study in my room	18%	27%	18%	11%	9%	7%	10%	4.71 (1.92) [221]	4.69 (1.86) [191]
Allowed me opportunities to learn with other students	11%	25%	20%	27%	7%	6%	5%	4.68 (1.57) [220]	4.39 (1.75) [191]
Maintained an environment where I could study in my hall	14%	24%	19%	14%	9%	11%	10%	4.47 (1.90) [221]	4.39 (1.82) [191]
Maintained an environment where I could work on projects in my hall	10%	24%	19%	22%	7%	10%	9%	4.43 (1.75) [221]	4.30 (1.76) [191]
Created opportunities to interact with faculty	11%	20%	17%	25%	10%	9%	9%	4.34 (1.75) [221]	4.09 (1.79) [190]

Table 2—Academic Environment

Using a select all that apply response option, students were asked about the academic resources they utilized during the academic year. Table 3 indicates that the study lounges were utilized the most. While study lounges usage decreased compared to 2017, the use of community learning center increased compared to last year. There was an option to select none of the options; however, it was not selected by any of the respondents. Those selecting the “other” response option were provided the opportunity to write a response. Students mentioned supplemental instruction sessions, professor office hours, internet access, and fellows or coaches.

<b>Please select any academic resources you utilized this academic year. (select all that apply)</b>	<b>2018 Frequency Percentage [n=214]</b>	<b>2017 Frequency Percentage [n=160]</b>
<b>Study Lounges</b>	65%	84%
<b>Community Learning Center</b>	53%	31%
<b>On-Campus Tutors (Hullabaloo, White Creek, Commons, &amp; Gardens)</b>	22%	24%
<b>Academic Peer Mentors</b>	21%	14%
<b>Hall Peer Mentors/Advisors (not APM or RA)</b>	10%	‡
<b>Programs Related to my Living Learning Program/Major in my Hall</b>	10%	‡
<b>Dinner with a Prof</b>	8%	10%
<b>Academic Focused Hall Programs</b>	8%	6%
<b>Study Spectacular</b>	6%	‡
<b>Other:</b>	3%	3%
<b>Residence Life Sponsored Undergraduate Research Opportunities</b>	2%	0%
<b>Residence Life Sponsored Scholarship Application or Writing Workshops</b>	1%	2%

Table 3—Academic Resources  
‡ Question not asked

### **Community/Communication/Civility**

The next section focused on the community within the residence halls and the impact the on-campus environment had on students interacting and communicating with different students. Residents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the sense of community in their hall or apartment. Fourteen percent (14%) reported being very satisfied, 33% were satisfied, 30% said they were neutral, 14% were dissatisfied, and 10% said they were very dissatisfied (mean=3.26/5.00; sd=1.16; n=208). The question and scale changed so there is no comparison to 2017.

When asked if they felt that they were part of the community, the residents were fairly split with 35% saying yes, 40% saying no, and 25% being unsure (n=208). There were fewer students feeling that they were part of the community compared to last year when 41% said yes, 41% said no, 18% were unsure (n=169). Students had the opportunity to explain their response, and 92 wrote a response. Those reporting they were part of the community, and also more likely to be satisfied with the community in their hall, commented on being able to meet others, having friends, people being nice, and having opportunities to get together. Some also stated that being part of the Living Learning Community or student bonfire helped them have a group to be part of quickly. Alternatively, those who reported being dissatisfied were also more likely to report that they did not feel that they were part of the community. Those students commented that there were no programs or opportunities to meet other residents and that most people stayed in their rooms. Others talked about there being events, but that very few attended, that residents were rude, and having roommate problems. A couple of students also discussed residents drinking, using drugs, and having sex, which did not contribute to a sense of community. Those who indicated they were neutral in their level of satisfaction with the community, also indicated they were not part of the community in their hall. The

examples they shared were similar to those who were dissatisfied with the level of community and that they did not know others, there were few programs to meet others, and that others were rude or loud.

Using a select all that apply option, students were asked to identify how living on-campus helped them. Table 4 reveals that students felt that living on-campus helped them gain a sense of community at Texas A&M. They were less likely to understand how they impacted others. All areas decreased compared to the previous year.

