



Annual Assessment Report Template: Learning
Academic Year: 2016-2017

Date of Report Submission: July 7, 2017

Name of Department: Residential Education

Name of Contact Person: Stacey Jaksa

Name of Person(s) completing report or contributing to the project: Joey Leon, Kelly Liang, Megan Heckel, Stacey Jaksa

Part I: Follow-Up on Last Year's Assessment Report Recommendations

The 2015-2016 assessment report findings produced recommendations regarding a re-alignment of programming efforts to better prepare and engage our students in the first few weeks of the quarter, specifically during Welcome Week. It was also recommended that this re-alignment be a shared initiative amongst key partners associated with Welcome Week. Our proposed action plan included sharing our assessment report findings with professional staff which occurred during our July 2016 staff training. The report findings were also shared with resident advisors and New Student and Family Engagement staff. Due to the timing of when assessment reports are finalized and the overlap that occurs with Welcome Week planning there were aspects of the recommendations that our department knew could not be implemented for Welcome Week 2016. Our Director, Rod Waters was able to make suggestions at the divisional level regarding future Welcome Week planning which was also a part of our action plan. The implementation of many of these suggestions from our assessment report is now taking place for 2017. These changes included a working group for key partners across the division, sharing resources, increasing collaboration, and clearly outlining Welcome Week events. The working group has committed to coming together throughout the summer of 2017 and after Welcome Week occurs to review how it went. If this new model is successful, Welcome Week will continue to grow and further implementation of other recommendations such as increasing faculty engagement, will be able to take place.

Part II: Report on This Year's Assessment Project

I. Abstract

This assessment examined student learning regarding benefits of living on campus upon completion of residential community development activities that included Residential Education Learning Initiatives (RELI), floor meetings, Welcome Week and the Blue Demon Community Meeting. Results from a single, multiple-answer online learning survey question were compared with level of activity attendance. Of the students assessed, 7.9 percent correctly identified benefits to living on-campus. A majority of students did not correctly identify the benefits to living on-campus and thus, did not demonstrate learning. Implications of research findings include recommendations for revisiting how initiatives are planned and implemented in the residence halls and consideration for creating a formalized Residential Curriculum model.

II. Assessment Question

To what extent are students learning about the benefits of living with others after participating in residential community development activities?

III. Introduction & Context**Project Overview**

Residential Education was interested in examining what learning takes place for residential student participants in residential community development activities. The residential community development programming area is comprised of fourteen key activity areas. For the purpose of this project, we assessed four of those activity areas: RELI, the Blue Demon Community Meeting, floor meetings, and Welcome Week. Each of the areas assessed are activities offered within the first six weeks of the academic year, with the exception of RELI which is offered throughout the entirety of the academic year. In order to assess our learning outcome for residential community development, we defined learning as being able to accurately identify the benefits of living in the on-campus community.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

The primary program level learning outcome assessed was the following: “Students who engage in Residential Community Development will identify the benefits and responsibilities of living with others.”

The primary department level learning outcome assessed was the following: “As a result of participating in Residential Education programs, students will be able to demonstrate personal responsibility and respect for others in communities of which they are a part.”

The primary division level learning outcome assessed was the following: “Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Development: Students who participate in Student Affairs programs and activities will develop a strong sense of personal identity and form mature, respectful relationships with others.”

Context for This Year’s Report

Residential Education was interested in assessing specific student learning outcomes through our residential community development program area, specifically four of the fourteen key activities that make up this area. Community development within the residence halls is an important area of contribution that our department offers to the Division of Student Affairs, thus gauging student learning within this initiative is a focal point for our department. As previously mentioned, we indicated that learning would be determined by a student’s ability to correctly identify the benefits of living within the on-campus community. We developed a learning survey question for students to take in which they were asked to identify the benefits to living on-campus. Prior to the survey tool being distributed to students, our department’s professional staff team determined what we believed to be the most important benefits to living on-campus based on the interactions our staff has with students. The top three benefits identified were: getting to

know other people, a sense of community, and being close to campus. “Correct and incorrect” answers on the learning survey were then determined based on these selections made by our staff.

