NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Report from the Task Force on Living and Learning at NC State

University Housing

NC STATE

August 28, 2002

Acknowledgments

This Report from the Task Force on Living and Learning at NC State incorporates ideas generated in numerous meetings, focus groups, campus tours, and market research surveys. The task force is grateful to all who have devoted their time and energy to the creation of this report.

Task Force Members

Kay Moore, Chair
Dean, College of Education

Frank Abrams
Senior Vice Provost, Academic Affairs

Sam Averitt
Vice Provost for Information Technology

Thomas Conway
*Associate Vice Provost, Division of
        Undergraduate Affairs*

George Dixon
*Vice Provost, Enrollment Management
        and Services and Director of Admissions*

Susan Grant
Associate Director, University Housing

Gail Hankins
Associate Dean, Management

Kathy Hart
University Treasurer

Michael Harwood
University Architect

Karen Helm
Director, University Planning and Analysis

David Johnson
President, Inter-Residence Council

Margaret King
Associate Dean, Graduate School

Charles Leffler
Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities

Tim Luckadoo
Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Jim Pappenhagen
Assistant Director, University Housing

Sarah Rajala
Associate Dean, Engineering

Evelyn Reiman
Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

John Wall
Interim Director, Honors Program

Esther Wilcox
President, Graduate Student Association

Kay Yow
Women's Basketball Coach

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Editorial Board

Anderson Strickler, LLC

Susan Grant
Associate Director, University Housing

Michael Harwood
University Architect

Karen Helm
Director, University Planning and Analysis

Tim Luckadoo
Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Kay Moore
Dean, College of Education

Jim Pappenhagen
Assistant Director, University Housing

Evelyn Reiman
Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs

Mary Russell Roberson
Freelance Writer

Other Contributors

Barry Bram
*Associate Director of Residence Life,
        Pennsylvania State University*

Mark Dohery,
*Director, University Housing,
        University of Virginia*

Michael Glowacki
*Project Coordinator, Department of Resident
        Life, University of Maryland*

Lisa Miles
Computer Consultant, University Housing

Tracey Peake
*Information and Communications Specialist,
        University Housing*

Bill Zeller
Director of Housing, University of Michigan

University Housing
NC STATE

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Task Force on Living and Learning was convened in September, 2001, at the request of University Housing to review its current status and to help plan for a future that involves not only student enrollment growth but also many changes in academic programs and physical facilities at NC State University. We approached our task with the aim of assisting a strong housing program become not only better but a key partner in achieving the aims of the University with respect to the education of students.

The Task Force on Living and Learning at NC State proposes a vision and guiding principles for University Housing that will meet current and future housing needs, while at the same time enhancing the educational experience and performance of students for generations to come. We have concluded that the University could accomplish this through living-learning communities called villages.

A village is a place where people of diverse backgrounds and perspectives live, work, and learn together; students, faculty, and staff interact frequently, both formally and informally; students feel supported as members of a community; partnerships drive planning, implementing, learning, and teaching; programs and services act as magnets for all members of the University community.

Vision
Residential villages enhance the student learning experience at NC State University by supporting and integrating the academic and personal development of students. A rich variety of villages offers opportunities for students to engage in active and collaborative learning with peers, faculty, and staff. Frequent formal and informal interactions foster a sense of community and an intellectually stimulating environment that set the stage for student learning and success.

Guiding Principles

1. Support the University's mission and vision.
2. Optimize student learning.
3. Support students through developmental stages.
4. Create a discernible sense of community.
5. Succeed through partnerships with faculty.
6. Reflect an efficient business model.
7. Improve through ongoing assessment.

University Housing

NC STATE

The Task Force recommends that

1. the University as a whole accept and endorse this report as the foundation for mutual action to advance living-learning at NC State.

2. the provost, the vice chancellor for Student Affairs, the director of University Housing and the academic deans assume responsibility for forging active partnerships between University Housing, faculty, and staff to realize the aims of this report.

3. University Housing create a Steering Committee to oversee the implementation of the village vision, guiding principles, and Task Force Recommendations in conjunction with the development of Housing's Master Plan. The Compacet Planning process is a way to advance these partnerships.

4. the Steering Committee enhance three existing housing programs using the village guiding principles, and launch two new living-learning villages within the 2004-2006 timeframe.

5. each village create an Administrative Council with students, faculty and staff to implement, operate and assess the various programs within the village.

6. consistent with the Physical Master Plan, and supported by market research from Anderson Strickler (see Appendix B), University Housing add 1,800 beds to campus housing by 2010, which would increase the service level to 30% of total enrollment.

7. the creation of a student residential village on Centennial Campus, in light of the movement of large numbers of upperclass and graduate students to that campus.

8. the Steering Committee issue a report in 2006 to evaluate the progress of the village Administrative Councils.

I. Introduction

Excellence in education at NC State requires the entire community to act in partnership at many levels. Faculty and University Housing, in particular, can work together to provide an ideal environment for living and learning. When students feel supported in an intellectual community they make great strides in cognitive and personal development. And what students learn by living together productively strengthens the University's overall goals.