<b>Living on-campus helped me to (select all that apply):</b>	<b>2018 Frequency Percentage [n=205]</b>	<b>2017 Frequency Percentage [n=140]</b>
<b>Gain a sense of community at Texas A&amp;M University</b>	51%	69%
<b>Interact with residents who are different from me</b>	43%	69%
<b>Understand how the actions of others impact me</b>	42%	53%
<b>Gain an appreciation for interacting with those different from myself</b>	33%	47%
<b>Understand the role I play in a community</b>	30%	36%
<b>Understand more about the culture of others</b>	29%	44%
<b>Understand how I impact others</b>	27%	34%
<b>None</b>	23%	‡

Table 4—Community Impact  
‡ Question not asked

Residents were also asked about how living on-campus helped them in areas of communications, with a select all that apply option. Table 5 demonstrates that students selected about being better at communicating with others as a result of living on-campus most frequently. Alternatively, the least selected option was about living on-campus has helped them be able to discuss topics related to diversity with others. Students were less positive about all areas this year compared to last year.

<b>Living on-campus helped me to (select all that apply):</b>	<b>2018 Frequency Percentage [n=198]</b>	<b>2017 Frequency Percentage [n=117]</b>
<b>Better communicate with others</b>	42%	64%
<b>Work with others more effectively</b>	35%	55%
<b>Develop skills for working with others I can utilize for the future</b>	33%	48%
<b>Discuss differing opinions with others</b>	25%	44%
<b>Better resolve conflicts</b>	24%	47%
<b>None</b>	23%	‡
<b>Improve my ability to discuss diverse topics with others</b>	19%	36%
<b>Discuss topics related to diversity with others</b>	13%	32%

Table 5—Communication  
‡ Question not asked

When asked if living on-campus contributed to their skills and abilities to be a better citizen in the future, 52% agreed it had, 26% said no, and 21% were unsure (n=206). There was a slight decrease of students agreeing with this statement from last year when 57% said yes, 28% stated no, and 15% were unsure. Students were provided the opportunity to explain their response and 42 wrote a comment. Students who indicated living on-campus contributed to their skills to be a better citizen commented on learning to live with others, finding out how to compromise or resolve conflicts, and interacting with others who were different from them. Students who said living on-campus did not contribute to them being a better citizen mentioned having a bad roommate, the floor

being loud, and not being part of a group. Those who were neutral felt that they could learn these skills beyond living on campus or that living on-campus was not the reason they developed this skill.

**Education/Learning**

Residents were asked questions about the programming offered in their residence hall or apartment complex. When asked if they utilized programming offered, 65% reported they had not utilized programming efforts and 35% said they had (n=201). This was similar to last year when 62% said they had not (n=165).

Those who had not attended programming in their hall or apartment complex (n=130) were asked what could have been done differently for them to attend. Many of the 51 who wrote a comment indicated that not having time was the biggest factor for not attending. Others reported they did not want to attend, to schedule programs at better times, to offer topics that were more appealing, and to advertise more.

Those who reported they had attended programming in their hall or apartment complex (n=71) were asked a series of questions about their level of satisfaction with the programming efforts. Table 6 shows that residents were mostly satisfied to neutral with the programming. They were most satisfied with the variety of the programming; additionally, this area improved when compared to the 2017 results.

<b>How satisfied are you with the following regarding programming in your hall/apartment:</b>	<b>Very Satisfied (5)</b>	<b>Satisfied (4)</b>	<b>Neutral (3)</b>	<b>Dissatisfied (2)</b>	<b>Very Dissatisfied (1)</b>	<b>2018 Mean (sd) [n]</b>	<b>2017 Mean (sd) [n=61]</b>
<b>Variety of programming</b>	22%	51%	21%	3%	3%	3.87 (.90) [67]	3.82 (.99)
<b>Quality of programming</b>	18%	57%	15%	6%	4%	3.78 (.96) [68]	3.82 (1.01)
<b>Topics of programming</b>	18%	47%	29%	3%	3%	3.74 (.89) [68]	3.80 (.95)
<b>Frequency of programming</b>	19%	49%	22%	4%	6%	3.71 (1.02) [68]	3.75 (1.04)

Table 6—Satisfaction with Programming

Additionally, residents were asked about their level of satisfaction with the information they gained from attending programs. As displayed in Table 7, on the following page, residents were generally satisfied to neutral regarding all statements. They were most satisfied with the social programming; however, were less satisfied with all three areas compared to the previous year.