Assessing this topic area directly relates to Residential Education’s Key Activity Map (KAM) and departmental learning outcomes. At a program-level, the learning outcome related to our assessment question is, “Students who engage in Residential Community Development will identify the benefits and responsibilities of living with others.” At the department-level, the learning outcome related to this program-level learning outcome is, “As a result of participating in Residential Education programs, students will be able to demonstrate personal responsibility and respect for others in communities of which they are a part.” By contributing in these areas at the program and department-level, this topic area also feeds up to the learning outcomes of the Division of Student Affairs, specifically, it is related to Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Development. This learning outcome states, “Students who participate in Student Affairs programs and activities will develop a strong sense of personal identity and form mature, respectful relationships with others.” Assessing the benefits of living on campus will help our department to observe whether or not our current approach to residential community development is in alignment with the learning we are trying to ensure students are doing within the on-campus community.

Astin’s student involvement theory (1999) defines involvement as “the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience” (p. 519). As a part of the research, Astin also had findings specifically regarding on-campus students. Astin indicates that on-campus students are more likely to have greater proficiency in “artistic interests, liberalism, and interpersonal self-esteem” (p. 524). Astin goes on to state that, “Living on-campus substantially increases the student’s chances of persisting and of aspiring to a graduate or professional degree. Residents are more likely than commuters to achieve in such extracurricular areas as leadership and athletics and to express satisfaction with their undergraduate experience, particularly in the areas of student friendships, faculty-student relations, institutional reputation, and social life” (p. 525). This increase in satisfaction promotes retention efforts and alumni engagement. Bloland (1987) further discusses providing activities that seamlessly combine leisure with student growth and development by concluding that, “we [student development educators] should expand the ways in which a greater number of campus experiences, including leisure [behaviors], can be used to promote the educational growth of students” (p. 293). Johnson and Cavins (1996) identify that the residence halls are an ideal environment for developing community, increasing student involvement, and creating a space for intentional interactions to occur, especially between faculty members and students. Furthermore, Lopez Turley and Wodtke (2010) utilized Astin’s theory as a framework for a study conducted assessing first year students. The study determined that “among students attending liberal arts institutions, those who live on campus have significantly higher GPAs than comparable students at the same institution who live off campus with family.” It should also be noted that literature from Graham (2016) indicates that “while there is much anecdotal evidence to support the benefits of living on campus, trustworthy measurements are difficult to achieve” (p. 9). Graham goes on to state, “We

need to parse out the sources of positive impact, further investigating the environment, the programming, and the peer interactions so as to improve practice” (p. 23).

IV. Data Collection & Methodology

Population and Sample

Our focus and collection of data for our project was on residential undergraduate students in the Lincoln Park campus. Our population included residential students who completed our Student Experience Survey in the fall 2016 quarter. This group was the most useful to answer our assessment question because they chose to participate in our survey, and had the opportunity to attend a residential community development activity during the fall 2016 quarter within their on-campus living experience.

All the residential students on the Lincoln Park campus (2,443 students) were invited to complete the Student Experience Survey through email notifications, facebook posts, and through word of mouth from their resident advisors (RAs). Our rationale for collecting from this specific sample was used to help us understand the student learning that takes place with the top benefits of living on campus.

Data Collection

Our data was collected through one, multiple answer question that was added this year on our online Student Experience Survey that was communicated through email during the end of the fall 2016 quarter. The question added was, “Of the list below, what would you identify as the top 3 benefits of living in the residence halls. Please rank order the benefits 1 through 3, with 1 being the most important benefit” (Appendix Figure 15). Our department solidified the learning survey question during one of our staff meetings. All professional staff participated and identified the top benefits to living on campus based on the daily interactions they have with students. Our staff determined the top benefits to be: getting to know other people, a sense of community, and being close to campus. These top benefits were then utilized to determine learning based on whether students correctly or incorrectly identified these same benefits on the survey. Student learning was assessed through both the data from our survey and through participation data from our residential community development activities during the fall quarter. Student ID’s were collected in the survey.

Data Analysis

The evidence collected was analyzed by four professional staff members within our department to determine how many students met the threshold of success by answering the learning question correctly. These professional staff members organized the data for the additional analysis from Doug Palzer and Scott Tharp, and facilitated the discussion in staff meetings to confirm the threshold of success (two out of three correct responses). After two professional staff members received the residential community development activity participation data, we went through the participation data and organized the information to compare the answers to the student learning question with the fall quarter activity participation data.