For the past year, University Housing has been working with faculty, students, staff, and the consulting firm of Anderson Strickler to develop a comprehensive University Housing plan. As part of this process, the Task Force on Living and Learning at NC State was created and charged to

- Develop a set of guiding principles by which a long-range plan should be developed and evaluated.
- Review the work of the consultants and suggest applications of findings.
- Look at peer institutions and best housing practices across the country to help develop an innovative approach to campus housing at NC State.
- Provide vision and direction to develop the best possible living and learning environments for residential students.
- Ensure that the final plan complements the University mission and supports the enrollment plan and Physical Master Plans.

Members of the Task Force and students visited three universities whose living and learning programs are nationally known, and whose programming models are similar to the types of living and learning communities we would like to implement here. The universities visited were the University of Michigan, the University of Virginia, and the University of Maryland. In addition, Pennsylvania State University sent the Task Force detailed information about its programming models, as the planned visit there had to be cancelled. We benefited greatly from our visits (please see Appendix A for summaries of our findings).

With community and partnership as touchstones, the Task Force on Living and Learning at NC State has developed a vision and guiding principles for campus housing that support the mission and vision of the University as a whole. This vision is anchored in the belief that the way in which students are housed on campus has far-reaching ramifications regarding how much and how well those students learn in their college years, and beyond and that thoughtful design for residential living is a critical asset.

II.   The Case for Living-Learning Communities: Literature Review

Research shows that students learn more and better when they do so in the context of a community—for example in living-learning communities. Such communities differ from institution to institution, but typically include academic programming, opportunities for a wide variety of interactions, and physical spaces that encourage an intellectually stimulating environment among students.

In a wide-reaching literature review, Terenzini, Pascarella and Blimling (1996), found strong support for the idea that students in living-learning residence halls make greater cognitive gains than students in conventional residence halls. The authors stated, "The research quite consistently points to the educational value and potency of the 'living-learning' concept in residence halls." In contrast, living in conventional residence halls increases persistence and degree attainment but does not appear to affect academic achievement (Astin, 1993; Blimling, 1993; Schroeder, 1994; Tinto, 1993; and Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991).

In *Creating Learning Communities,* Shapiro and Levine (1999) share the assessments of living-learning communities from a dozen universities. Although the universities measured different outcomes, all found positive results. Temple University found a higher rate of retention among participants in learning communities. Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis found a higher rate of retention among African-American students who participated in learning communities. At the University of Wisconsin, students participating in the Bradley Learning Community were more likely to report satisfaction with their first-year experience, more likely to contact professors, more likely to act in leadership capacities, and less likely to suffer declines in academic self-esteem than non-participants. At the University of Missouri-Columbia, students who participated in Freshmen Interest Groups (living together and taking classes together) had higher grade-point averages than non-participants.

Harvard statistician Richard J. Light has spent more than ten years studying the college student experience. In *Making the Most of College* (2001), he says that first-year students who struggle academically are frequently isolated, both socially and academically. In contrast, students who have support groups, in the form of organized activities or clubs, and students who study in groups, benefit tremendously. Other researchers concur. G.S. Blimling (1999), says, "The connection between a sense of belonging and student success and retention . . . is clear."

Numerous studies have found that frequent out-of-class interactions with faculty members have a measurable, positive effect on student learning (Terenzini, Pascarella and Blimling, 1996). Light (2001) also points out the value of student-faculty interactions. He reports that highly successful students often mention the power of a faculty advisor, professor, or mentor in encouraging them to discover how their academic work relates to their goals for their lives. These kinds of connections help students find real meaning in their course work that translates into academic and personal success.

The frequency of academic or intellectual interactions among peers also correlates positively with student learning, as does socializing with people of different racial/ethnic groups (Astin, 1993). Light found that encounters between students of different ethnic and religious backgrounds often provided the richest opportunities for personal growth. Because of the strong connection between "in-class" learning and "out-of-class" learning, Light says, "when students interact with fellow students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds in day-to-day living, it makes a strong impression. This finding drives home the importance of creating residential living arrangements that bring students from different backgrounds together . . . ."

Living-learning programs also benefit other members of a university—in particular, faculty and graduate students. Many of the faculty who participated in the College Park Scholars program at the University of Maryland called it "the best teaching experience I've ever had" (Shapiro and Levine, 1999). Graduate students find that learning communities offer opportunities for rich and creative curriculum development and teaching—opportunities that serve them well in the academic job market (Shapiro and Levine, 1999). Learning communities can also help graduate students—particularly those from other countries—avoid isolation. Even university admissions can profit: a University of Maryland study found that the College Park Scholars Program increased the number of top tier students who chose to attend the University (Flannery and Snyder-Nepo, 1994).

Developing learning communities would also address the challenges of recent national commissions calling for improved and more integrated undergraduate education. In fact, the Kellogg Commission recommended that research universities "put students first," and described learning communities as a way to do so: "In such a community, all activities and responsibilities are related. Students, staff, and faculty come to see themselves as engaged in a common enterprise. Above all, the quality of learning is nearly inseparable from the experience of functioning as an integral part of the community itself" (Kellogg Commission, 1997, p. 9). The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University made a similar recommendation when it wrote: "What is needed now is a new model of undergraduate education at research universities that makes the baccalaureate experience an inseparable part of an integrated whole. Universities need to take advantage of the immense resources of their graduate and research programs to strengthen the quality of undergraduate education. . . . Research universities should foster a community of learners. Large universities must find ways to create a sense of place to help students develop small communities within the larger whole." (Boyer, 1998, p. 5)

Multidisciplinary studies are also receiving attention nationally as a way to enrich university education. Boyer states, "Too many campuses. . . are divided by narrow departmental interests that become obstacles to learning in the richer sense" (Boyer, 1987). Schneider and Shoenberg recommend focusing on improving intellectual capacities of students rather than encouraging simple fact acquisition and, as one strategy to do so, endorse "multidisciplinary and integrative learning

designed to create an awareness of relationships, tensions, and complementarities among ideas and epistemologies" (Schneider and Shoenberg, 1998).