How satisfied are you with the information gained from attending the following:	Very Satisfied (5)	Satisfied (4)	Neutral (3)	Dissatisfied (2)	Very Dissatisfied (1)	2018 Mean (sd) [n=68]	2017 Mean (sd) [n]
<b>Social programming</b>	18%	44%	27%	6%	6%	3.62 (1.04)	3.80 (1.11) [61]
<b>Academic programming</b>	15%	47%	28%	3%	7%	3.59 (1.03)	3.74 (.91) [61]
<b>Cultural/Diversity programming</b>	12%	37%	38%	7%	6%	3.41 (1.00)	3.61 (1.05) [61]

Table 7—Satisfaction with Information Gained

This year, residents were asked if they had been able to utilize information gained from attending programming in their hall/apartment. Table 8 tells us that residents reported using information from social and academic programming the most; while almost half indicated using information from cultural or diversity programming.

Have you been able to utilize information gain from attending the following:	Yes	No
<b>Social programming</b>	72%	29%
<b>Academic programming</b>	72%	29%
<b>Cultural/Diversity programming</b>	49%	52%

Table 8—Utilize Information Gained (n=66)

The final question for students who reported they utilized programming efforts, asked how Residence Life programs or events could be improved to enhance their experience living on-campus. There were a variety of ideas from the 10 responses shared, including offering more workshops overall, more on diversity or traditions, and having more students attend. Additionally, two residents talked about providing more study space and one person suggested doing more to reach students during Howdy Week to build community.

### Staffing

The next section of the survey focused on the staffing within the residence halls. Residents were asked about their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a series of areas performed by their Resident Advisors (RAs). Table 9, on the following page, says that residents were most satisfied with RAs performance in treating everyone fairly and creating a welcoming environment. Alternatively, they were least satisfied with the RAs efforts to get to know them. Many of the areas were similar to last year; however, all statements decreased some compared to 2017.

<b>How satisfied are you with your RAs performance in the following areas:</b>	<b>Very Satisfied (5)</b>	<b>Satisfied (4)</b>	<b>Neutral (3)</b>	<b>Dissatisfied (2)</b>	<b>Very Dissatisfied (1)</b>	<b>2018 Mean (sd) [n]</b>	<b>2017 Mean (sd) [n]</b>
<b>Treating everyone fairly</b>	46%	28%	20%	3%	3%	4.10 (1.03) [194]	4.11 (1.06) [156]
<b>Creating a welcoming environment</b>	43%	28%	18%	6%	4%	4.01 (1.11) [194]	‡
<b>Communicating rules &amp; regulations</b>	40%	30%	18%	8%	4%	3.94 (1.13) [194]	4.08 (1.02) [155]
<b>Helping with a problem</b>	39%	25%	24%	7%	5%	3.88 (1.15) [193]	4.01 (1.12) [156]
<b>Enforcing policies</b>	34%	30%	28%	5%	4%	3.85 (1.06) [193]	3.97 (1.03) [156]
<b>Gaining your respect</b>	35%	26%	27%	8%	4%	3.80 (1.13) [194]	3.97 (1.09) [156]
<b>Helping with facility issues</b>	35%	27%	28%	5%	6%	3.79 (1.14) [194]	3.85 (1.12) [156]
<b>Availability</b>	34%	29%	23%	9%	6%	3.76 (1.17) [194]	3.94 (1.09) [156]
<b>Organizing programs/activities</b>	31%	29%	31%	4%	5%	3.76 (1.09) [194]	3.82 (1.06) [156]
<b>Providing on-campus resources</b>	29%	28%	33%	6%	3%	3.75 (1.05) [194]	3.83 (1.04) [156]
<b>Supporting on-campus events</b>	30%	26%	34%	7%	3%	3.72 (1.06) [193]	3.96 (.97) [156]
<b>Encouraging on-campus involvement</b>	32%	25%	31%	7%	5%	3.71 (1.14) [194]	3.89 (1.07) [156]
<b>Creating a community for residents</b>	30%	30%	26%	7%	7%	3.71 (1.17) [194]	3.88 (1.16) [156]
<b>Serving as a positive role model</b>	30%	25%	34%	5%	6%	3.68 (1.14) [192]	3.90 (1.16) [156]
<b>Providing academic support/resources</b>	27%	22%	38%	9%	6%	3.60 (1.09) [192]	3.79 (1.05) [156]
<b>Efforts to get to know you</b>	33%	20%	24%	13%	10%	3.53 (1.33) [194]	3.63 (1.30) [156]