As demonstrated in the appendix within our “Residential Education Data Analysis Report,” student learning data was collected from a multiple-answer learning survey question with up to three correct answers (getting to know people, sense of community, being close to campus). Activity attendance data was collected from OrgSync card swipes spanning four activities: 1) Blue Demon Community Meeting (BDCM), 2) Floor Meetings (FM), 3) Welcome Week (WW), and 4) RELI events (RELI). RELI was the only activity category that included a collection of nine sub-activities. All data was associated with 1,320 unique students.

Doug Palzer and Scott Tharp analyzed our data and shared it with us through a Residential Education Data Analysis Report. In this report, the analysis method that was used included descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. They wrote about this in the report:

Descriptive statistics (i.e., frequencies, means) for activity attendance data were calculated in four ways. First, the frequency of attendance across all 12 sub-activities (within the four total activities) were calculated for all unique students. Second, the frequency of attendance across all 9 sub-activities within the RELI events category were calculated for all unique students. Third, the frequency of students who attended each of the four activity categories were attended for all unique students (labeled as “categories”). Fourth, all 12 sub-activities were collapsed into “attendance categories” (i.e., 0, 1-2, 3-4, 5-6) and the frequency of attendance was calculated for each attendance category.

Inferential statistics (i.e., correlations, cross-tabs) were conducted to determine if there was a relationship between student learning data and activity attendance data. Three scatterplots and correlation analyzes were conducted based on number of right answers selected with 1) total number of sub-activities attended, 2) total number of RELI sub-activities attended and 3) total number of activity categories attended. Crosstabs were conducted based on 1) threshold for successful learning relative to attendance categories, 2) threshold for successful learning relative to activity categories, and 3) each correct student learning answer choice relative to activity categories. The first two types of crosstabs were conducted to determine if a relationship exists between successful learning and either overall level of attendance or categories of attendance. The last crosstab was conducted to determine if there was a relationship between identifying specific right answer choices and a specific category of attendance.

Participant Consent

Consent was obtained through the active participation of the online survey through the form of inputting their student ID number. Participation from the survey was optional and students were communicated the purpose of the survey prior to their participation. The participant information was kept and stored securely through the Qualtrics website. The sensitive information that was collected about individual participants were their student identification numbers.

V. Data & Findings

Response Rate and Demographics

All residential students in Lincoln Park at DePaul University (2,443) were invited to participate in our Student Experience Survey. There were 1,320 responses total that were used for our analysis. The response rate yielded 54%. No demographic data was collected about this sample.

Key Findings

The Residential Education Data Analysis Report from Doug Palzer and Scott Tharp included the following synopsis of our project's key findings (with all tables and charts located in the appendix):

With respect to the learning survey question, the mean number of correct answers identified was .31 (SD=.81). 1103 students (83.6%) did not identify a single correct answer, 113 students (8.6%) selected one correct answer, 13 students (1.0%) selected two correct answers, and 91 students (6.9%) selected all three correct answers. Therefore, 104 students (7.9%) met the learning threshold of identifying at least two correct answers. When considering each individual answer choice, 108 students (8.2%) selected answer choice A (getting to know people). The same number, 108 students (8.2%), selected answer choice B (sense of community). 194 students (14.7%) selected answer choice C (being close to campus).

With respect to student activity participation, 299 students (22.7%) did not attend any activities. 589 students (44.6%) attended one activity. 324 students (24.5%) attend two activities. 84 students (6.4%) attended three activities. 23 students (1.7%) attended four activities, and 1 student (0.1%) attended five activities.

With respect to the number of categories attended, the same 299 students (22.7%) did not participate in any activities. 594 students (45.0%) participated in one category. 328 students (24.8%) attended 2 categories of activities. 77 students (0.6%) participated in three categories, and 22 students (0.02%) participated in all four categories. For the individual category attendance, 811 students (61.4%) attended the Blue Demon Community Meeting, 317 students (24.0%) attended a Floor Meeting, 185 students (14.0%) attended Welcome Week, and 256 students (19.4%) attended at least one RELI event.

