ABSTRACT

LEIBOWITZ, SETH L. Determining Curricular Components of Living-Learning Programs: A Delphi Study. (Under the direction of George B. Vaughan and Deborah C. Luckadoo)

From the evolution of the first colleges, residence halls have been viewed as more than a place to eat and sleep. The Oxford and Cambridge models offered residential settings where students and faculty lived, ate, and studied together (Rowe, 1981). The living-learning residential model emerged from the present day American university’s desire to practice learning as a part of living.

The Educational Resources Information Center defines living-learning programs as “Residential facilities of higher education institutions designed to enhance students’ educational experiences by enabling them to integrate their academic activities with their ordinary living activities” (ERIC, 1982, p. 143). Riker (1965) and Rowe (1981) created eight components that give living-learning program administrators a broad based foundation on which to build living-learning program curricula.

Twenty living-learning program administrators listed how their programs incorporate Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) components and then prioritized the curricula on these lists. A three round Delphi surveying technique was used to structure this process. In the first round of the process administrators generated lists of program curricula that exist at established programs across the country. Rounds two and three of the process were a tool for building consensus on the most heavily valued living-learning program curricula.

Results indicate that curricula providing opportunities for students to pursue an academic life style were most valued by the group of twenty administrators. Specific curricula that were valued include active learning experiences, student involvement and
participation in programs, student accessibility to faculty, and spaces that facilitate discussion and study.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

From the evolution of the first colleges, residence halls have been viewed as more than a place to eat and sleep. The Oxford and Cambridge models offered residential settings where students and faculty lived, ate, and studied together (Rowe, 1981). The living-learning residential model emerged from the present day American university’s desire to practice learning as a part of living.

The Educational Resources Information Center defines living-learning programs as “Residential facilities of higher education institution designed to enhance students’ educational experiences by enabling them to integrate their academic activities with their ordinary living activities” (ERIC, 1982, p. 143).

As student affairs educators became managers of the programming and management functions of college residences, fostering student and faculty contact has become more difficult. The Student Learning Imperative has challenged student affairs administrators and faculty to collaborate in developing programs (ACPA, 1994).

Moreover, structuring the residential environment with purposeful educational activities challenges educators. To extend learning outside of the classroom, student affairs educators have infused programmatic curriculums and strategic management techniques into the residential experience.

Cooperative or communal living arrangements, intentional democratic communities, honors housing, thematic units, residential colleges, languages houses, first-year initiative programs, and living-learning centers are attempts to integrate the student’s interests or educational experience within his or her place of residence (Rowe, 1981).
Statement of Problem

Living-learning programs are based on student interests, institutional goals, available resources, size of residential programs, and physical layout of residence halls. Riker (1965) and Rowe (1981) view the following eight components as paramount in the design of all living-learning programs:

1. Provide opportunities for students to pursue an academic lifestyle
2. Encourage active student participation
3. Foster peer support for learning
4. Allow student input into program-related decisions
5. Encourage close relationships with faculty and staff
6. Provide facilities to meet student needs
7. Provide staffing to serve special populations of students
8. Encourage students to explore different areas of study

Although these components give administrators a philosophical basis on which to design curricula and manage living-learning programs, researchers have yet to determine how these components are being actualized. Administrators lack consistent standards on which to direct the implementation of management strategies and curriculum design in living-learning programs. Consistent standards will give administrators structure in designing and implementing living-learning program curricula. This study explores how living-learning program administrators have incorporated Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components into living-learning programs.
Research Questions

Research questions are as follows:

1. Can consensus among living-learning program administrators be obtained on how Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components are incorporated in living – learning program curricula?

2. Which curricular components are viewed as most important to the success of living-learning programs?

3. Can a model be used to incorporate these curricular components into individual components?

Research Objectives

The objectives of this study that will guide the researcher are as follows:

1. Formulate an in-depth study of the literature on the history, student learning mission, and curriculum design of living-learning programs.

2. Conduct a study to measure consensus on how living-learning program administrators incorporate Riker (1965) and Rowe's (1981) eight components in program management and curriculum design.

3. Draw conclusions from the literature review and results of the Delphi study to determine standards for designing curricula and managing living-learning programs.
Study Limitations

Implications from Pilot Study

During the summer of 1999, a pilot study was performed using a sample of six living-learning program administrators. Five of the six administrators completed all three rounds of the virtual Delphi study. Limitations were discovered in the technological aspects of the study. Included are strategies that were developed and implemented to deal with these limitations.

Even though expected and unexpected challenges occurred during the pilot study, the data received from the respondents affirmed the methodology was appropriate to obtaining the desired feedback. The respondents effectively related their experiences and programs to Riker (1965) and Rowe (1981)’s components. The results of the pilot yielded data that could be used to build standard living-learning curricula and management practices. Working through the rounds of the Delphi process demonstrated how Delphi draws consensus from group opinions and gave the researcher experience with analyzing and collecting data using the three rounds of questionnaires.

Lack of Student Input

Two of the questions on the first questionnaire ask living-learning program administrators to speculate how students perceive their involvement in living-learning programs. Giving administrators the latitude to answer questions on behalf of students could create a situation where administrators report different features of the program from what students would report. Administrators might be less critical of their programs than the students who participate in them.
Since most administrators of living-learning programs are involved in program marketing, they should be qualified to report how a program is perceived through the eyes of students. In many cases, there is also student input into the design and implementation of the curricular components being reviewed.

**Researcher Bias**

Eisner and Peshkin (cited in Hart, 1991) discuss how a researcher with an investment in a research project or knowledge of a subject area can easily bias qualitative research. In this study, the researcher is familiar with the subject matter from professional and educational experiences. Such familiarity can lead to bias when research conclusions are rendered or when data are analyzed.

Linstone and Turoff (1975) describe the importance of a monitoring team when using the Delphi method. The monitoring team serves as a means to limit any bias on the part of the researcher. In this study, a monitoring team composed of a former housing director and a quantitative statistician reviewed how data were processed upon return of the questionnaires and critiqued questionnaires before revised editions were posted to the web site for respondents to complete. An expert in the area of Delphi data management and processing techniques also advised the researcher and reviewed questionnaires prior to national distribution. (Appendix Kuncl's and Jordan's Resumes and Monitoring Team Communications)
Sampling

The relationship with the pilot sample participants was advantageous in maintaining open lines of communication and motivating participants to stay involved with the study. The sample used for the pilot study however, was a group of administrators with whom the researcher worked. Having an established relationship with the researcher, the pilot sample might have been subjective in responding and more inclined to return questionnaires.

The sample used for the national study was selected from a directory and had no relationship with the researcher before the study was conducted. It was necessary to establish a relationship with each of the study participants before the national distribution of questionnaires, so high motivational levels and open lines of communication were maintained throughout the data collection phase. (Appendices E & F, Phone Call Script and E-mail Communications to Respondents)

Questionnaire Return Rate

The “Virtual Delphi” technique was utilized to make it easy for respondents to fill out and return questionnaires. Problems arose, however, during the pilot study. Questionnaire respondents did not know it was possible to access a web site by clicking on a hyper-link in an E-mail message. Two of the five pilot study respondents initiated follow-up communication after the initial E-mail instructed them to click on a hyper-link to get to the questionnaire web site.

If the same proportion of respondents in the national distribution were not familiar with accessing web sites from an E-mail message, or were unable to complete web forms,
it could have affected the response rate. The two respondents who contacted the researcher to find out how to access the web site did so because they knew him and were comfortable calling the researcher to receive instructions. Respondents who were less familiar with the researcher might not have asked for help and would have been likely to disregard the initial E-mail entirely.

Before the questionnaires were distributed, an E-mail or phone call was made to each respondent. These communications introduced the study and set expectations the researcher had for the respondents. The phone call or E-mail also explained how technology was being used in the data collection process. These initial contacts were also opportunities to get to know the respondents and assess the respondent’s comfort level with using E-mail and web based questionnaires.

Since it took four weeks to collect and process data from all three rounds of the study, it was important to keep respondents involved throughout the data collection phase. For respondents, the majority of the questionnaire period was down time where they were not actively involved in answering questions. During the pilot and national questionnaire distribution, letters, post cards, and North Carolina State University promotional items were sent between the questionnaire distributions to ensure that respondents remembered to check their E-mail for follow up questionnaires. (Appendices E, F & G: Phone Call Script, E-mail Communications to Respondents, and Letters and postcards to respondents)
ACUHO-I Endorsement.

The Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) agreed to endorse this research. This endorsement permitted the use of the organization's name when communicating with respondents about the importance of the study. Respondents were also informed results might be published in the ACUHO-I journal or periodical. Since ACUHO-I is the parent organization of the housing profession, the endorsement validated the legitimacy of the study and motivated respondents to participate. (Appendix A, sponsorship letter from ACUHO-I)

Data Management

There was potential of getting an unmanageable amount of qualitative data to process from the results of the first questionnaire. In the second round of the pilot study, between 15 and 20 program interventions emerged to be rated in each of the eight categories. With three times as many respondents in the national distribution, some categories had as many as 100 program interventions to be rated in the second round. Including this many responses for rating and raking in the round two and three questionnaires would have been too overwhelming for respondents. If respondents had to rate and rank lists of 100 program interventions during rounds two and three, they might have been less inclined to continue participating throughout the data collection period.

In the data analysis process of the first round, it was possible to code similar responses in each category and merge responses so the lists for the second and third round questionnaires were condensed. Since many living-learning programs offer the same kinds of services, similar responses from several administrators were represented as a
single statement. In addition, subcategories were created that represented the genre of the various kinds of program interventions that were listed as responses to the round one questionnaire. (Appendices J & K, Round two and three questionnaires)

Data Analysis

In analyzing the first round responses, the researcher was challenged to create a list for second round distribution that represented all responses. There is no standard methodology to analyze Delphi data, so the researcher had autonomy in creating the second round list from the first round data. In the pilot, terms were altered that were specific to institutions, so a wider audience would be able to interpret the second round. This had to be done on a larger scale during the national distribution of the questionnaires.

The monitoring team and Aaron Clark were helpful in advising the researcher on the methodologies to use in creating subcategories and coding questionnaire feedback from the first round. The monitoring team was also used to make sure the language used on the round two and three questionnaires was standard to the profession and accurately reflected comments made by the respondents. (Appendix L, Kuncl ’s and Jordan's Resumes / Monitoring Team Communications)

Statement of Significance

As mentioned in the review of the literature, writers and professionals in the student affairs field have failed to determine standard curricular components to address the learning needs of students who participate in living-learning programs. Some authors
(Pascarella, Terenzini and Bliming, 1994; Rowe, 1979) suggest some curricular components and others (Felver, 1986; Zeller, 1996) categorize programs based on their characteristics. There has been no attempt, however, to gain consensus from professionals on the kinds of programmatic interventions that are priorities in designing, implementing, and staffing living-learning programs.