Table 9—RA Staff Performance  
‡ Question not asked



Furthermore, residents were asked about the areas that Residence Life staff members had supported them. Table 10 articulates that staff assisted residents with social integration and facilities issues the most. Alternatively, staff helped residents with medical issues and study abroad the least. Those that selected the “other” response option were given the opportunity to write a comment, and three provided different comments. One indicated that his/her RA checked in with them during Hurricane Harvey, another felt that his/her RA was there when they need a person to talk to, and one stated that the RA helped with a maintenance issue. Fewer residents reported staff members supporting them on most of these areas when compared to the previous year.

<b>Of the following, please select the areas that Residence Life Staff have supported you: (select all that apply)</b>	<b>2018 Frequency Percentage [n=180]</b>	<b>2017 Frequency Percentage [n=118]</b>
<b>Social integration</b>	36%	48%
<b>Facilities issues</b>	34%	40%
<b>Academics</b>	28%	38%
<b>None</b>	25%	‡
<b>Campus involvement</b>	24%	42%
<b>Transitioning to Texas A&amp;M</b>	23%	32%
<b>Roommate issues</b>	21%	25%
<b>Personal issues</b>	19%	26%
<b>Continuing at Texas A&amp;M</b>	17%	31%
<b>Community involvement</b>	15%	25%
<b>Personal development</b>	14%	22%
<b>Goal setting</b>	9%	13%
<b>Mental health</b>	9%	11%
<b>Identity</b>	7%	10%
<b>Career planning</b>	6%	11%
<b>Bryan/College Station resources</b>	6%	10%
<b>Career fairs</b>	4%	9%
<b>Financial concerns</b>	4%	7%
<b>Traumatic events</b>	4%	3%
<b>Study abroad</b>	3%	4%
<b>Medical issues</b>	3%	3%
<b>Other:</b>	2%	6%

Table 10—Staff Support  
‡ Question not asked

Residents were asked what, if anything, Residence Life staff members could have done to improve their on-campus experience and 35 provided a response. The most common suggestion shared was for staff to be available and known to the residents. Several talked about not knowing who their Resident Advisor (RA) was or that their RA was never around. Other ideas included enforcing the rules, emailing more, and helping when asked. One suggested having a better roommate matching system and a couple of residents mentioned facilities, especially flooding from Hurricane Harvey at the start of the year.

## Overall Experience

The final section looked at residents' overall on-campus living experience. Students were asked a series of questions about their overall on-campus living. Table 11 indicates students reported most positively that living on-campus contributed to their feeling of being an Aggie and their sense of belonging at Texas A&M. Alternatively, students rated that living on-campus contributed to their willingness to recommend living on-campus to others and their ability to be successful in social interactions the lowest. Almost all statements decreased some when compared to 2017.