As a consequence of the research on student learning, and the challenges issued by national commissions, many universities are designing a variety of living-learning communities that help reach both housing and academic goals. The Task Force on Living and Learning contends that learning communities can have a significant positive impact for students at NC State as well.

III. NC State Context

NC State is at a critical decision point as it plans for future on-campus housing. Currently, about 7,500 students live on campus—27% of total enrollment, including 76% of the first-year students. An additional 1,900 students currently living off-campus would choose to live in campus housing if desired facilities were available, according to work by Anderson Strickler Real Estate Services (see Appendix B).   By 2010, University enrollment is expected to increase from 28,000 to 31,000. The Physical Master Plan recommends that housing availability be increased to 30% during the same time—an increase of 1,800 beds.

Many residence halls are currently in need of renewal and renovation. NC State's residence halls, apartment buildings (at E.S. King Village), and Greek houses were built between 1903 and 1985, and many need improvements, such as adding air conditioning, increasing the number of single rooms, increasing accessibility, and updating electrical and mechanical systems. Most buildings also lack suitable common areas and study lounges.

Moreover, the housing plan must fit into the context of the *Physical Master Plan: A Campus of Neighborhoods and Paths* and the University enrollment plan. Most importantly, the housing plan must support the overall mission and goals of the University. One of the University's goals is to become one of the top 25 public teaching and research institutions in the nation, and excellence in undergraduate education is a critical part of that goal. With these factors in mind, the Task Force examined options for campus living that would improve the educational experience and performance of students for years to come.

Creating a richer, more cohesive living-learning environment will have multiple benefits for NC State students. The Task Force endorses the concept of residential villages as a way to meet the demand for more and improved campus housing while at the same time

- increasing faculty-student interactions;
- valuing campus diversity;
- enhancing student learning;
- strengthening bonds between students and the University;
- complementing the Physical Master Plan.

IV. Vision and Guiding Principles for Villages

After considerable deliberation and consultation, the Task Force has framed a vision and guiding principles. We believe this approach will serve to guide those who develop the villages, and also offer parameters to direct assessment of the effectiveness of villages.

Vision

Residential villages enhance the student learning experience at NC State by supporting and integrating the academic and personal development of students. A rich variety of villages offers opportunities for students to engage in active and collaborative learning with peers, faculty, and staff. Frequent formal and informal interactions foster a sense of community and an intellectually stimulating environment that set the stage for student learning and success.

Guiding Principles

1. *Support the University's mission and vision.*

    Villages contribute to the University's goal of excellence in undergraduate and graduate education and to the University's aspirations for national prominence.

2. *Optimize student learning.*

    Residential facilities and programs create an intellectually stimulating environment where living and learning are intertwined, promote higher levels of student success, and foster a commitment to lifelong learning.

3. *Support students through developmental stages*

    Continue to expand services and programs that enhance the elements of community building and student development. For example, the Transitions Programming Model assists students as they move from matriculation through their academic career specifically focusing on their adjustment to university life, their functioning within the university community, and their life beyond NC State.

4. *Create a discernible sense of community.*

    Villages are inclusive communities that promote civic engagement, service learning, and leadership opportunities. Members support each other, contribute to the success of the community and develop a bond to the University.

5. *Succeed through partnerships with faculty.*

    Villages are inspired and sustained through lively partnerships with faculty and academic programs, and motivated by the common enterprise of discovery.

6. *Reflect an efficient business model.*

> Sound fiscal planning, creative sharing of resources, and outside partnerships ensure the financial health of villages.

7. *Improve through ongoing assessment.*

> Villages will be managed and improved through a commitment to an ongoing assessment and planning process, including input from faculty, staff, and students. The Guiding Principles will be used as criteria for evaluating the success of villages.

V. Village Framework

A village is a living-learning community designed to enhance students' opportunities for academic and social engagement. Each village has a discernible sense of place, with a unique mix of activities and services. The support and community offered by a village increases students' academic and personal success. (See Figure 1: Village Framework Summary.)

A village is a place where

People of diverse backgrounds and perspectives live, work, and learn together.

A village is inclusive, diverse, and accessible. It attracts people of different abilities and strengths, people of different ethnic backgrounds, people of different ages (undergraduates and graduate students), people with different jobs (students, faculty, staff), and people from different disciplines. Encouraging people of diverse backgrounds to interact and work together is an important way to broaden horizons and increase student learning.

Students, faculty, and staff interact frequently, both formally and informally.

Academic programming is designed to encourage interactions among students, faculty, and staff. In addition, other aspects of villages (dining, convenience services, fitness/recreation facilities, and social opportunities) set the stage for many kinds of informal interactions.