Marshall and Rossman (1999) outline purposes for qualitative research. One such purpose is to identify or discover important categories of meaning. LeCompte and Preissle (1993) identify the ethnoscience or cognitive anthropology theoretical perspective as “the production of the cognitive maps or rules which govern behavior and beliefs of groups of individuals” (p. 128). This study has produced maps of how living-learning program administrators incorporate Riker’s (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components in program management and curriculum design.

Results provide living-learning program administrators with standards for incorporating Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components in curriculum design and program management. A consistent curriculum will assist administrators in the design, implementation, and evaluation phases of new program curricula. The results establish priorities for living-learning program administrators who must make decisions about how to invest their limited budgetary, physical, and human resources. The final product guides administrators in designing, implementing, and staffing living-learning programs in college residence halls.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The review of the literature has been organized into three divisions: history of the educational role of residence halls, the student learning imperative, and curriculum development of living-learning programs.

The literature review explains the educational role of residence halls has shifted from a faculty driven, residential college model to a student affairs function. A case is made for an expanded literature base that provides structure and specific curricula for living-learning program design and implementation.

History of the Educational Role of Residence Halls

"It is important to understand that the philosophical underpinnings of the present day living/learning movement in undergraduate higher education are wider than an ocean and several centuries deep"(Henry & Bruce, 1999, p. 55).

The residential college models at Oxford, Cambridge, and the early American colleges and universities have influenced the evolution of living-learning programs. The residential college model has set precedent for the following aspects of present day living-learning programs: building construction, programming, staffing, and student-faculty relationships. Authority for these functions has traversed from faculty in the Oxford and Cambridge models and early American institutions to departments of housing and student affairs.
Oxford and Cambridge Residential College Models

Zeller (cited in ACUHO-I, 2000) defines residential colleges as "the most fundamental type of residentially-based academic program. Dating back to 1200 A.D. in England, the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge were used as models for the original institutions of higher education in North America and Australia. The collegiate model offers degree-granting programs in settings where students and faculty live and work together. All classrooms, library support, faculty offices, and student residences are in the same facility" (p. 2).

Henry and Bruce (1999) define a residential college as first and foremost, a living-learning community. "Its physical space, standards, and traditions serve to foster a sense of belonging and loyalty in the smaller college and by extension, the larger university as a whole. Its community includes students, staff, and faculty whose daily and primary informal interactions personalize learning by softening traditional role boundaries and promote the shared discovery of knowledge on a human scale" (Henry and Bruce, 1999, p. 54). Referring to the role that religion played in residential colleges, Brubacher and Rudy (1968) state that "Residential Colleges were designed to bring the faculty and students together in a common life which was both intellectual and moral” (p. 42).

In describing the organizational structure in the Oxford model, Henry and Bruce (1999) acknowledge that the 39 residential colleges at Oxford have 39 independent web sites. There is no portion of the Oxford University web site that offers links to a central residence life or housing department. Designing web sites with links back and forth from the university main page to a housing or residence life department is a common practice for American colleges and universities. The absence of such links on the Oxford web
pages shows that the Oxford residential colleges are not subordinate to a university wide
department or even to the university (Henry and Bruce, 1999).

When the individual college web sites are viewed, it becomes clear that the Oxford
system is formulated around residential colleges that are run independently from each
other. The individual residential college web pages are designed very differently. Each
residential college has a distinct student body. The academic program offerings and
options for living arrangements vary considerably among the colleges. The residential
colleges are administered entirely separately and each college admits and graduates its
own population of students (Oxford University, 2001).

The Merton College web site (Merton College, 2001) explains that Merton, founded in
1264, is one of the original residential colleges of the Oxford system. The housing unit
or "chambers" at Merton is in "Penhurst Place", which is the same location of the dining
facility or the "pantry and buttery." In addition to the usual dinner and supper activities
that included the reading of the Bible, Penhurst hall was used as a place for disputation,
as a lecture-room, and as a theater. Disputations are oral exams where the student defends
a thesis against senior opponents and then against the regent master (Penner, 2001).

Gomes (2000) describe the physical layout and religious influences underpinning the
Kings College, residential college at Cambridge University. In most of the institutions
founded before 1900, the most prominent architectural feature of the campus is the
college chapel, proclaiming the central place of religion in the life of the school. The
geography of the principal quadrangle reflects the seats of the chapels and the library
(Koblik and Graubard, 2000).
Much has been written about how instruction was delivered to students in the early Oxford and Cambridge residential college models (Henry and Bruce, 1999; Duke, 1996; Kolblick and Graubard, 2000). The instructional staff also disciplined students and enforced building policies and procedures. Senior scholars or regent masters were upper-level students who established standards of achievement by which to judge the competency of the lesser scholars’ disputation (Cambridge University web site, cited in Henry and Bruce, 1999).

At the turn of the twentieth century, a position called a tutor was created. The tutors had roles with the undergraduates that were well beyond a disciplinarian and a lecturer. (Henry and Bruce, 1999) "They taught lessons of life and character and they attempted to do so by example. The model tutor made his rooms a meeting place for undergraduates" (Henry and Bruce, 1999, p. 59).

Henry and Bruce (1999) describe a Head Master who lived in and served as an authority figure in the Oxford and Cambridge residential college system. "The position of Chancellor of the university was filled by college head masters who served in the role on a rotating basis" (Henry and Bruce, 1999, p. 57). Penner (2001) writes that the Head Master sat at the “high-table” in the dining hall, located on a raised dais. (Appendix B, Penner’s (2001) Schematic of Penhurst Place)

**Importing Oxford to American Universities**

during the entire evolution of American higher education, the Oxford and Cambridge residential college model has served as the strongest influence in attempts to build strong faculty and student relationships.

Duke (1996) and other writers (Henry and Bruce, 1996; Gomes, 2000) discuss the efforts of American universities to replicate the organizational structure, staffing patterns, architecture, faculty/student relationships, and modes of instruction of the Oxford and Cambridge residential colleges. Replication efforts are evident in modern day living-learning programs and can be traced starting in the early 1900s with America’s oldest and most established institutions.


Harvard and Yale were interested in replicating the Oxford residential college system because the individual houses would develop their own personality and identity, facilitate close ties between students and teachers, and accommodate expanding enrollments rather than simply making existing colleges bigger (Duke, 1996).

In the 1920's Harvard, Yale, and Pomona College in California launched residential college projects. The Oxford inspired residence systems were called “colleges” at Yale and “houses” at Harvard. At the same time the Harvard and Yale systems were being
created, Pomona officials adopted a plan to develop a system of autonomous residential colleges as an alternative to expanding within their university framework (Duke, 1996).

Duke (1996) is critical of Harvard's efforts to replicate the tutor position in the Oxford system. The departmental structure of the American university hindered Harvard's ability to replicate the relationship between the Oxonian tutor and undergraduate (Duke, 1996).

"Tutorial arrangements, staffing, and the importance placed on the tutorial itself varied from department to department. Some used graduate students and others employed full faculty; some emphasized the tutorial as a major component of the concentration, and others played down its importance" (Duke, 1996, p. 97).

As part of his struggle to implement a residential college system, Woodrow Wilson established a preceptorial program at Princeton adopted from the Oxford tutorial system. The preceptors were hired to conduct small group discussions on readings covered in larger lecture courses. “The preceptors were chosen not so much for their scholarship, but rather their ability to inspire through example” (Henry and Bruce, 1999, p. 65).

American colleges and Universities replicated the architecture and campus design of Oxford and Cambridge buildings. The old college library in the “New Yard” quadrangle of Harvard is a replica of the King’s College Chapel at Cambridge. The gothic-style architecture used in the construction of the residential college buildings at Yale and Duke was an attempt to replicate the look and feel of Cambridge (Gomes, 2000).

There was little interest in residential colleges in the 1940s and 1950s, but the idea enjoyed a renaissance in the 1960s, when at least forty-four residential colleges were established at institutions across the United States. In 1966, the University of California at Santa Cruz campus established its principal organizational unit around the residential
college model. The organization of the campus into a residential college system reflected President Clark Kerr’s contention that the English university had elevated higher education to its highest state (Duke, 1996).

“In the planning stages, the English influence on Santa Cruz’s organization went beyond establishing a system of student residences: it was the college, not the academic department that was to be the locus of faculty activity, with intercollegiate boards of study established to coordinate disciplinary course offerings at the campus level. Some planners even considered adopting the English model of comprehensive degree offerings” (Duke, 1996, p. 3).

It was around this same time President Woodrow Wilson’s dream of a residential college system at Princeton was actualized. Fifty-five years after Wilson left Princeton, Woodrow-Wilson College-- the “College of Destiny”-- received its charter as Princeton’s first residential college (Henry and Bruce, 1996).

Currently, all first and second-year students at Princeton University live and dine in one of five residential colleges. “Each college consists of a cluster of buildings that house between 450 and 500 students and a dining hall. The colleges also have libraries, seminar rooms, reading rooms, lounges, coffee houses, theaters, computer clusters, study spaces, and recreation/game rooms” (Henry and Bruce, 1999, p. 65).

A senior faculty member serves as a master of each of Princeton’s residential colleges. Other positions that currently serve the Princeton residential colleges include faculty fellows, graduate student fellows, visiting faculty members, academic advisors, a supervising administrator, and secretaries. Upper-class students are selected to serve as resident assistants (Henry and Bruce, 1999).
University of Michigan Housing Director, Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas (1999) describes how residential college programs operate at her institution. Most faculty employed by the residential colleges have joint appointments with an academic department in the College of Literature, Science, and Arts. The student participants can take classes outside the residential college, but have the opportunity to take courses only offered to residential college participants in 12 disciplinary areas. The residential college uses a narrative evaluation system instead of letter grades, requires that participants achieve competency in a second language, and emphasizes writing across the curriculum (Inkelas, 1999).