Three correlations were conducted to assess the relationship between activity attendance and student response to the learning survey question:

- Frequency of total sub-activity attendance and level of knowledge were not significantly correlated, $r(1318) = -0.04$, $p = .381$. This weak, negative correlation indicates that as sub-activity attendance increases, level of knowledge does not tend to increase.
- Frequency of categories attended and level of knowledge were not significantly correlated, $r(1318) = -0.05$, $p = .100$. This weak, negative correlation indicates that

as frequency of categories attended increases, level of knowledge does not tend to increase.

- Frequency of RELI event attendance and level of knowledge were not significantly correlated, $r(1318) = -0.02$, $p = .381$. This weak, negative correlation indicates that as frequency of RELI event attendance increases, level of knowledge does not tend to increase.

One cross-tabulation was conducted to assess whether students who participated in specific categories were more or less likely to meet the learning threshold for the learning survey question. For the Blue Demon Community Meeting, those who attended were more likely to have met the learning threshold than those who did not. For the Floor Meeting, those who attended were less likely to have learned than those who did not attend. For Welcome Week, those who attended were more likely to have met the learning threshold than those who did not attend. For RELI events, those who attended were less likely to have learned than those who did not attend. However, none of these relationships proved to be statically significant.

A second cross-tabulation examined the relationship between meeting the learning threshold and attendance categories. Those who attended zero sub-activities and those who attended “3 or 4” sub-activities were more likely to have met the learning threshold than those who attended “1 or 2” sub-activities. This relationship did prove to be statically significant.

The final cross-tabulations were conducted to assess whether students who participated in specific categories were more or less likely to correctly identify a specific answer choice. Students who attended BDCM or Welcome Week were more likely to correctly select answer choice A (getting to know people). Conversely, student attendance at the Floor Meeting or RELI activities makes them less likely to select correct answer choice A (getting to know people). However, none of these relationships proved to be statistically significant.

With respect to answer choice B (sense of community), students who attended Welcome Week were more likely to select this answer choice. Students who attended any of the three other categories were less likely to select answer choice B. However, none of these relationships proved to be statistically significant.

With respect to answer choice C (being close to campus), students who attended any of the four activity categories were less likely to select answer choice C. The relationships between category attendance and answering selection C were all statistically significant except for Welcome Week (See Figure 14).

Program Level Learning Outcome	Department Level Learning Outcome	Number of Students Assessed	Number of Students with Acceptable or Better Performance
Students who engage in Residential Community Development will identify the benefits and responsibilities of living with others.	As a result of participating in residential education programs, students will be able to demonstrate personal responsibility and respect for others in communities for which they are a part.	1,320	104

We determined two of three correct answers was considered “acceptable performance” because two of three is 66.6% correct and we felt that getting over half correct demonstrated alignment with the department’s perception of what benefits there are to living on campus.

VI. Discussion & Interpretation of Findings

Based upon the assessment that was taken during this academic year, we were not able to see a strong relationship between student learning and participation in the residential community development activities that we chose to include in this project. The response rate for our learning survey yielded a 54 percent response rate, however, only 7.9 percent of students demonstrated learning by correctly identifying the benefits to living on campus. This data reinforces our department’s current initiative to strongly consider creating a formalized Residential Curriculum model. Having a more formalized model may allow us to create activities with more intentionality and thus, allow for better student learning to occur. In terms of limitations, our department decided to pick activities that occur primarily within the first six weeks (3 of the 4 activities). Upon reflection, perhaps splitting the activity selection up more evenly across the academic year may have made a difference to our findings as it would allow for more time for students to experience the activities we offer on-campus. Conducting this learning survey again with more variance in type of activity and including more activities from our residential community development area may be important to explore. This project contributes to our department because it is important to see if the intentionality we infuse within our activities is causing students to learn or, as this assessment project indicates, if we need to revisit how we are implementing these activities.