Students feel supported as members of a community.

Villages provide a home for students within our large, complex university. Students get to know faculty and staff (and vice versa). Students also learn how to access support services and how to move through a variety of transitional points. Villages give students a feeling of belonging and connectedness, and prevent students from becoming isolated.

Partnerships drive planning, implementing, learning, and teaching.

Villages will be designed, guided, and assessed by teams consisting of students, faculty, student affairs staff and others from inside and outside the University. These teams will develop common goals and objectives and monitor achievement through program and activities, with an overriding commitment to improving student learning.

Programs and services act as a magnet for all members of the University community.

Innovative and multi-disciplinary curricular and co-curricular programs and services attract not only residents, but also interested students, faculty, and staff from across the campus. These village-based activities contribute to an ongoing dynamic of intellectual exploration across the University.

Programmatic characteristics of a village

Academic engagement

Villages promote active, collaborative, and interdisciplinary learning. Opportunities for academic engagement could take any of a variety of forms, as illustrated by the wide variety of living-learning programs in existence at different universities. Perhaps all residents of the village take a required course for credit together. Or maybe certain sections of large introductory courses are reserved for residents of that village. "Faculty fellows" could offer semester-long seminars, one-time only workshops, and/or informal lunch-time discussion groups. Village residents could work with faculty to design service learning projects or a course that is open to all students. Student/faculty teams could put together a lecture series of visiting experts. Small groups of students could design an independent study course with faculty.

Whatever the specifics, any plans for academic engagement must strive to involve students in active and collaborative learning and increase student/faculty interactions. In addition, village residents should be able to choose their level of engagement along a continuum of involvement. Some students may be much more interested and motivated to be academically involved in the village while others might be more focused on academic or professional pursuits outside the village. To allow for this, some portions of the village academic program might be mandatory for student residents while other portions are optional.

Theme

The theme of a village will be developed and articulated during the planning stage. Numerous possibilities exist, including advocates for children, international, entrepreneurship, global and multicultural forces, Honors, wellness, environmental sustainability, women in science and engineering, design, and arts/music. Some villages, particularly larger ones composed of more than one residence hall, might have several, interrelated themes. For example, a global village could have sub-themes of different languages, continents/cultures, or different topics of world-wide importance (economy, environment, etc.).

Themes would inform the types of facilities, services, and classes offered at a village. An arts/music village might include practice rooms. An "advocates for children" village might cooperate with a neighborhood school to offer after-school activities. A wellness village might offer seminars for the campus community on healthy lifestyle choices.

Support services for students

Villages offer students personal support through a well-established system of resident advisors and other live-in staff. Villages also offer easily accessible academic advising and career advising. Some villages may have faculty or graduate students in residence.

Self governance

Villages have events, traditions, and some type of government, all of which are shaped by residents, giving each village an identifiable character.

Cross village/cross campus interaction

Each year or so, the villages arrange or host a campus-wide "exploratory" to showcase each village and promote shared activities in support of community.

Social engagement

Social engagement increases the feeling of community, which is important for the emotional and academic well-being of students. In villages, some social occasions are simply social (parties and hanging out), while others accomplish other goals (study groups, building a Habitat house together, planning a village ceremony to mark the beginning or end of the year, attending an aerobics class). In addition, there are many spontaneous interactions each day as students, faculty, and staff provide and use the programs and services offered by a village.

Physical characteristics of a village

Identifiable character and boundaries

The architecture and landscaping of a village contribute to the sense of place. Someone passing through is aware of when he or she enters and leaves the village.

Spaces for living

A village may consist of one residence hall or it may consist of several. Other buildings may or may not be included in the village.

Spaces for academic pursuits

Villages have academic spaces such as classrooms, computer labs, tutoring centers, libraries, study rooms, or advising offices. These spaces support formal learning activities, but also allow for informal collaborative learning, such as student-led study groups.

Spaces for social pursuits

Villages have spaces for formal and informal social gatherings. These spaces could be "hearths," parlors, lounges, coffee shops. Some might be outdoors (quads, swings, benches). Both planned and spontaneous social interactions build community in a village, and support the health and well-being of its residents and visitors.

Spaces for dining, convenience services, and/or recreation

Villages also offer opportunities for dining, convenience services and fitness/recreation. The opportunities could encompass facilities or programs or a combination. For example, dining could be provided with a reserved room at a nearby cafeteria on selected weekdays. Convenience services

could be drug stores, laundry services, copy centers, or ATMs, or they could be discounts at local businesses within short walking distance that already offer these services. Fitness/recreation could be sport fields, walking trails or weight rooms, or it could be softball leagues, group bicycle rides, game days, and fitness equipment for rent. Villages offer these opportunities for several reasons: to support students personally; to attract faculty, staff and non-resident students; and to increase the number of interactions between these groups.

Consistency with Physical Master Plan

Villages fit the framework of the *Physical Master Plan: Neighborhoods and Paths.* The guiding principles of *Neighborhoods and Paths* apply to villages as well: commitment to the master-planning process, coordination of programmatic and physical planning, human-scaled neighborhoods and paths, mixed-use activities, design harmony, environmental sustainability, city context, universal design, campus safety, pedestrian-oriented campus, effective and appropriate vehicular movement, visible neighborhood activities, and efficient responsible development.