The Student Affairs Movement

Since the University of Michigan program operates within a department of student affairs, the disciplinary, administrative, and other staffing functions are not provided by the academic part of the institution. Unlike the Oxford and Cambridge model, faculty members who participate in these residential colleges do not live with students and mainly interact with them during designated office hours (Smith and Raney, 1993; University of Michigan, 2001). Faculty members have responsibilities that are split between the residential college and academic departments (Inkelas, 1999). Smith and Raney (1993) counted only 26 living-learning programs in the country that feature faculty members residing in student living areas. An explanation of how Princeton’s residential college program grew to incorporate advisors, administrators, and resident assistants (Henry and Bruce, 2000) also shows the drastic effects that student affairs has had on living-learning environments.
American faculty became more involved with their academic disciplines and less involved with teaching in the residence halls. These influences led to a distinction and separation between the in-class and out-of-class aspects of the undergraduate experience (Brubacher and Rudy 1968). In 1890, Harvard University President Eliot appointed the first official to be charged with responsibility for student relations as separate and distinct from instruction (Cowley, 1937).

The expansion of student affairs prompted the American Council on Education to examine and identify expectations for Student Affairs. “The 1937 Student Personnel Point of View reaffirmed the importance of educating the whole student and underscored additional goals for higher education, including education for democracy, for international understanding, and for the ability to solve social problems” (Schroeder and Mable, 1994, p. 8).

The migration of housing from academics to a function in student affairs resulted in staffing changes. Housemothers were employed in the 1960’s and had primary responsibility for enforcing curfews, conducting bed checks, and instructing students in social graces. Later on, residence educators with advanced degrees replaced housemothers (Schroeder, 1980). In contrast to the housemother, residence educators were responsible for coordinating a multitude of organizations, services and programs, including programming councils, judicial boards, resident assistants and outreach counselors. Residential educators were also instrumental in implementing a variety of life-style options, unique living-learning centers, and new models for community governance (Schroeder, 1980).
Rapid growth of college residential hall programs in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the first 50 years of the twentieth century was a result of increasing enrollments of blacks and women in higher education, the rise of the extracurricular, and a proliferation of public higher education. The enactment of the G.I. Bill after World War II and Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 fueled a massive program of housing construction across the nation (Schroeder and Mable, 1994).

Since the end of World War II, faculty reward systems had moved away from valuing teaching and learning to the recognition of research and scholarship (Zeller and Hummel, 1999). “Subsequently, the student affairs profession gained more responsibility for out-of-class environments and embraced Student Development Theory as a theoretical foundation. Consequently, the gap between in-class and out-of-class activities grew substantially” (Zeller and Hummel, 1999, p.83).

Collaboration between academic and student affairs has been deficient because of cultural differences in regard to professional belief systems. Faculty value formal, classroom learning and student affairs work promotes informal, out-of-classroom learning (Zeller and Hummel, 1999). “In formal learning, students are moving from their known experience to generalized concepts. In the more informal learning experiences, it is the other way around. Hence a philosophical difference exists between the two cultures in approaches to learning itself” (Zeller and Hummel, 1999, p. 86).

Lack of collaboration resulted in the first group of living-learning programs that were created by student affairs departments without any input from the academics (Zeller and Hummel, 1999).
During the 1970’s higher education received criticism for lack of accountability and a decreasing amount of attention towards the undergraduate. Significant deficiencies were found in the undergraduate experience across the country. As a result, national and state government leaders called for increased accountability in the face of rapidly rising costs (Zeller and Hummel, 1999).

The mid-1980s brought renewed attention to the need for collaboration between academic and student affairs (Astin, Boyer, and Study Group cited in Zeller and Hummel, 1999). A 1984 report entitled, Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education, recommends that an increasing amount of faculty time and attention be directed toward the undergraduate. The report specifies that faculty time and attention be “front-loaded” to first-year students who are vulnerable to dropping out or failing (Study Group, 1984). The report lays a foundation for the concept of living and learning by stating, “Every institution of higher education should strive to create learning communities organized around specific intellectual themes or tasks” (Study Group, 1984, p. 33).

In 1993, one of the most influential researchers and writers in higher education, Alexander Astin, published results from a study that found close student and faculty relationships are critical factors in a successful undergraduate experience. Other critical factors include faculty and student and student group interactions that are built around substantial academic work (Astin, 1993).

The wave of criticism and research findings (Study Group, 1984; Astin, 1993) sparked a renewed interest in programmatic themes for student living groups on college and university campuses. Faculty and student affairs administrators have worked together to
create academically based living-learning centers to enhance the undergraduate experience (Zeller, 1996, p. 1).

In 1991, forty-five universities and colleges were identified as having residential colleges or living-learning centers; each was described in the National Directory of Residential Colleges and Living-Learning Units (Smith and Raney, 1993). An updated directory was published two years later that identified 64 colleges and universities with residential colleges or living-learning centers. It is estimated that the 1993 version of the directory lists less than 50% of the programs that actually exist in the United States (Smith and Raney, 1993). Smith and Raney (1993) state that after the publication of their first directory, “the residential college movement has burst onto the national agenda, beginning with the First Annual International Conference for Residential Colleges and Living-Learning Centers in 1992 (p. 1).

Research suggests that residing in living-learning programs is more educationally beneficial to students than living in conventional residence halls (Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991). Most research has found that students in living-learning programs have a significantly stronger intellectual dimension to their living environment than do students in conventional residence halls. Students who reside in living-learning communities report a more rewarding or personally satisfying social climate and perform better academically compared with their counterparts in conventional residence halls (Pascarella, Terenzini, and Blimling, 1994).

“Tinto and Associates (cited in Inkelas, 1999) found that first-year students who participated in learning communities were better able to; 1) develop a network of supportive peers, 2) bridge the academic-social divide in the college environment, 3) gain
a voice in the construction of knowledge, 4) become more involved in a range of academic and social activities, and 5) perceive greater developmental gains than students who did not participate in a learning community” (p. 10). Moreover, Tinto et al (cited in Inkelas, 1999) found that in comparison to students living in traditional residence halls, students in learning communities found their campus climates, fellow peers, and professors to be more welcoming and supportive.

John N. Gardner recognized the need for housing departments to provide first year students with increased levels of services and connections to the academic world. In 1986, Gardner founded The National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition at the University of South Carolina. The center grew out of a first-year seminar course, called “University 101” that was initially offered to first-year students at the University of South Carolina in 1972. The Center’s mission is to collect and disseminate information about the first college year and other significant student transitions. This information is used to assist educators at the University of South Carolina and other institutions to enhance the learning, success, satisfaction, retention, and graduation of college students in transition (University of South Carolina, 2001).

**The Student Learning Imperative**

George Kuh (1994) wrote a monograph that details the attributes of student learning outside the classroom. Kuh states, “the largest discretionary block of time for undergraduate students is outside the classroom, an area that receives little systematic attention but which has considerable potential for increasing learning” (p. 1). Student learning outside the classroom should result in the acquisition of cognitive complexity,
knowledge acquisition and application, humanitarianism, interpersonal and intrapersonal competence and practical competence (Kuh, 1994). Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) determine that the greater a student persists in college, the greater the gains in these outcomes.

Zeller and Hummel (1999) declare that student affairs leaders have moved away from viewing Student Development Theory as a foundation of the profession and now embrace student learning as a more relevant construct. “Although student development theory is an important tool for anyone working with traditional-aged college students, student learning theories are now viewed as more encompassing of a broader role within the institution (Zeller and Hummel, 1999, p. 84).

The American College Personnel Association’s (ACPA) (1994) statement, the **Student Learning Imperative** (SLI), defines student learning as having the same outcomes that are described by Kuh (1994). However, the SLI defines these outcomes as the product of both in-class and out-of-class experiences. “Experiences in various in-class and out-of-class settings, both on and off the campus, contribute to learning and personal development. Indeed, almost any educationally purposeful experience may be a precursor to desired outcomes. However, optimal benefits are more likely to be realized under certain conditions, such as active engagement and collaboration with others (faculty, peers, co-workers, and so on) on learning tasks” (American College Personnel Association (ACPA, 1994, p. 2).

Similar to the earlier Oxford and Cambridge models, the SLI challenges student affairs administrators and faculty to renew efforts to integrate in-class and out-of class learning (ACPA, 1994). To renew this relationship, “student affairs must seize the
present moment by affirming student learning and personal development as the primary goals of undergraduate education” (ACPA, 1994, p. 4).

To prioritize student learning and form partnerships with student affairs administrators, faculty will require research that connects student learning to student affairs functions. The SLI suggests student affairs administrators must rigorously evaluate their programs and services to determine the extent to which they contribute to the desired outcomes of undergraduate education. Toward this end, "student affairs staff should participate in institutional-wide efforts to assess student learning and personal development and periodically audit institutional environments to reinforce those factors that enhance, and eliminate those that inhibit student involvement in educationally-purposeful activities” (ACPA, 1994, p. 5).

Henry and Schein (1998) discuss the SLI in the context of living and learning programs. Henry and Schein (1998) state, "Living-learning centers, with their foundations in both the student affairs and the academic affairs sectors of campus, offer an opportune avenue for combining the formal, course-oriented learning activities of academic affairs with the programmatic learning activities typical of residence life. Living-learning centers are a means to holistically address The Student Learning Imperative” (p. 9).

The SLI declares that student learning and development is the primary outcome of college attendance. Student affairs professionals are challenged in the statement to “intentionally create the conditions that enhance student learning and personal development” (ACPA, 1994, p. 1).
The term “Intentionality” depicts student learning as a planned, intended, and purposeful outcome of student affairs programs. Intentionality is emphasized in the SLI to clarify the teaching and learning role student affairs plays on college campuses. In the past, student affairs practitioners have been negligent in communicating how their efforts result in student learning (ACPA, 1994).

“The key to learning in the out-of-class setting is for student affairs professionals, first, to identify as many as possible of the “unintentional” opportunities for learning that occur. Then, they need to structure or facilitate these opportunities in such a way that students not only become “intentional” regarding their personal involvement and subsequent reflection, but also are capable of even more complex involvement and reflection in the future” (Boland, Stamatakos, and Rodgers, 1996, p. 217).

The following is an example of making the unintentional, intentional. One could conclude that a student's adjustment to college has gone smoothly because of a high grade point average after completing the first year of college. The observer would not realize, however, that a student affairs practitioner assisted the student by providing a living environment that included evening tutorials and study sessions with faculty members. In this situation, student affairs practitioners need to design and communicate the following learning outcome: Students will learn how to focus on academics. Designing, documenting, and communicating tasks that would accomplish this learning outcome are done so others understand that these efforts are deliberate and not serendipitous.