VII. Recommendations and Plans for Action

Recommendations

Based on the interpretation of the findings within this project, our committee recommends the following:

- Revisiting the intentionality of how initiatives are planned and implemented in the residence halls
- Benchmarking with other institutions and consideration for adjusting our residential community development activities to include a Residential Curriculum model
- Permanently keep the student learning questions as a part of our Residential Student Experience Survey so that further analysis can occur

Action Plan

Based on the results of this project and the above recommendations, our plan of action is as follows:

- *Fall 2017:*
 - Share project findings with Residential Education department during departmental meeting. Professional staff to attend ACPA Residential Curriculum Institute (RCI).
 - After attending RCI, determine whether to include the student learning question in the fall 2017 Residential Student Experience Survey or not
- *On-Going:*
 - Department assessment committee to meet with Director Rod Waters to discuss Residential Curriculum model and continued professional development around intentionality within our residential community development activities.

Sharing the Results

We will share the results of this assessment project as is listed above in the action plan.

Appendix

Sum_All

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5.00	1	.1	.1	.1
	4.00	23	1.7	1.7	1.8
	3.00	84	6.4	6.4	8.2
	2.00	324	24.5	24.5	32.7
	1.00	589	44.6	44.6	77.3
	.00	299	22.7	22.7	100.0
	Total	1320	100.0	100.0	

Figure 1: Frequency of Sub-Activity Attendance

Cat_Att

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4.00	22	1.7	1.7	1.7
	3.00	77	5.8	5.8	7.5
	2.00	328	24.8	24.8	32.3
	1.00	594	45.0	45.0	77.3
	.00	299	22.7	22.7	100.0
	Total	1320	100.0	100.0	

Figure 2: Frequency of Activity Category Attendance

BDCom

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	811	61.4	61.4	61.4
	.00	509	38.6	38.6	100.0
Total		1320	100.0	100.0	

FloorMeet

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	317	24.0	24.0	24.0
	.00	1003	76.0	76.0	100.0
Total		1320	100.0	100.0	

WWeek

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	185	14.0	14.0	14.0
	.00	1135	86.0	86.0	100.0
Total		1320	100.0	100.0	

R_Att

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	256	19.4	19.4	19.4
	.00	1064	80.6	80.6	100.0
Total		1320	100.0	100.0	

Figure 3: Frequency of Activity Attendance

Statistics

		Tot_Cor	Thresh_Cor
N	Valid	1320	1320
	Missing	0	0
Mean		.3121	
Median		.0000	
Mode		.00	
Std. Deviation		.80531	
Variance		.649	

Figure 4: Mean and St. Dev. of Correct Answer Selections

Tot_Cor					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3.00	91	6.9	6.9	6.9
	2.00	13	1.0	1.0	7.9
	1.00	113	8.6	8.6	16.4
	.00	1103	83.6	83.6	100.0
Total		1320	100.0	100.0	

Figure 5: Frequency of Correct Answer Selections

Correlations			
		Tot_Cor	Sum_All
Tot_Cor	Pearson Correlation	1	-.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.160
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	855.406	-38.024
	Covariance	.649	-.029
	N	1320	1320
Sum_All	Pearson Correlation	-.039	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.160	
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	-38.024	1128.397
	Covariance	-.029	.855
	N	1320	1320

Figure 6: Correlation Between Frequency of Sub-Category Attendance and Correct Answer Selections

Correlations

		Tot_Cor	Cat_Att
Tot_Cor	Pearson Correlation	1	-.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.100
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	855.406	-43.718
	Covariance	.649	-.033
	N	1320	1320
Cat_Att	Pearson Correlation	-.045	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.100	
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	-43.718	1086.030
	Covariance	-.033	.823
	N	1320	1320

Figure 7: Correlation Between Frequency of Activity Category Attendance and Correct Answer Selections

Correlations

		Tot_Cor	Sum_R
Tot_Cor	Pearson Correlation	1	-.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.381
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	855.406	-11.209
	Covariance	.649	-.008
	N	1320	1320
Sum_R	Pearson Correlation	-.024	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.381	
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	-11.209	252.539
	Covariance	-.008	.191
	N	1320	1320

Figure 8: Correlation Between Frequency of RELI Attendance and Correct Answer Selections

Crosstab

			Thresh_Cor		Total
			Learned	NotLearn	
BDCom	.00	Count	39	470	509
		% within Thresh_Cor	37.5%	38.7%	38.6%
	1.00	Count	65	746	811
		% within Thresh_Cor	62.5%	61.3%	61.4%
Total		Count	104	1216	1320
		% within Thresh_Cor	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 9: Cross-Tabulation Between Blue Demon Community Week Attendance and the Learning Threshold