Village Framework
A village is a place where
• people of diverse backgrounds and perspectives live, work, and learn together.
• students, faculty, and staff interact frequently, both formally and informally.
• students feel supported as members of a community.
• partnerships drive planning, implementing, learning, and teaching.
• programs and services act as a magnet for all members of the University community.
Programmatic characteristics of a village
• Academic engagement
• Theme(s)
• Support services for students
• Self governance
• Cross village/cross campus interaction
• Social engagement
Physical characteristics of a village
• Identifiable character and boundaries
• Spaces for living
• Spaces for academic pursuits
• Spaces for social pursuits
• Spaces for dining, recreation and/or convenience services
• Consistency with Physical Master Plan: Neighborhoods and Paths

Figure 1: Village Framework Summary

VI. Campus Reaction

Members of the Task Force created a PowerPoint presentation on the village concept. The presentation provided an overview of the living and learning concept and how these communities may be incorporated into NC State's residential and academic environments. The presentations sought responses to four questions.

1. What do you think of the village metaphor as a way to organize campus housing?
2. How do you translate the village concept into the University to benefit students?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the village?
4. How can our residential environment be transformed to create villages on the NC State campus?

The presentation was made to a wide variety of constituencies across campus. They included the Dean's Council, Faculty and Staff Senates, Watauga Seminar, Physical Environment Committee, Student Affairs, and various University Housing staffs, hall councils and advisory groups.

Overall, the feedback was positive for the use of "Village" as a metaphor to organize University Housing. Student representatives from the Inter-Residence Council noted that saying the word village starts you thinking about community and assists in breaking down a large University into small-scale units.

The village concept was seen as a way to create opportunities for curricular and co-curricular integration, social interactions, leadership, and community service. The facilities would offer amenities that would invite and encourage faculty, students, and staff to spend time together. Examples are specialty eateries, central fountain, plaza.

Village strengths were seen as improving the sense of community; improving the personal and academic success of students; strengthening the connection with the University; improving alumni support; and improving the ability to address the transition issues students face as they enter the campus, move through the academic programs and move beyond college. A number of comments echoed the assertion "If you design beautiful places, the quality of life is dramatically increased."

Weaknesses expressed included the possibility of creating an isolated elitist village, creating a village theme that is not flexible to meet the changing needs of students, lack of resources to design programs and facilities to support the village concept, and concern about the loss of diversity. "Do it right or don't do it" was a message expressed in a number of comments. Other respondents suggested that not all residence halls should have to be part of a village.

The participants saw many different ways to transform our residential environment to create villages on our campus. These included everything from improving landscaping; limiting parking; adding fitness centers; improving Hillsborough Street; creating classrooms that would entice faculty; providing art, music practice and photography rooms, as well as coffee shops and other conveniences.

A number of organizing themes for villages were suggested such as a cyberspace village, service-learning village, sustainable environment or "green" village, world village, women in science and engineering, arts exposure, design village and residential colleges like First Year College and Honors College.

Overall, the focus groups were positive and supportive of the village concept. It is clear that many questions remain regarding the implementation of the concept, including support of the academic and student affairs administrations and faculty, and securing the resources and partnerships needed to move the village concept forward.

VII.   Recommendations

The Task Force recommends that

1.   the University as a whole accept and endorse this report as the foundation for mutual action to advance living-learning at NC State.

2.   the provost, the vice chancellor for Student Affairs, the director of University Housing and the academic deans assume responsibility for forging active partnerships between University Housing, faculty, and staff to realize the aims of this report.

3.   University Housing create a Steering Committee to oversee the implementation of the village vision, guiding principles, and Task Force Recommendations in conjunction with the development of Housing's Master Plan. The Compact Planning process is a way to advance these partnerships.

4.   the Steering Committee enhance three existing housing programs using the village guiding principles, and launch two new living-learning villages within the 2004-2006 timeframe.

5.   each village create an Administrative Council with students, faculty and staff to implement, operate and assess the various programs within the village.

6.   consistent with the Physical Master Plan, and supported by market research by Anderson Strickler (see Appendix B), University Housing add 1,800 beds to campus housing by 2010, which would increase the service level to 30% of total enrollment.

7.   the creation of a student residential village on Centennial Campus, in light of the movement of large numbers of upperclass and graduate students to that campus.

8.   the Steering Committee issue a report in 2006 to evaluate the progress of the village Administrative Councils.

VIII. Conclusion

The Task Force on Living and Learning has concluded that an invigorated partnership between Housing and the faculty (Academic Affairs), organized through the concept of villages, would bring many benefits to students and NC State generally. We believe there are many pathways to reach the goal of creating dynamic living-learning environments on campus. We submit our vision and guiding principles in a sincere effort to assist Housing and the University community in achieving greater excellence in the education of our students.

Appendix A: Best Practices from Site Visits to Other Universities

Following are brief summaries of the findings of the task force: the names of the programs hosted, the facilities required for living-learning communities, how the programs are staffed and funded, and how accountability is organized. The summaries are intended to give an overview of how these residential campuses have incorporated the living-learning concept.