Developed by Ward and Mitchell (1996), the Cycle of Intentionality can be used to instruct student affairs professionals on how to use the SLI for living-learning program
implementation and assessment strategies. The Cycle of Intentionality assumes student learning is the outcome of all educational interventions in higher education. Practitioners assess needs, articulate intended outcomes, design learning opportunities, and determine outcomes in relation to the learning mission of a program. After outcomes have been articulated and learning opportunities have been designed and implemented, practitioners can evaluate if a program accomplished its intended outcomes. A formative evaluation can determine if needs were appropriately assessed, further assessment needs to occur, or changes in delivery of services are warranted (Ward and Mitchell, 1996).

Used appropriately, the Cycle of Intentionality holds student affairs accountable for communicating and documenting the teaching and learning mission of the profession. “Student affairs professionals, like most other professionals in higher education, are being called upon to pay greater attention to defining, assessing, and demonstrating student’s progress toward academic and developmental outcomes” (Ward and Mitchell, 1996, p. 2).

The Cycle of Intentionality is a four-step approach to the need assessment, outcome design, implementation, and evaluation phases of the programming process in student affairs. The visual representation of the cycle is a circle with the following stages represented in a four-quadrant succession: needs assessment, articulate intended outcomes, design learning opportunities, and outcomes assessment (Ward and Mitchell, 1996). (Appendix C, Cycle of Intentionality)

Using the Cycle of Intentionality, student affairs practitioners, plan, implement, and evaluate the succession of each stage based on the proceeding stage. Evaluation can be conducted at each stage so that the needs of learners affect the delivery of instruction. In
stage one, “Need Assessment” student affairs practitioners gain knowledge of students’ backgrounds, learning styles, and special needs. Stage two is the designation of outcomes that represent a program’s focus and the student learning / development characteristics that were identified at stage one. Stage three is the creation of learning opportunities that will achieve the outcomes articulated in stage two. Evaluation can occur throughout the process, but formative evaluation is conducted at stage four (Ward and Mitchell, 1996).

The SLI challenges student affairs administrators to design, implement, and assess outcomes and strategies that focus on student learning. The SLI also mandates that unintentional efforts to promote student learning are made intentional through documentation and systematic program design. A standard curriculum for living-learning programs would give student affairs administrators documented guidelines on how to organize program services around learning outcomes and strategies that are practiced across the country. Much of the work involved in the cycle stages of assessing, articulating, and designing learning outcomes would be reduced by the existence of curricular standards.

It is appropriate that Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) living-learning components be expanded upon at this time so student affairs administrators and faculty receive structured direction and are accountable for implementing learning outcomes in the residence halls. Structured direction and accountability in implementing learning outcomes will define a role for faculty as educators in the residence halls. The Student Learning Imperative identifies faculty participation in the residence halls as a critical component for student learning (ACPA, 1994).
Curriculum Development of Living-Learning Programs

A living-learning experience may take place on several levels. The literature describes how the integration of the living environment with a student’s development of academic skills, social values and ethical judgment denotes the category under which a living-learning program is placed.

Even though researchers have been able to show how students benefit from living-learning programs (Pascarella et al., 1994; Tinto and Associates cited in Inkelas, 1999), the literature reports that the tasks of classifying programs and defining a philosophical basis on which to build programs remain a work in progress. The ACPA Commission III task force report (Rowe, 1979) and the work of Riker (1965) and Rowe (1981) are efforts at deriving a definition for the term, “living-learning program” and categorizing the programs. The report also describes types of programs and services that should be provided by living-learning programs and constructs philosophical and organizational principals under which curricular components should be based (Rowe, 1979).

Commission III, Task Force Report

In 1977, Commission III of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) formulated a “Task Force on Living-learning Centers.” The task force’s creation was a direct result of the confusion among many educators affiliated with residence halls who were interested in the living-learning concept but were not sure of the meaning of the terms or how to initiate and develop programs on their campuses (Felver, 1986).

The task force was chaired by Linda Rowe and consisted of forty-four professionals in the housing and residence life profession. Rowe (1979) authored the task force report
that defines the term “living-learning centers,” categorizes programs by type, describes the effects of institutional needs on living-learning programs, promotes a model for living-learning centers, and delineates roles for participants. The report also includes practical and philosophical considerations facing residential educators who want to implement the concept (Rowe, 1979, p.9).

Program Nomenclature.

The task force derived a definition for living-learning centers (LLC) by combining descriptions of the term that were submitted by task force members. The definition is as follows: "A residence unit which seeks to bridge the gap between the student's academic experience and the living environment. Within LLCs, the goals of affective and cognitive growth of residents are pursued through the intentional provision of formal and/or informal (ie. credit and non-credit) learning experiences. The LLC, unlike a Residential College is not a degree-granting entity. Student residence within the LLC is voluntary, contingent upon some form of application / selection process. Academic support is provided and may include goods, services, on-going faculty participation, and/or a programming budget" (Rowe, 1979, p. 1).

The Educational Resources Information Center defines living-learning programs as “Residential facilities of higher education institutions designed to enhance students’ educational experiences by enabling them to integrate their academic activities with their ordinary living activities” (ERIC, 1982, p. 143). The definitions of a living-learning programs found in the literature (Rowe, 1979; Felver, 1986; Smith, 1993; Zeller, 1996; ACUHO-I, 2000; ERIC, 1982) all emphasize a programmatic or learning experience that
involves a relationship between academics and residential living. For the purposes of this study, the definition in the ERIC (1982) report of living-learning programs will describe all the kinds of programs being studied.

The broad explanation offered by the ERIC report (1982) will give administrators multiple possibilities in creating responses to the study questionnaires. The use of a broad definition will also generalize the study results to multiple populations who work and participate in living-learning programs. “Living-learning program” is also a heavily used term in professional circles.

**Categorical Structures**

The task force identified types of residential programs that have been designated living-learning centers (Rowe, 1979). The following types of residential program endeavors were identified: “interest units, like-major units, units with non-credit classes and programming, units offering regularly scheduled classes, units with unique / experimental programs, and residential colleges” (Rowe, 1979, p. 8).

The report is unclear whether these types of programs should be categorized as living-learning centers, or a living-learning center should be a separate program category. “The general consensus on the meaning of the term living-learning center is lacking. While each of these structures is certainly a living-learning program in a sense that it fosters some kind of experiential education, to call all of them living-learning centers is to court confusion” (Rowe, 1979, p.16).

In 1996, Zeller accomplished the task that the ACPA Commission III task force started in 1979. Zeller (1996) was able to determine six categories that distinguish
programs by nature of services and programs, student populations who participate, and communal values or themes. Zeller’s (1996) six categories of living-learning programs are as follows: residential colleges, living-learning centers, theme housing, academic residential programs, residential learning communities, and the first year experience.

Zeller’s (1996) six categories are defined as the following:

- **Residential Colleges** - The Collegiate model is the most fundamental type of residentially-based academic program. Dating back to 1200 A.D. in England, the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge were used as models for the original institutions of higher education in North America and Australia. The collegiate model offers degree-granting programs in settings where students and faculty live and work together. All classrooms, library support, faculty offices, and student residences are in the same facility. Besides Great Britain, the evolution of the collegiate model has occurred in many countries, including Australia, Canada, and the United States.

- **Living-Learning Centers** – Specialized residential programs that have direct connections with a specific academic program are generally referred to as living-learning centers. Typically, very strong partnerships are formed between an academic program and the residence staff. Such offerings include foreign language programs; programs for math, science, and engineering majors; and pre-med programs.

- **Theme Housing** - Programs that offer opportunities for students with special interests to live and work together are referred to as theme housing opportunities. Residential staff are the key sponsors of these programs, yet receive significant
support from academic and student affairs colleagues. Such programs might include wellness halls, leadership halls, international halls, scholarship halls, and substance free housing.

- **Academic Residential Programs** - Providing academic support services and programs to all students often requires strong partnerships between academic and student affairs staff. The residential setting can be an ideal location for providing “front-line” service in the area of academic advising, career planning and placement, tutoring, and study group formation. Program offerings typically include workshops in study skills, time management, and library usage. Such programming requires coordination and collaboration between different kinds of academic constituents.

- **Residential Learning Communities** – Creating opportunities for clusters of students who live together to attend classes together are generally referred to as residential learning communities. Close working relationships must be developed with faculty in order to maximize the benefits of these offerings. Specialized course assignments, study groups, and faculty involvement programs all can take place in the living group when close partnerships are formed.

- **The Freshman Year Experience** – Specialized housing setting that offers a range of services to first-year students. To provide institutionally based, coordinated opportunities to new students, strong partnerships must be formed between the key campus players who support the transitional needs of new freshmen. The residential setting is often the ideal setting for the provision of these services. (ACUHO-I, 2000).
These categories are similar to the ones that the Commission III task force report identified (Rowe, 1979). The task force’s categories correspond to Zeller’s (1996) categories in the following manner: interest units are similar to theme houses; living-learning centers are similar to like-major units and units offering regularly scheduled classes; academic residential and residential learning communities are similar to units with non-credit classes and programming. Zeller (1996) and the Commission III report (1979) give similar definitions for residential colleges.

The Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I, 2000) has adopted Zeller’s categories of living-learning programs in a statement entitled, The Residential Nexus: A focus on student learning. The residential college, living-learning center, academic residential programming, residential learning communities, and freshman year experience models all involve collaboration among student services, residential living, and academic departments. The theme house model does not incorporate programs and services, but constructs an environment around a lifestyle choice or a student’s background (ACUHO-I, 2000).

The residential college, living-learning center, academic residential program, residential learning community, and freshman year experience models all fall under the ERIC description (1982). Theme housing programs will be excluded from the study because theme houses do not include collaboration between housing and academic services that is specified in the ERIC (1982) definition, the task force report (Rowe, 1979), or Zeller's (2000) other categories.
Institutional structures

The Commission III report (Rowe, 1979) indicates that living-learning programs can develop a structure based on the needs of an individual institution. Consequently, the programs differ in such areas as specific goals, purposes, faculty involvement, composition, structure, theme, scope, and target populations (Felver, 1986).

Zeller and Hummel (1999) discuss how programs that involve collaboration between academic and student affairs can originate from different areas on campus. Zeller and Hummel (1999) state that programs can be generated from academic departments, student affairs organizations, or institutional leaders who are responding to a crisis (Zeller and Hummel, 1999).