<b>Overall, living on-campus positively contributed to my:</b>	<b>Strongly Agree (5)</b>	<b>Agree (4)</b>	<b>Neutral (3)</b>	<b>Disagree (2)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree (1)</b>	<b>2018 Mean (sd) [n]</b>	<b>2017 Mean (sd) [n=153]</b>
<b>Feeling of being an Aggie</b>	31%	39%	19%	5%	7%	3.82 (1.13) [182]	3.80 (1.20)
<b>Sense of belonging at Texas A&amp;M</b>	32%	36%	19%	5%	8%	3.80 (1.17) [186]	3.79 (1.12)
<b>Academic transition from high school to college</b>	29%	35%	21%	7%	9%	3.70 (1.21) [184]	3.86 (1.08)
<b>My plans to graduate from Texas A&amp;M</b>	30%	29%	30%	4%	7%	3.69 (1.15) [183]	3.80 (1.07)
<b>Ability to be successful in my academic pursuits</b>	25%	40%	22%	7%	7%	3.69 (1.13) [184]	3.71 (1.03)
<b>Ability to integrate my academic and social life</b>	24%	40%	21%	9%	7%	3.65 (1.13) [183]	3.68 (1.02)
<b>Decision to return to Texas A&amp;M next year</b>	26%	30%	31%	5%	8%	3.62 (1.51) [183]	3.78 (1.08)
<b>Ability to live the Aggie Core Values</b>	23%	36%	27%	8%	7%	3.61 (1.12) [184]	3.71 (1.02)
<b>Willingness to recommend living on campus to others</b>	29%	32%	20%	8%	11%	3.59 (1.29) [184]	3.64 (1.31)
<b>Ability to be successful in social interactions</b>	23%	34%	29%	7%	7%	3.59 (1.12) [184]	3.54 (1.09)

Table 11—Overall On-Campus Experience

Residents were asked to rate overall how living on-campus positively contributed to a series of statements. Table 12, on the following page, demonstrates residents were mostly agreeable to neutral for most statements. Residents agreed most that living on-campus contributed to their ability to live independently. However, almost one-third of residents disagreed that living on-campus contributed to their living a healthy lifestyle. In comparison to 2017, most statements decreased, with the exception of seeking help if needed and living a healthy life.

<b>Living on-campus positively contributed to my:</b>	<b>Strongly Agree (5)</b>	<b>Agree (4)</b>	<b>Neutral (3)</b>	<b>Disagree (2)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree (1)</b>	<b>2018 Mean (sd) [n]</b>	<b>2017 Mean (sd) [n]</b>
<b>Live independently</b>	35%	40%	15%	4%	6%	3.92 (1.11) [182]	3.95 (1.06) [153]
<b>Balance social and academic commitments</b>	25%	37%	25%	6%	7%	3.68 (1.12) [182]	3.79 (1.02) [153]
<b>Study effectively</b>	27%	35%	22%	8%	8%	3.65 (1.18) [182]	3.68 (1.09) [153]
<b>Solve my problems</b>	22%	35%	29%	7%	7%	3.59 (1.11) [182]	3.66 (.98) [153]
<b>Seek help if needed</b>	22%	34%	33%	6%	6%	3.59 (1.08) [181]	3.57 (1.01) [153]
<b>Make decisions</b>	22%	34%	31%	5%	8%	3.56 (1.31) [181]	3.68 (.95) [152]
<b>Manage my money</b>	16%	29%	35%	10%	10%	3.31 (1.16) [181]	3.41 (1.04) [153]
<b>Live a healthy life (e.g., sleep, exercise, diet)</b>	16%	31%	24%	17%	12%	3.23 (1.25) [182]	3.11 (1.25) [153]

Table 12—Overall On-Campus Contributions

The final questions asked residents to rate the overall value of their on-campus living experience when comparing the cost to the quality. Respondents were asked to rate this on a scale of 0 to 10 with 10 being the best. Residents were slightly positive in their overall rating with mean=5.80/10.00; sd=2.55; n=176. This was about the same as 2017 (mean=5.85/10.00; sd=2.55; n=150). The breakdown can be found in Table 13, in descending order from 10 to 0 on the following page. Residents were also provided the opportunity to explain their rating, where 81 students shared a comment. Residents rating the overall value on the lower end (0 - 3) felt it was expensive and had many concerns about the lower quality of the facilities (water, heat, etc.) Several others also commented on bugs, rats, or mice in the building/their room and that it was loud on their floor. Residents in the middle with their rating (4 - 7) also felt it was too expensive and that the facilities were of low quality; however, many students also appreciated the convenience of living so close to everything. Students also expressed frustration with being required to have a meal plan and the lower quality and variety of the food options. Those students rating their on-campus living experience on the higher end (8 - 10) shared some concerns about the cost and facilities, but also made comments about it being worth it and how much they enjoyed the convenience. These students also talked about the hall staff and other residents in a positive sense.