University of Maryland

Programs Hosted
•   College Park Scholars
•   Gemstone
•   Honors Housing
•   Language House
•   Civicus
•   Hinman Entrepreneurial Program

Most programs offer courses for academic credit; Language House is an immersion community with planned activities, and participants in the Hinman Entrepreneurial Program work on independent projects in partnership with the business school.

Program Facilities
All programs are housed in particular halls set aside for the purpose. Program participation varies from 100 to 500+ students. The College Park Scholars program, since it includes twelve separate living-learning environments, is spread throughout campus in various buildings.

Program Staffing
Programs are faculty-led, with a faculty member appointed as Executive Director of the program. These Executive Directors usually do not teach, but handle all program development and management. Residence life responsibilities for ongoing coordination with the program are handled by a Community Director, who is a university staff member. There is a half-time Resident Director and a Resident Advisor to students with a ratio of one to thirty-five.

Funding
Sponsorship of any capital improvements for the Learning Communities is a joint venture between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, and typically includes program, staffing, and facilities renewal expenses. The appropriate Dean considers the funding sources for any program before forwarding the proposal to the Dean for Undergraduate Studies. The Advisory Committee on Living/Learning Communities then reviews the program and suggests funding sources for the program, outlining cross-divisional alternatives for support. The Provost gives final approval to funding proposals, and the monies come from academic, residence life, and central administration, based upon the focus of the

NC STATE

program involved. In the case of the Hinman Entrepreneurial Program, a grant funded the startup, and partnerships with corporations comprise part of their current budget.

Accountability
The Dean of Undergraduate Studies is responsible for outlining guidelines for program development, though proposals for programs are generally initiated at the Academic Department or College level. A broader advisory committee, including representatives from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Resident Life, Undergraduate Admissions, faculty, students, and other living-learning programs, reviews proposals before implementation. After approval, a Program Executive Director is hired by the college, and an advisory committee is formed to assist with academic programming. This structure facilitates a more deliberate review process that ensures that decisions are made according to institutional priorities. Decisions related to capital funding are negotiated by the Provost and the Director of Resident Life.

Summary
The University of Maryland uses Residential Colleges to enhance the academic and social experience of its students. Program proposals usually originate from faculty, and are approved based on a set of academic guidelines. All departments are involved in the decision-making process, and share financial responsibilities based on the requirements of the program. Maryland has seen an increase in recruitment and retention of on-campus residents, and attribute much of their success to the living-learning communities.

University of Michigan

Programs Hosted
The University of Michigan hosts two four-year residential academic colleges and six residential programs. The residential programs are categorized as either transition (serving only first and second-year students) or academic initiative (components of non-residence-based academic initiatives) programs. All academic initiative programs have a mandatory course load that carries academic credits.

Program Facilities
Programs are housed either in portions of residence halls or entire halls set aside for the purpose, depending on the number of students involved.

Program Staffing
Typically, a faculty member and a student affairs administrator work with each program. In the halls, staffing is handled by Housing, though efforts are underway to tailor Housing personnel to the interests of a particular program. Faculty involvement varies from program to program; for example,

faculty are more heavily involved in the residential college programs, teaching, acting as program staff, and maintaining offices in the buildings. Faculty do not reside in the halls with students, though some graduate student instructors do reside in the buildings where they teach living-learning seminars.

Funding
Hall maintenance and renovations are funded jointly by Housing and the College of Literature, Science and the Arts. Most of the programs are funded by grants, with no student fees, except for the Lloyd Hall Scholars Program, which requires a $50.00 student fee. Staff are paid by the unit they work for.

Accountability
Each program has a set of clearly defined goals and objectives that can be assessed, and they each receive rigorous yearly evaluations by an advisory committee comprised of faculty, staff and students. Most of the living-learning programs report to the Assistant Director of Housing; the residential college and honors program report to respective academic departments for oversight.

Summary
The University of Michigan uses living-learning communities to enrich both the academic and non-academic experiences of its students. These communities were developed through grassroots efforts of faculty and supported by Housing, and they are maintained by partnerships between college deans and the Housing department. Currently, 25% of the student body at the University of Michigan is involved in a living-learning community.

University of Virginia

Programs Hosted
International Residential College (IRC)
Hereford Residential College
Brown College

Program Facilities
IRC: 4 housing facilities with a total capacity of 320 people.
Hereford: 5 buildings with a total capacity of 500.
Brown College: 12 buildings with a total capacity of 300.
The programs have required curricula which carry course credits.

Program Staffing

IRC: Faculty-led. Positions are as follows:

Principal Faculty member responsible for all aspects of community life who resides in the community with students.

Director of Studies: Faculty member responsible for community building. Works with student leadership within community, and resides in community.

Coordinator of Academic Programming : Faculty member who initially developed and who now facilitates academic programming. Non-resident.

Office Manager: Staff member responsible for day-to-day administration. Non-resident.

Intern: Student responsible for coordinating with student leaders and conducting supplemental programming for community in collaboration with other campus departments.

College Fellows : Faculty and staff who reside in the college and assist with programming. IRC has the smallest number of Fellows, since it is the newest program.

Hereford Residential College: Faculty-led. Structure similar to International Residential College, with Principal, three Coordinators of Studies (doctoral students), Secretary, and College Fellows. There are currently thirty Hereford Fellows residing in the college.