Shapiro and Levine (1999) defined the approaches that institutions have used to create learning communities as follows:

- Curricular structure - The method used to organize courses and students.
- Faculty role - The levels of faculty development and ways faculty collaborate to achieve curricular integration.
- Co-curricular opportunities - The integration of students' in-class and out of class learning experiences.
- Opportunities for peer leadership - Leadership roles assumed by community members or upper-division students (Shapiro and Levine, 1999).

Zeller explains that living-learning programs spawn from different campus constituents who have varying intentions. Faculty initiated programs develop for pedagogical reasons. Student Affairs or housing initiated programs typically grow out of a desire to enhance the student's out-of-classroom learning experience. The chancellor or
academic provost will initiate a program to enhance the reputation of the institution (W. Zeller, Conference presentation, October 5, 2001).

Newman, Taylor, Cannon, and Dean (1988) discuss how the desires, needs, and roles of the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill evolved into the creation of a Romance Language, German Language, and a pre-professional health science living-learning program. The creation of these programs at UNC-Chapel Hill involved a need for a stronger community of faculty and students who were studying languages and preparing for health professions (Newman et al., 1988).

Model program

Although institutional differences are quite apparent in the literature, several common purposes and goals for the formulation and development of the programs exist. The task force analyzed the mission statements of several living-learning programs to find common themes (Rowe, 1979). The analysis revealed the following themes: student development; personalization of the student’s educational experience; creation of an intellectual environment; integration of the student’s in-class and out-of-class learning experiences; and increased student satisfaction with academic programs, residence hall living, and the institution as a whole (Felver, 1986).

Based on the mission statement analysis, the task force report (Rowe, 1997) proposed a model for living-learning centers. Features delineated in the model were the following: intentional learning in formats such as classes, community activities, study groups, discussions, and special training opportunities. Other features of the model living-
learning center include faculty involvement and budgetary support by academic departments (Rowe, 1979).

In 1994 Pascarella, Terenzini, and Blimling wrote about curricula components that are similar to those published in the 1979 task force report. Pascarella et al. (1994) mention that, “typical features of living-learning centers include classes taught in the residence hall, increased student-faculty contact, cultural events, faculty lectures in the residence halls, and students taking a common course together” (p. 32).

Rowe (1979) explains possibilities are endless when it comes to types of programming endorsed by the model. The following ideas are suggested: faculty lectures, roundtable discussions, language tables in the dining hall, craft instruction, theater groups, field trips and human growth workshops (Rowe, 1979).

Shapiro and Levine (1999) recommend specific types of group work and class structures to involve students and promote student-faculty interaction in learning communities. Their recommendations are as follows: interdisciplinary and writing courses, experiential learning which involves undergraduate research and service learning, and freshman seminars (Shapiro and Levine, 1999).

Another curricular component that incorporates the concept of freshman seminars and group discussions is the Freshman Interest Group or (FIG). FIGs have been endorsed in recent publications (Schroeder, Minor, and Tarkow, 1999; Zeller, 1996) as effective curricular component in first-year initiative programs.

The FIG program at the University of Missouri at Columbia was highlighted as a model initiative in two recent publications (Schroeder et al., 1999; Zeller, 1996). The University of Missouri's FIG program combines elements in existence at most campuses
general education courses and residential living options. "A FIG integrates three general education courses (acceptable to all majors at MU) and a fourth, one credit professional seminar, all around a central theme (science, art, and business, among others.) A student who joins the FIG is co-enrolled with 19 other students so these 20 students take the same sections of the same courses together, along with the professional seminar " (Zeller, 1996, p. 134).

The twenty first-year students participating in each FIG group live together on the same floor in a residence hall with an upperclassman peer advisor who leads their respective section of the professional seminar. "The shared living arrangements and course enrollment allow for natural formation of powerful peer reference groups as well as strengthening the connections between the classes themselves and the overall experience of the student" (Zeller, 1996, p. 134).

Student and faculty participation

The task force report (1979) discusses student participation in programs and involvement by faculty. In regards to student participation, Rowe (1979) explains that there is an integrated, dual reward system for academic and experiential learning. Rowe (1979) states that the recognition for academic learning comes in the form of academic credit, and recognition for the experiential learning process comes in the form of personal growth and development. By the academic and experiential learning integrating, living is brought to learning, and learning is brought to living.

Rowe (1979) emphasizes that since the experiential learning component is driven by student involvement, student participation in the programs must be voluntary and not
mandated by the university. Required application and selection into a living-learning program is another important component. (Pascarella, et al., 1994).

Zeller and Hummel (1999) base strategies for motivating student involvement on themes or tasks important for development at different levels of class standing. First-year students are exposed to first year initiative programs that focus on helping students navigate the transition from high school to college. Juniors and seniors generally participate in living-learning centers that connect students to their majors and are sponsored through particular academic departments (Zeller and Hummel, 1999).

Living-learning program options for sophomores are lacking. Sophomores often wish to continue their learning community experiences after the first year but find few opportunities available to them (Zeller and Hummel, 1999). “The sophomore year offers thus another significant opportunity for housing professionals to form new partnerships with academic colleagues. These opportunities might include sophomore mentorship and leadership programs in first-year student living programs, or work with faculty to develop whole new offerings for sophomore students” (Zeller and Hummel, 1999, p.88).

The 1979 task force report does assign a specific role for faculty involvement in living-learning programs. Rowe (1979) specifies that the University of Illinois is a model program because faculty members have opportunities to serve as instructors, advisors, live-in tutors, and academic department liaisons. In this program’s format, the academic departments provide the following financial and/or resource support for faculty who participate: release time, instructional materials, staff salaries, and cultural programming monies (Rowe, 1979).
Riker (1965) and Rowe (1981)

Harold C. Riker

Harold Riker's 1965 publication, *College Housing as Learning Centers*, is a landmark publication because it was the first document during the emergence of the student personnel movement to recognize that housing departments have a responsibility to educate students. In 1965, Riker makes the accurate prediction that the educational mission of residence halls will result in the proliferation of living-learning centers across the country. Riker recommended that living-learning programs would need to include the following components to be successful; (1) active student participation, (2) facilities to meet student needs, and (3) staffing to foster the programs.

In addition to authoring the first publication to structure curricula in living-learning programs, Harold Riker had a distinguished career in housing administration, teaching, and research in student activism on college campuses. He finished his housing career as the Director of Housing at the University of Florida after spending 50 years working in student services. He taught in the counselor education department from 1971-1991, developing and teaching several courses addressing the counseling and mental health needs of adults and the elderly (Gainesville Sun, 2000). Referring to Harold Riker's contributions to the housing profession, Don Creamer (2000) states "Through Harold's leadership, housing and residence hall education today provides structures, policies, and practices that support active student learning” (online at http://www.elfacpa.org/funding.html).

Like Riker (1965), the ACUHO-I statement (2000) mentions the importance of facilities in which living-learning programs are housed. “Clearly, architectural design,
interior design, and general upkeep issues all impact students’ behavior and ultimately
the ability to learn. As we move forward in this area, housing professionals must obtain
greater expertise in this emerging field. Architectural and interior design schemes must
take into consideration not only aesthetics and long-term usage issues, but also must
address the impact these settings have on promoting and enhancing the learning process”
(ACUHO-I, 2000, p. 3).

Linda P. Rowe

In an effort to give administrators more direction in establishing living-learning
program curricula, Linda Rowe (1981) examined mission statements collected from a
dozen living-learning programs. Rowe's 1981 study was a follow-up to the Commission
III report she authored in 1979. Rowe (1981) derives the following additional core
components under which all living-learning programs should structure services; (4)
opportunities for students to pursue an academic lifestyle, (5) interdisciplinary study, (6)
peer support for learning, (7) student input in and control over decision making, and (8)
development of close student-faculty relationships.

Rowe has an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership from West Virginia University. She
has 29 years experience working in judicial affairs, residence life, teaching, and doing
research in higher education administration. In addition to the housing commission
report she authored, Rowe has several major publications that deal with programming in
the residence halls. Rowe (1979; 1981) is the only author who recommends curricular
components of living-learning programs based on comparison studies of multiple
programs.
Conclusion

In conclusion, as faculty became more involved in their disciplines and less involved in housing operations, living-learning programs have encouraged faculty and student interaction outside of the classroom. Research shows that the living-learning program has acted as a catalyst for student success in college (Pascarella et. al, 1994).

Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) components provide a basis to structure specific curricular components of living-learning programs. Drawing consensus from living-learning program administrators on how curricula are designed and implemented based on Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) research will develop applicable standards.

The research on living-learning program curricula has categorized programs and defined parameters for programs and services. Specific curricular components, however, have yet to be established through significant research. Although living-learning programs vary depending on perceived institutional needs, authors have struggled to develop a common understanding of how core values are implemented in living-learning program design and management. Moreover, the literature has failed to provide a standard, -- an agreed upon set of expectations for services that living-learning programs should provide to student participants.

As seen in the review of the literature, living-learning program content and management strategies have been developed based on student learning theory, institutional priorities, and precedent. Writers have offered administrators guidelines under which to structure curricula of living-learning programs, however administrators lack guidelines for designing more specified learning interventions. Currently, programs are structured and managed without attention to research that has defined standard
operating procedure. There can be consistent standards established for elements such as faculty participation in programs, involvement by student leaders, facility design, student participation, and staffing. Once standards are established, administrators can work to adopt them in multiple kinds of living-learning programs, thereby providing a base of literature available that is applicable to modern practices.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Delphi Technique

The Delphi Technique is a qualitative research method that relies on controlled feedback to elicit opinions of expert respondents and arrive at group consensus. Developed by the Rand Corporation in 1950, Delphi is a “method for systematic solicitation and collation of judgments on particular topics through a set of carefully designed sequential questionnaires interspersed with summarized information and feedback of opinions derived from earlier responses” (Delbecq, Van de Van, and Gustafson, 1975, p. 10).

The Delphi technique is an effective methodology to draw consensus from administrators on a standard curriculum for living-learning programs. Convenience, flexibility, systematic data collection methods, and high reliability make Delphi an ideal approach to gather the necessary data for this study.

Linstone and Turoff (1975) explain that although Delphi was originally designed as a forecasting procedure, more recently it has been used as a tool for university planning and curriculum development. There is precedent for utilizing the Delphi technique in curriculum development. Volk (1993) states, “The Delphi technique has been found to be an applicable tool for educational research and curriculum development” (p. 35). Volk (1993) used the Delphi technique to poll experts in the area of technology education. The results of this study were used to formulate a technology education curriculum for developing countries (Volk, 1993). The Graphic Communications Program at North
Carolina State University used a national Delphi study to determine the curriculum for a masters program for graphic communications educators (Clark and Scales, 2000).