<b>Comparing the cost to the quality of your on-campus living experience, how do you rate its overall value on a scale of 0 to 10 with 10 being best?</b>	<b>2018 Frequency Percentage [n=176]</b>	<b>2017 Frequency Percentage [n=150]</b>
<b>10</b>	5%	3%
<b>9</b>	5%	9%
<b>8</b>	23%	17%
<b>7</b>	14%	22%
<b>6</b>	13%	12%
<b>5</b>	11%	10%
<b>4</b>	10%	9%
<b>3</b>	6%	6%
<b>2</b>	6%	4%
<b>1</b>	5%	4%
<b>0</b>	3%	5%

Table 13—Overall Value

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Residents seemed most positive regarding their academics as related to their on-campus living experience. This is an area the department has focused on in the past several years and it seems that students appreciate these efforts. Additionally, residents value the close, convenient proximity the residence halls have with classrooms and other areas of campus, which is seen as a benefit.

Alternatively, many residents expressed a lack of community in their hall, which decreased when compared to 2017. The Department of Residence Life may want to continue to look at programming options to promote community in the residence halls. Additionally, the Department could continue to emphasize the Resident Advisors (RAs) getting to know their residents. While for some halls Residence Life cannot change the facilities, they could work at changing the personalization or community within the halls.

Students were less positive about how living on-campus helps them in a variety of areas. The department may want to explore options for a marketing campaign focused on the benefits of living on-campus, beyond just its close proximity. It also may be valuable for the department to map various efforts to the intended benefit. This may help the department see where more energy is going to but also for residents to understand how Residence Life works to create these benefits.

The standard deviation (sd) for many of the statements shows a range of responses, meaning there are greater differences in students' experience living on-campus. It may be beneficial for the department to explore this further by looking at different statements based on various demographics. For example, do women have a different experience than men related to the community? Do students living in one type of residence hall or area of campus have a different experience than others? This could lead to programming based on students' needs and not the same model throughout all the residence halls. If data needs to be looked at differently, Student Life Studies can assist with that to help the department further understand the results.

While this report provides themes of the qualitative results, the Department of Residence Life is strongly encouraged to read all qualitative responses to gain a fuller understanding of students' experiences.

Residence Life staff is encouraged to share this information with the Department staff and intentionally use it for planning future years. Additionally, staff members are encouraged to identify other stakeholders and share this information to improve the overall living environment for students. Some stakeholders could be external to the department such as facilities staff and campus dining staff. Furthermore, if changes are made based on the feedback from this survey, Residence Life could consider highlighting that changes were made based on student feedback and to show that the Department took what students said to make improvements. This might encourage students to respond to surveys in the future feeling that the Department will use that feedback.

The survey instrument continues to be rather long. Students stopped taking the survey throughout the survey. At the beginning of the survey, there were approximately 220 responses (11% response rate); however, by the end of the survey, this had dropped to just under 180 respondents (9% response rate). This represents approximately 18% who did not complete the survey. Residence Life may want to explore options to address this. The department could break the survey up and ask certain sections one year and other sections the next year. This would also allow a little more time to make changes and improvements to see if those were effective. The department may want to prioritize the areas and questions that are most important. Then efforts could be focused on the areas that the department considers essential for all students' on-campus living experience. These also could be the areas the department has the ability to address or make changes to improve the living experience for students.

From reading the comments, some of the students receiving the survey link were Resident Advisors (RAs). These students may have a different experience living on campus and it may be beneficial to remove them from the list prior to sending the survey out.

Report prepared for: Kyle McCracken, Residence Life  
Report prepared by: Kelly Cox, Student Life Studies  
Report prepared on: June 6, 2018  
Analysis prepared by: Bhagyashree Barhate, Student Life Studies  
Survey designed by: Kelly Cox, Student Life Studies

***Services provided by Student Life Studies are funded, in part, by Texas A&M University Advancement Fee.  
Follow Student Life Studies on Facebook!***