Brown College: Faculty-led, with Principal, Office Manager, Director of Studies, and forty-seven College Fellows. The Fellows and Principal reside in the college. There are also Resident Coordinators (similar to Residence Directors here at NC State), who represent the university's concerns, assure that the facilities are maintained and safe, and assist with programming.

Funding

Sponsorship of any capital improvements for the Learning Communities is a joint venture between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Although each program receives funding or sponsorship from academic, residence life, and central administration, the funds each receives are based upon the thrust of the program involved.

Accountability

For all three colleges, accountability comes through the Provost's office. Each faculty and staff member involved with the college has a clear job description, and there is a clear chain of command. Students are also involved in the self-governing process through elected hall councils.

Summary

The University of Virginia uses Residential Colleges to enhance the academic and social experience of its students. Faculty involvement drives these communities, with Housing and other non-academic departments offering support. The programs are popular with the students, and have succeeded in coupling intellectual stimulation with an intimate community setting.

Pennsylvania State University

Programs Hosted
There are numerous living-learning options on the Penn State Campus. The most noteworthy are:
First Year in Science and Engineering
Honor's College
Discover House
Learning Enrichment Academic Program (LEAP)
Depending on the nature of the living environment, academic for-credit courses may be included in the program.

Program Facilities
Programs are housed either in portions of residence halls or entire halls set aside for the purpose, depending on the number of students involved.

Program Staffing
Staffing is based upon the focus of the living-learning environment. There are partnerships between faculty and staff for all programs, and decisions concerning these programs are made by a team of professionals from both Housing/Residence Life and the academic units. For general living-learning options, residents request the faculty members they would like to have involved, and Housing/ Residence Life provides support to these faculty, though salaries are paid by the academic departments. The academic unit takes responsibility for recruiting faculty into the LEAP and Honor's College.

Funding
Residents pay a membership fee to participate in the living-learning programs at Penn State. The Honor's College requires a facilities fee in addition to the membership fee in order to help pay for renovations and improvements. Housing pays for renovation and upkeep to the residence halls, some of the Colleges provide additional funding, and some programs (like Discover House) were funded by a grant.

Accountability
Most programs at Penn State originated either from academic units who wished to partner with Housing/Residence Life, or from Housing/Residence Life itself. Initial planning teams included staff from the academic unit, Housing/Residence Life, and other personnel throughout the University, depending on the nature of the program. For example, LEAP had representatives from the Registrar's Office and the Admissions Office. Ultimately, the programs were approved by the Director of Housing/Residence Life and the administrative officer most closely associated with the academic unit. All decisions regarding programs are made by a team of professionals from both Housing/ Residence Life and the academic units.

Summary

Pennsylvania State University uses living-learning programs to enhance the academic and social experience of its students. Program proposals originate from both faculty and residence life staff, are reviewed by committee and approved by Housing/Residence Life and the appropriate academic unit. Financial responsibilities are shared based on the requirements of the program. Currently, 33% of Penn State's housing is in the living-learning mode.

Appendix B: Anderson Strickler Report:
Executive Summary

In the spring of 2001, North Carolina State University (NC State) retained Anderson Strickler, LLC (ASL) to conduct a University Housing Study, consisting of focus groups and interviews, off-campus market analysis, peer analysis, and survey and demand analysis. This document represents the final deliverable of the University Housing Study.

Focus group participants revealed an appreciation for the convenience of living on campus as well as the sense of community afforded by on-campus living. The lack of privacy of shared baths and small rooms were cited as drawbacks, as were the lack of air conditioning in certain halls and fewer than desired common areas. Overall, however, students find the value of the residence halls to be reasonable when the physical condition of the halls is balanced against the convenience and community they offer.

Focus group participants shown floor plans of a variety of unit types prefer a four-student, four-bedroom, two-bathroom apartment, and are willing to pay more than the going off-campus market rates for this type of product. Students prefer having an option of either a 9-month or a 12-month lease and prefer having the units furnished.

The off-campus market for student housing is generally reflective of a thriving overall area economy. In particular, the apartment housing market is expanding rapidly, as is the number of building permits issued. This growth has resulted in an oversupply of units and vacancy rates as high as 12%; the resulting concessions offered to student renters reduce their cost of housing.

ASL examined 23 apartment complexes and found that most have two-bedroom plans, followed by three-bedroom and one-bedroom units. The most common amenities are pools, dishwashers, and air conditioning, while few are furnished, offer playgrounds, or allow pets. Rents vary from almost $1.40 per square foot to under $0.60 per square foot, depending on the unit type, size, location, and other factors. Students find above-median priced units popular due to their student-targeted amenity packages and services.

In addition to more conventional off-campus housing, University Towers, an Allen & O'Hara-managed property, provides competition to NC State-owned residence halls. Its units are semi-suites—two double bedrooms connecting through a shared bathroom—and the property provides a full-range of student-oriented features and amenities, including dining services and a staff of resident aadvisors. University Towers housing is significantly more expensive than University-owned housing, typically by $1,000 or more per semester, depending on the meal plan selected.

Since the original data was collected in the summer of 2001, a 2002 follow-up indicates rents have remained at the same level or have increased for most units. New development is continuing unabated, with 71 units having been completed in central Raleigh in the last six months, 599 currently under construction, and another 256 proposed units under consideration.