Linstone and Turoff (1975) explain that the “Delphi Exercise” is a combination of a polling and conference procedure which attempts to shift a significant portion of the effort needed for individuals to communicate from a larger respondent group to a smaller monitor team. Delphi is more effective than holding a conference because participants do not have to arrange a meeting, respondents may remain anonymous to each other, domination by individuals is prevented, adequate time is provided for thinking and reflection, participants are granted flexibility in responding, and conformity issues are avoided (Price, 1998).

The validity and reliability of the Delphi technique have been addressed in numerous studies (Dalkey, Rourke, Lewis, and Snyder; Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson; and O’Connell cited in Price, 1988, p. 8). Validity is high because the initial round produces responses that are affirmed through quantitative means in subsequent rounds. Since the Delphi technique involves statistical group response, it ensures that all respondents’ opinions are represented in the final response (Dalkey, Rourke, Lewis, and Snyder cited in Price, 1998). O’Connell (cited in Price, 1998) claims the reliability of Delphi has shown to be high because group consensus is more dependable than an individual’s opinion.

**Sampling**

Ludwig (1997) explains that randomly selecting participants for a Delphi study is not acceptable. Characteristics and qualifications of desirable respondents should be
identified and a process to select respondents to participate should be initiated by the researcher (Ludwig, 1997).

Respondents in the study were administrators who work directly with living-learning programs that serve undergraduate students at four-year institutions. Administrators responding to the questionnaires ranged in levels of experience, and have professional backgrounds in student personnel, housing administration, or academic affairs. The educational and professional backgrounds of these administrators qualified them as experts in the area of integrating student housing with curricular and co-curricular activities.

The total population is all administrators who work in living-learning programs. Smith and Raney (1993) designated a subset of this population by creating The North American Directory of Residential Colleges and Living-Learning Centers. Since only a limited number of respondents can participate on a Delphi panel and all Living-learning Program administrators could not be identified, a sample of the total population was studied.

A group of 20 programs and institutions were selected from the list of 64 published in the directory (Smith and Raney, 1993). Since the programs in the directory have been in existence for at least eight years, it can be assumed the programs that participated in the study offer established practices and curricular interventions on which others can base decisions.

Participating programs at The University of Missouri, Michigan State, the University of South Carolina, and the University of Illinois were described in the literature review as having been distinguished for innovative services that cater to specific populations of students. Other participating programs, such as the College Park Scholars Program at The
University of Maryland and the Living-Learning Centers at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, were distinguished for providing excellent student services in the book, *Creating Learning Communities: A practical guide to winning support, organizing for change, and implementing programs* (Shapiro and Levine, 1999).

A diverse representation of sizes and types of institutions, kinds of programs, and individuals participated on the Delphi panel. Sampling a diverse population makes the results of the study externally valid and applicable in multiple arenas. The Delphi panel was inclusive of the attributes listed below. These attributes are represented in the living-learning program directory and the total population of living-learning programs (Smith and Raney, 1993). As stated in Chapter Two, the types of living-learning programs included in the study are limited to those that include both housing and academic services. (Appendix D, Sample)

- **Size and Type:** Large, mid-size, small, public, and private institutions
- **Geographic location:** North, South, East, and West
- **Type of Program:** Living-learning programs, residential colleges, living-learning centers, academic residential programs, residential learning communities, and first-year initiative programs (ACUHO-I, 2000).
- **Type of Respondent:** Student affairs, housing, and academic backgrounds

**Sample Size**

Adler and Ziglio (1996) suggest that good results can be obtained in a Delphi panel with small, homogeneous panels of 10 to 15 individuals. Ludwig (1997) suggests a sample size of 15 to 20. Twenty administrators were chosen from the list of 64 to ensure
a representative sample and a high questionnaire return rate. Twenty administrators were
carried so the sample size would stay within the Delphi sample size guidelines (Adler and
Ziglio, 1996; Ludwig, 1997) and the amount of data collected was manageable to process.

**Expert Qualifications**

Since the panel consisted of experts who implement, lead, and design curricular
components of living-learning programs, data were gathered from sources qualified to
give feedback. All administrators listed in the National College Living-Learning
Directory have experience designing and implementing living-learning curricula or
managing programs (Smith and Raney, 1993).

Once the programs and institutions were selected from the directory, each program's
web page was viewed for an updated phone number and E-mail contact. The contacts
identified on web sites were then called or E-mailed about participating in the study. The
researcher established a relationship with the designated contact person and asked
appropriate questions to ensure an understanding of the tasks involved with participation.
(Appendices E & F, Phone call script and E-mail communications to respondents)

Since the Delphi process requires that questionnaire respondents be experts, criteria
were established to define who would participate as expert panel members in the study.
Linstone and Turoff (1975) state the researcher can determine which experts may
participate in the Delphi process, as long as expertise is considered, “expert knowledge
upon which professional authority can be founded” (p. 295). When respondents were
contacted via phone or E-mail, they were screened before they were approved to
participate. (Appendices E & F, Phone call script and E-mail communications to respondents)

The expert qualifications to participate in the study were designed in collaboration with Timothy Luckadoo, an Associate Vice Chancellor and Director of University Housing at North Carolina State University. Having worked extensively with living-learning program design and implementation issues, Timothy Luckadoo was identified as an appropriate resource to identify the minimum qualifications to participate in this study.

Identifying qualifications led to a Delphi panel that was representative of administrators and educators with varying levels of practical experience and educational attainment. While panel members were diverse in backgrounds and relationships to the programs in which they serve, all had expert knowledge of how students participate in the programs they represented. Following are characteristics of administrators who qualified as being "experts":

- At least a Master’s degree
- Having been working full-time for at least a school year with the university and living-learning program being studied.
- Spent a minimum of 20% (average of 5 to 8 hours a week) for at least a school year working with the living-learning program being studied

Data Collection

The description of inductive analysis by Lecompte and Preissle (1993) indicates that gathering data and then coding the information into appropriate categories is an effective way to analyze qualitative data. The Delphi technique offers the researcher a different
paradigm to collect and analyze data. Delphi is based upon a deductive process where the researcher establishes categories before gathering data, and then analyzes data based on how it pertains to the pre-established categories. In this study, the researcher collected and analyzed data based on how it pertains to Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components of living-learning program curriculum.

LeCompte and Preissle (1993) define the participant-construct questionnaire as a tool to “measure the strength that feeling people have about phenomena or to elicit the categories into which people classify items in their social and physical worlds” (p. 162). LeCompte and Preissle (1993) review the efficiency participant-construct questionnaires give researchers in getting study participants to sort and arrange given sets of items, or to discover the boundaries of categories.

The explanation of participant-construct questionnaires offered by LeCompte and Preissle (1993) supports the rationale and value in utilizing the systematic data collection strategies integral to the Delphi process. The first round of Delphi offers study participants the opportunity to categorize thoughts and feelings, while subsequent rounds are offered so the researcher can obtain group consensus within the categories.

The process of Delphi consists of a series of rounds of questionnaires. The first round is characterized by exploration of the subject under discussion, wherein each individual contributes information he believes is pertinent. The second round involves the process of reaching an understanding of how the group views the issue (i.e., what group members mean by relative terms such as importance, desirability, or feasibility). Round three, the final evaluation, occurs once all previously gathered information has been initially
analyzed and the evaluations have been fed back for consideration (Linston and Turoff, 1975).

Ludwig (1997) explains how the development and administration of questionnaires are interconnected. A multiple series of at least three questionnaires are used. The first questionnaire would most likely include open-ended questions related to broad problems or issues. The researcher develops the second questionnaire based on information collected during the first round. The second round questionnaire asks participants to review all items identified by the first round. Participants are then asked to use a Likert-type rating scale to establish preliminary priorities among the items identified in the first round. During the third round, respondents prioritize items identified in round two by ranking them in order of their importance (Ludwig, 1997).

Delphi rounds of questionnaires should continue until a predetermined level of consensus is reached or no new information is gained (Ludwig, 1997; Linston and Turoff, 1975; Delbec, Van de Ven and Gustafson, 1975). A review of the literature however, (Altschuld cited in Ludwig 1997) found that in most instances three iterations were enough, and not enough new information was gained to warrant the cost of more iterations.

This study used the three round Delphi approach to draw consensus on the most heavily utilized, popular, and critical curricular components of living-learning programs. Three rounds of questionnaires were administered to an expert panel of living-learning program administrators.
Virtual Delphi

In 1975, Linstone and Turoff predicted computers would simplify Delphi questionnaire distribution and data collection procedures. Ludwig (1997) felt with the growth of electronic mail, the technology could be adapted to facilitate the Delphi process. In 1995, Edward Shearin completed his doctoral dissertation using a “Virtual Delphi” technique. “Virtual” denotes that all information exchanged between Shearin and his respondents was completed via E-mail (Shearin, 1995).

Participants in this study received communication via E-mail and were able to complete and return questionnaires through a web site. Questionnaires were filled out through a web page form that was revised at each round and was accessed via a hyperlink from an E-mail message. All E-mail communication that was distributed to the entire group of respondents was done through a list-serve to protect the confidentiality of individual respondents. A computer programming language called "cgi script" made it possible for responses from the on-line forms to be stored in databases and returned to the researcher via electronic communication. (Appendix F, E-mail communications to respondents)

A telephone call was made or an E-mail message was sent to each respondent before the data collection period started, to ensure each respondent had the expert qualifications to participate in the study and to make a personal contact with each respondent. A letter and post card was sent through U.S mail to each respondent during the data collection period to keep respondents actively involved in the study. (Appendices F & G: E-mail communication to respondents, letter, and post-card sent to respondents)
**Instrumentation**

The instruments for rounds one, two, and three of the process were modeled after previous Delphi studies (Adler and Ziglio, 1996; Clark and Scales, 2000; Zenger and Zenger, 1986).

Round one was a qualitative questionnaire that assessed the methods living-learning program administrators use to implement curriculum and manage programs. Via the list-serve, respondents received an E-mail message giving them a web site location that could be accessed via a hyperlink in the body of the E-mail message. (Appendix F, E-mail communications to respondents) Before completing the first questionnaire, respondents viewed consent forms that; explained the study, gave respondents an opportunity to view all programs that participated, and asked respondents to commit to participating in the study. (Appendix H, Consent Form) Upon agreeing to the terms of a consent form via a mouse click, respondents were taken to the round one questionnaire.