Crosstab

			Thresh_Cor		Total
			Learned	NotLearn	
FloorMeet	.00	Count	83	920	1003
		% within Thresh_Cor	79.8%	75.7%	76.0%
	1.00	Count	21	296	317
		% within Thresh_Cor	20.2%	24.3%	24.0%
Total		Count	104	1216	1320
		% within Thresh_Cor	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 10: Cross-Tabulation Between Floor Meeting Attendance and the Learning Threshold

Crosstab

			Thresh_Cor		Total
			Learned	NotLearn	
WWeek	.00	Count	87	1048	1135
		% within Thresh_Cor	83.7%	86.2%	86.0%
	1.00	Count	17	168	185
		% within Thresh_Cor	16.3%	13.8%	14.0%
Total		Count	104	1216	1320
		% within Thresh_Cor	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 11: Cross-Tabulation Between Welcome Week Attendance and the Learning Threshold

Crosstab

			Thresh_Cor		Total
			Learned	NotLearn	
R_Att	.00	Count	87	977	1064
		% within Thresh_Cor	83.7%	80.3%	80.6%
	1.00	Count	17	239	256
		% within Thresh_Cor	16.3%	19.7%	19.4%
Total		Count	104	1216	1320
		% within Thresh_Cor	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 12: Cross-Tabulation Between RELI Attendance and the Learning Threshold

Level_att * Thresh_Cor Crosstabulation

			Thresh_Cor		Total
			Learned	NotLearn	
Level_att	Zero	Count	29	270	299
		% within Thresh_Cor	27.9%	22.2%	22.7%
	1-2	Count	61	852	913
		% within Thresh_Cor	58.7%	70.1%	69.2%
	3.00	Count	14	93	107
		% within Thresh_Cor	13.5%	7.7%	8.1%
Total		Count	104	1215	1319
		% within Thresh_Cor	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 13: Cross-Tabulation Between Attendance Categories and the Learning Threshold

Crosstab

		CorC		Total	
		.00	1.00		
BDCom	.00	Count	421	87	508
		% within CorC	37.5%	44.8%	38.6%
	1.00	Count	702	107	809
		% within CorC	62.5%	55.2%	61.4%
Total		Count	1123	194	1317
		% within CorC	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

		CorC		Total	
		.00	1.00		
FloorMeet	.00	Count	840	160	1000
		% within CorC	74.8%	82.5%	75.9%
	1.00	Count	283	34	317
		% within CorC	25.2%	17.5%	24.1%
Total		Count	1123	194	1317
		% within CorC	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

		CorC		Total	
		.00	1.00		
WWeek	.00	Count	966	167	1133
		% within CorC	86.0%	86.1%	86.0%
	1.00	Count	157	27	184
		% within CorC	14.0%	13.9%	14.0%
Total		Count	1123	194	1317
		% within CorC	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstab

		CorC		Total	
		.00	1.00		
R_Att	.00	Count	895	167	1062
		% within CorC	79.7%	86.1%	80.6%
	1.00	Count	228	27	255
		% within CorC	20.3%	13.9%	19.4%
Total		Count	1123	194	1317
		% within CorC	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 14: Cross-Tabulation Between Activity Category Attendance and Correct Selection of Answer Choice C (Being close to campus)

Q103

Of the list below, what would you identify as the top 3 benefits of living in the residence halls.
 (Please rank order the benefits 1 through 3, with 1 being the most important benefit)

Items

- * Sense of Community
- Programs/Events
- RA/RD on call 24/7
- Being Close to Campus:
Classes, Food, and Extra-
Curricular Activities
- Having a Front Desk Worker
24/7
- Being Able to Utilize Public
Safety on Campus
- Having the Halls Cleaned
Professionally
- Help with Any Work Order
Issues
- Getting to Know Other People
- Find Friends and Meet
Different People
- Connecting to Campus
Resources
- A Community of Other
Students Who are the Same
Year and Possibly in the Same
Classes
- Learning/Practicing a Sense
of Responsibility and
Independence

Top 3 Benefits of Living in Residence Halls

Figure 15: Residential Student Experience Survey Student Learning Question