ASL surveyed 13 peer institutions and compared them to NC State on several measures. NC State's peer institutions have ratios of beds to total enrollment that vary from 15% to 46% compared to NC State's 25% (which is close to the median of 28%). NC State's fall occupancy falls at the median, 97%, of the range of peers from 87% to 103%. Peers are finding occupancy to be trending upwards over the past few years.

Most peers are planning or currently undergoing changes to their housing systems due to their high occupancy rates; most have primarily traditional residence hall housing with some apartments and most offer some family housing. Five out of 13 require freshmen to live on campus, and 11 require a meal plan.

At $3,060, NC State's double occupancy premium room rate exceeds the median of $2,555 for the peers; the $2,400 per year for the other NC State halls is below the median. All institutions include utilities in the cost of housing. NC State's overall level of tuition plus fees, at $6,900, is at the low end of its peer group, which ranges from under $6,000 to $12,000.

ASL surveyed students about their preferences for housing and the demand for such housing at a given price level. Three-quarters of off-campus respondents are renters; of these, only 14% share a bedroom with someone other than their spouse or partner. About half of renters previously lived on campus; private bedrooms, room size, and private bathrooms were the reasons most often given for moving off campus.

According to students, the most important facility-related improvement for campus housing is air-conditioning, followed by private or suite bathrooms, larger rooms, private bedrooms, and cleanliness of communal bathrooms. For amenity improvements, students would like to see computer labs with network access, followed by additional washers and dryers, study lounges, and convenient parking. For student life improvements, students rank most highly longer or unrestricted visiting hours, more roommate selection options, ability to decide on rules and regulations for their own living unit, and the ability to live near others with similar interests.

For the top four reasons students gave for selecting their current housing, proximity to campus ranked most highly, followed by affordable rent, adequate space, and private bedrooms. The most popular unit type from the options given was a four single-bedroom apartment with two bathrooms (31%), followed by the double room suite (24%), the two double bedroom apartment with two bathrooms (21%), the semi-suite double (11%), the typical NC State double (7%), and the typical NC State suite (6%).

 Using the respondents' expressed rates of interest in the proposed housing and enrollment figures provided by the University, ASL projected demand for about 1,900 beds of additional on-campus housing, as shown in Table 1.

				Fall 2000				
Class	**Capture Rate**		**Target Market**		**Potential Interest**			**Potential Demand**
	Full-time Interested Now Live Off-Campus from Survey		*Full-time Enrollment Live Off-Campus*					
Freshmen	51.9%	x	2,073	=	1,077	x 50%=		538
Sophomores	33.3%	x	2,517	=	839	x 50%=		420
Juniors	27.1%	x	2,813	=	763	x 50%=		382
Seniors	16.8%	x	3,783	=	634	x 50%=		317
Graduate Students	16.6%	x	3,012	=	500	x 50%=		250
Total			**14,198**		3,813			**1,907**

Table 1: Projected Demand for Additional Housing

Appendix C: References

American College Personnel Association. (1994). *The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs.* Washington, DC: Author.

Astin, A.W. (1993). *What works in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Blimling, G.S. (1993). The influence of college residence halls on students. In J.S. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 9, 248-307. New York: Agathon.

Blimling, G.S., Whitt, E.J., and Associates. (1999). Good practice in student affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (1998). *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities.* Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E.L. (1987). *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America.* New York: HarperCollins.

Brower, A.M. and Dettinger, K.M. (1998). What is a learning community? *About Campus, Nov./ Dec. 1998,* 15-21.

Chickering, A.W. and Gamson, Z.F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin, 39 (7),* 3-7.

Dunn, M.S and Zeller, W.J. (2002). The ideal of community as manifested in living/learning initiatives. *Talking Stick, 19 (6),* 6-7.

Flannery, T. and Snyder-Nepo, N. College Park Scholars and President's Scholarships: Two critical factors in improved yield rates. Unpublished report, University of Maryland, College Park, 1994.

Hargrave, A. (2002). Faculty and residence life staff involvement in learning communities at five midwestern public universities. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 30 (2),* 17-21.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (1997). *Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Klippenstein, S. and James, P. (2002). The residential nexus: A focus on student learning. *Talking Stick, 19 (6),* 7-16.

Light, R.J. (2001). *Making the most of college: Students speak their minds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McClellan, M.A. and Associates. (2001). Why university housing philosophy matters. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 30 (1),* 3-9.

McCluskey-Titus, P.M. and Associates. (2002). The relationship between community and academic achievement in residence halls. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 30,* 11-16.

Palmer, C.J. (2002). Living-learning centers: A tribute to infrastructure. *Talking Stick, 19 (6),* 17-18.

Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rice, N.D. and Lightsey, O.R. (2001). Freshmen living learning community: Relationship to academic success and affective development. *Journal of College and University Student Housing. 30 (1),* 11-17.

Schneider, C.G. and Shoenberg. R. (1998). *The Academy in Transition: Contemporary Understandings of Liberal Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Schroeder, C.C. and Mable, P. (1994). *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Shapiro, N.S. and Levine, J.H. (1999). *Creating learning communities: A practical guide to winning support, organizing for change, and implementing programs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.