The round one questionnaire asked respondents to identify how living-learning programs at their institutions incorporate Riker’s (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components. Respondents had the option of viewing a sample, round one questionnaire so they could determine the kinds of responses they could contribute. The sample questionnaire also provided the respondents an opportunity to understand how Riker (1965) and Rowe's (1981) eight components can apply to living-learning environments. (Appendix I, Round one questionnaire and sample questionnaire)

Round two enabled program administrators to rate the curricular components identified by the Delphi panel in round one. Items in round two were rated on a four-point Likert scale. The Likert Scale was numerically weighted with the following values:
1=should not be in any living-learning programs, 2=might work for some living-learning programs, 3=should be included in most living-learning programs, 4=is necessary for all living-learning programs. (Note: On the round two questionnaires, respondents clicked on buttons to indicate their ratings of curricular components. The researcher received raw data back in the form of a rating number that corresponded to the button the respondent chose.) From the data, median scores were determined for each item. (Appendix J, Round two questionnaire)

Using a median point of 2.01 as a minimum cut off, the researcher eliminated less popular responses and kept the most popular responses recorded in round two. Round three questionnaires asked respondents to rank strategies that had a median above 2.01. (Appendix K, Round three questionnaire)

Respondents were given the opportunity to describe other programmatic interventions, state how they felt about the groups' input, and/or qualify their responses during rounds two and three of the process.

**Steps to Integrate Technology in Data Collection**

Listed below is a summary of steps that were taken to integrate the use of technology in the data collection process:

1. Design web questionnaires and supplemental web pages using hypertext markup language (html) to construct the questionnaires and common gateway interface script (cgi) to control the manner in which form data is returned to the researcher.
2. Hyper-linking function in html utilized to help respondents; navigate from the consent form to the round one questionnaire, view a sample questionnaire, and view subcategory lists in rounds two and three.

3. Pilot questionnaires with a small sample of administrators. Based on feedback and responses of pilot sample alter the following; instructions given to respondents, questionnaire design, and cgi scripting commands.

4. Utilize institutional web pages and phone directories to find a possible sample of experts for the national study.

5. E-mail or place phone calls to contacts identified in web page searches to; explain study, confirm minimum expert qualifications, and describe expectations for participation.

6. Create a list-serve containing all of the respondent’s e-mail addresses.

7. On list-serve distribute; web site addresses of each questionnaire once they are ready for distribution, instructions for viewing questionnaires, time-lines by which questionnaires must be completed.

8. E-mail or call respondents to remind them to complete questionnaires by deadlines published on list-serve.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis processes were used to analyze Delphi data in round one and design the questionnaire used for round two. Quantitative processes were used as decision-making and consensus building tools in rounds two and three of the process.
The qualitative and quantitative processes for analyzing data were chosen based on a review of the literature and other studies that used the Delphi methodology (Adler and Ziglio, 1996; Clark and Scales, 2000; Zenger and Zenger, 1986; Ludwig, 1997; Linston and Turoff, 1975; Delbec, Van de Ven, and Gustafson, 1975). Quantitative procedures were modeled after a Delphi study executed to determine curricular components of a graphics communications program (Clark and Scales, 2000). One of the authors of this study, Aaron Clark, advised the researcher on how to use quantitative procedures to process Delphi data.

Round One Analysis

Delbec, Van de Ven and Gustafson (1975) state that data analysis during the first round of the process takes place once all round one feedback is returned. Round one analysis should result in a summary list of items identified and comments made. “The list should reflect the initial opinions of respondents concerning key variables, yet be short enough for all respondents to easily review, criticize, support, or oppose” (Delbec, Van de Ven, and Gustafson, 1975).

To shorten the list of questions in round two, similar responses were combined into one item on the round two questionnaires. In constructing the round two questionnaires, terminology was standardized so all items could be understood by the entire Delphi panel. Subcategories for some questions were designed that represented a genre of program curricula or grouped like program curricula together. (Appendix J, Round two questionnaire)
Round Two Analysis

The second round of the Delphi process involved a four point, Likert scale questionnaire where respondents had the opportunity to rate the curricular components the group listed in round one. The quantitative procedures in the second round of the study involved deriving a number that established a decision-making tool for keeping and prioritizing responses. (Appendix J, Round two questionnaire)

Heretofore stated, each value on the Likert scale in round two was numerically weighted. Once all the ratings from round two were collected, a group median was computed for all rated curricula. A group median rating of 2.01 or higher on the four point Likert graduated a curricular component to the third and final ranking stage of the process. A median rating lower than 2.01 eliminated a curricular component from being included in the round three questionnaires.

In a Delphi study to identify curricular components of a graduate program in graphics communications, Clark and Scales (2000) used a group median score of 2.01 to decide whether curricular components would be graduated from the round two, rated questionnaire, to the round three, ranking questionnaire.

During round two, respondents had an opportunity to list other curricular components by category or explain their ratings. If curricular components were listed in round two, then the researcher with advisement from the monitoring team made a decision to include these responses in the ranking questionnaire that was designed for round three. Explanations of ratings were included in the 'results chapter' or were integrated into the third round questionnaire.
Summing the total rated responses for each question in each of Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight categories and computing means for each category enabled the researcher to determine the categories that respondents felt were priorities for living-learning programs. Listing the categorical mean scores from highest to lowest indicated the components viewed as most and least important.

Outlying questions were removed before categorical means were computed so the data did not represent extreme values at the time these means were computed. Outliers were defined as the lowest and highest rated questions in each component area. An important strategy for consensus building is removing the extreme responses to ensure there is a maximum amount of homogeneity in the rated data (Clark & Scales, 2000).

Round Three Analysis

The third round of the Delphi process involved a questionnaire where respondents had an opportunity to prioritize curricular components by ranking all the responses that graduated from the round two questionnaires. Respondents were informed of the median score for each curricular component, so they knew how the group felt about an item before submitting a ranked score. (Appendix K, Round three questionnaire)

As in round two, respondents had an opportunity to qualify how they ranked data. Comments that explained respondent's ranking values were analyzed in the results section.

Curricula added in the second round through qualitative comments were evaluated in the following manner: summing the total values for each curricular component ranked and then listing those values from lowest to highest. Added curricula prioritized in the
ranking stages appeared higher in these listings and curricula not prioritized appeared lower.

It is important to measure the consistency between the rated and ranked data in rounds two and three (Clark and Scales, 2000). To measure the degree of consistency that respondents evaluated the program curricula in the second and third round of the process, the following calculations were done:

- Group medians were tabulated for the rating and ranking scores of each program curricula.
- The median values of the rated curricula were subtracted from the median values of the ranked curricula.

Since higher ratings and lower ranking indicate the group felt favorably about curricular components, the differences between rankings and ratings were interpreted in the following manner:

- Lower differences indicated the group prioritized a curricular component in the rating and ranking rounds.
- Higher differences indicated the group did not prioritize a curricular component in the rating and ranking rounds.

**Monitoring Team**

Wolcott (1990) suggests validating a study by receiving feedback from others. Linstone and Turoff (1975) describe the importance of a monitoring team when using the Delphi method. The monitoring team serves as a means to minimize any bias on the part of the researcher. In this study, a monitoring team reviewed how data was processed.
upon return of the questionnaires, and critiqued questionnaires before revised editions were made available to the panel. Use of raw data and other notes from the pilot study familiarized the monitoring team with procedures for analyzing and collecting data.

The monitoring team was made up of Wayne Kuncl and Elizabeth Jordan. Kuncl has an Ed.D. in Educational Psychology from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Having served as the Director of Housing at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for 16 years and a Professor of Higher Education at the University of Northern Colorado, he had a distinguished career in housing administration and a strong knowledge of research design.

Jordan has a Ph. D. in Psychology from Arizona State University. Having taught college level classes in statistics at the University of Arizona, she has a strong knowledge of how to utilize and analyze effectively the results from quantitative procedures.

Aaron Clark was consulted throughout the data collection process, viewed questionnaires before they were distributed to the respondents, and gave feedback on how the data was processed. While he did not serve in the capacity of a monitoring team member, Clark served as an expert consultant in the area of Delphi data collection and processing techniques (Clark and Scales, 2000). (Appendix L, Kuncl's and Jordan's resumes / monitoring team communications)
CHAPTER IV

Results

Results are reported based on the outcomes of the data processing techniques used after data have been collected from each round of questionnaires. Sixty questionnaires were distributed to the group of 20 living-learning program administrators. Answers to fifty-seven questionnaires were returned, making for a total response rate of 95%. Once feedback from each round was collected, the researcher created a draft questionnaire for the succeeding round. Each draft questionnaire was edited and approved by the monitoring team before it was published on the web site for respondent feedback. Results were also reviewed and edited by the monitoring team. (Appendix L, Kuncl's and Jordan's resumes / monitoring team communications)

Round One Questionnaire Results

One hundred percent of the sample responded to the round one questionnaire. The amount of feedback returned by all 20 respondents, in most categories, was overwhelming to process into second and third round questionnaires that would be reasonable for respondents to complete. Once comprehensive lists were created of the entire group's feedback in each category, it was determined that between 45 and 95 living-learning program curricula were listed in the first six categories. Creating a second round rating and a third round ranking questionnaire, with such long lists of curricula in each category, would have set an unrealistic expectation for further respondent participation.
To condense the amount of items that had to be rated and ranked in the second and third rounds of the process, similar responses were represented as a single item and qualitative data coding techniques were used to create subcategories of program curricula.

Subcategories were built around the different genres of the program curricula listed as responses in the first round. Goetz and LeCompte (1981) instruct qualitative researchers to segment large amounts of data by "scanning the data for categories of phenomena and for relationships among the categories" (p. 57).

The subcategories were listed under the eight questions in the round two and three questionnaires. Program curricula subcategorized were indicated as such by way of their listing in hyperlink format on the second and third round web questionnaires. Hyperlinks appear on web pages as underlined, bold blue text. Clicking on the hyperlinks took the respondents to a list of all program curricula coded into each subcategory. For subsequent rounds, respondents were asked to evaluate entire subcategories by rating or ranking them in terms of their relationship to the eight broader categories. (Appendices I, J, & K: First, second, and third round questionnaires)

**Round Two Questionnaire Results**

One hundred percent of the sample responded to the round two questionnaires. Median equations were tabulated to determine the curricula that would be eliminated from round two and included in round three. Categorical means were tabulated for each of the eight categories to determine the categories the group rated most favorably. Qualitative feedback created additional curricula components in some categories and explained some quantitative responses.
Median Equations

Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8 list the composite, ranking medians for the program curricula listed as responses in the first round of the process. The tables also indicate whether specific program curricula graduated to the third round, ranking questionnaire. Decisions to graduate or eliminate curricula were based on whether curricula had composite median scores above or below 2.01.

The second questionnaire yielded the following results for each question:

- Question one, 12 program curricula listed, 1 eliminated.
- Question two, 8 program curricula listed, 1 eliminated
- Question three, 16 program curricula listed, 2 eliminated
- Question four, 21 program curricula listed, 6 eliminated
- Question five, 17 program curricula listed, 6 eliminated
- Question six, 25 program curricula listed, 15 eliminated
- Question seven, 22 program curricula listed, 6 eliminated
- Question eight, 24 program curricula listed, 14 eliminated

In general, the program curricula eliminated from the third questionnaire were interventions that are specific in particular types of living-learning centers and institutions. For example, facilities like fireplaces, theaters, and indoor swimming pools eliminated from inclusion in the third round are facilities that would be found at institutions that could afford such luxuries or programs that focus on the dramatic arts.
Categorical Means

Categorical means were tabulated in the following manner: summing all the ratings reported for each question and dividing that total by the number of questions in each category. Removing outlying questions that could have swayed the mean values higher or lower refined the categorical means scores. Outlying questions in each category were defined as the lowest and highest rated curricula in each component area. Frequency tables were generated to determine the questions that had outlying values. Table 2.0 reports the refined categorical means, listed from highest to lowest. (Appendix N, SAS/EXCEL Output and programs)

Seen Table 2.0, respondents gave the highest rating to program curricula in the category that dealt with providing opportunities for student to pursue an academic life style (m=69). Lowest ratings were given to items in the category that dealt with facility issues (m=49).

Standard deviations indicate the degree to which the respondent group agreed about the importance of curricula that were listed in each category. Respondents were in strong agreement about including curricula that allows students to have input into program related decisions (sd=3.44) and were least in agreement about staffing issues (sd=11.68).

Round Two Qualitative Feedback

Through qualitative feedback given in the text boxes, nine additional living-learning program curricula were derived. Four of the additional curricula were incorporated into the third round questionnaire and posted for ranking with the curricula kept from round
two. The other five curricula posted in the subcategory lists could be accessed via hyperlinks from the third round questionnaires. (Appendices J, K & M, Round two and three questionnaires and Code Sheet)

For questions two, three, six, and eight, some respondents chose to qualify their responses or report that statements were taken out of context. For question two, a respondent felt that item 2g, giving students little input into the structure of course content, was not communicated as was intended when he listed it as a response in round one. This respondent felt most students are not ready to help design courses, but could offer feedback about courses. It is possible that item 2g was taken out of context in the way it was communicated to the researcher or represented on the round two questionnaire. If this were the case, item 2g might have been eliminated unfairly. Students giving feedback into course content was already represented under subcategory 2D, Decision making processes.

For question three, a respondent commented, "we believe in local governance at the college house level, hence my general rating of "included for most." This respondent felt that living-learning programs should be governed individually and should not fall under a centralized governance system.

For question six a respondent commented, "Obviously, better rooms and common spaces are preferable. But my answers reflect that I don't think they're 'necessary' to make a College House system work properly." This comment is reflective of the group's feelings regarding facility issues. The consensus among the group, when the refined means were compared, was that facilities are less of a priority over academic issues, because facilities are designed to meet institutional or program specific needs. Table 2.0.
Refined comparison means and standard deviations of eight categories from round two data)

For question eight, a respondent commented, "I perceive that some of the statements above are out of context thus leaving it up to interpretation." If this respondent specified the curricula in question eight that she felt were taken out of context, it would have been possible to represent her feelings in the third round questionnaire or the results.

Round Three Questionnaire Results

Seventeen out of 20 respondents provided feedback to the third round questionnaire, making for an 85% response rate in the final round. Subtracting the group median values of the rankings from the group median values of the ratings revealed a measure of consistency for how curricula were prioritized. Qualitative comments explained some of the respondents’ ranking choices.

Added Curricula

Four additional curricula were derived from qualitative feedback in round two. Respondents in the third round of the process ranked these curricula. To evaluate the groups’ attitude toward the added curricula, rankings values for each question were summed and then listed from the highest priority items to the lowest. High priority items received lower total rankings and low priority items received higher total ranking.

Added items 1m, opportunities for students to explore majors and 1n, conducting a graduation ceremony for students who complete the first year of the program were the lowest priority for respondents in question one. Item 11, interweaving the academics with
the social component of the program was ranked sixth out of 15 total curricula in question one. Item 2i alumni interviews and surveys, was the lowest ranked item in question two. (Appendices K, M, & N; Round three questionnaire, Code Sheet, and SAS/EXCEL Output and programs)

**Median Differences**

Tables 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 list the median values of the curricula that were rated and ranked for each of the eight questions. Subtracting the rated medians from the ranked medians revealed the level of consistency at which respondents rated and ranked curricula. Lower median differences indicate that the respondent group prioritized a curricula component in the rating and ranking questionnaires. Higher median differences indicate that the respondent group felt that a curricula component was less a priority in the rating and ranking rounds.

The following curricular components were rated the highest and ranked lowest most consistently throughout the data collection process:

- Active Learning Experiences (-1)
- Groups of students, staff, and faculty making collaborative decisions (-2)
- Student involvement / participation in programs (-1)
- Student accessibility to faculty, on-site (-2)
- Encouraging informal / out of classroom interactions with faculty (-1)
- Spaces that facilitate discussion and study (-3)
- Staff receive special training to work in program (-2)
- Faculty participate from a wide range of disciplines (-2)
Round Three Qualitative Feedback

There was less qualitative feedback collected in round three than in round two. There were no further program curricula listed by respondents. Not listing further curricula could have meant the respondent group found the lists provided in rounds two and three to be comprehensive.

One respondent notified the researcher during this surveying period to report he was having trouble prioritizing the components by rank order. The researcher advised this respondent to view the third round questionnaire as a consulting project that involved helping an institution adopt best practices from a comprehensive list of possible program interventions. After receiving this advice the respondent assigned rankings values to the curricula listed in the third round questionnaire.

For question seven, there were two comments recorded that explained ranking values that were awarded. The first comment involved services provided for students with disabilities. Since disability services are required by law, a respondent ranked them lower, feeling that programs do not have a choice about whether they can provide them or not.

It is accurate that providing services to students with disabilities is the law, but not all institutions view this as a priority. For example, one institution might have a full-time staff member dedicated to helping students with disabilities and another institution might not. Clearly, the institution dedicating a position for this purpose is prioritizing
disabilities services over the institution that is not. Therefore, it is conceivable to rank these services as priorities over others.

Another respondent found the curricula in question seven difficult to rank because she found the items too similar. This respondent said specifically there was more than one item that referred to students with disabilities. Item 7h deals with providing sign language interpreters for students who are hearing impaired and item 7m deals with providing services for students with disabilities. These two items are too similar to rank and should have been combined into one item for the second questionnaire. (Appendix K, Round three questionnaire)
Table 1.1 Median Scores of Ratings for Question One and Decisions to Keep or Eliminate Curricula in the Third Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Academic courses / formal learning experiences in the residence halls</td>
<td>Irate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Non-credit / informal, group learning experiences in the residence halls</td>
<td>Ibrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Active learning experiences</td>
<td>Icrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. One on one interactions with faculty and staff</td>
<td>Idrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Events / programs</td>
<td>Ierate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Facilities</td>
<td>Ifrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Technology</td>
<td>Igrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Policies and procedures to meet the needs of program participants</td>
<td>Ihrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Program mission underlying curricular interventions</td>
<td>Ilrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Connections to campus resources</td>
<td>Ijrate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Student engagement with faculty and staff</td>
<td>Ikrate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Residential colleges grant degrees and graduate students. (i.e. Student gets a BA in English from the Residential College of Literature and Sciences)</td>
<td>Ilrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2 Median Scores of Ratings for Question Two and Decisions to Keep or Eliminate Curricula in the Third Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question2: Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Groups of students, staff, &amp; faculty make collaborative decisions</td>
<td>2arate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students having authority/responsibility to make significant decisions.</td>
<td>2brate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Elected student government leaders</td>
<td>2crate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Decision making processes</td>
<td>2drate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Student involvement / participation in programs</td>
<td>2erate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Staff accessibility (i.e. students having E-mail links from a web site to give the director feedback about the program)</td>
<td>2frate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Giving students little input into the structure of course content</td>
<td>2grate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Resident assistant trained to work in program</td>
<td>2hrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3 Median Scores of Ratings for Question Three and Decisions to Keep or Eliminate Curricula in the Third Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3: Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Study group arrangements</td>
<td>3arate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Tutoring</td>
<td>3brate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supportive classroom environments.</td>
<td>3crate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Classes are taught with group learning strategies</td>
<td>3drate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Having role models</td>
<td>3erate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Programming initiatives</td>
<td>3frate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Positions held by student leaders</td>
<td>3grate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Academic support services having a strong presence in the halls so that seeking academic assistance is viewed as a very &quot;normal&quot; thing to do among the community</td>
<td>3hrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Clusters of peers providing support for learning</td>
<td>3irate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Enforcement of quiet hours</td>
<td>3jrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Students help each other get to class</td>
<td>3krate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Small class sizes</td>
<td>3lrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. The community is informed of all the participant's majors so relationships can be formed with students in like majors</td>
<td>3mrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Expectations for student participation are clearly laid out to students when they enter the program</td>
<td>3nrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Student participants are involved campus wide in a wide variety of programs and activities</td>
<td>3orate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. During RA training we talk about the Student Learning Experience at the college and help them understand the philosophy of the College and Department of Residential Life. We send the message that student staff support is essential in helping students focus on their priorities.</td>
<td>3prate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.4 Median Scores of Ratings for Question Four and Decisions to Keep or Eliminate Curricula in the Third Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4: Methods Used to Encourage Active Student Participation</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Students apply for admission into the program which includes a written application and an interview.</td>
<td>4arate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students sign a statement of commitment</td>
<td>4brate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students pay dues additional from housing fees and tuition to be part of the program</td>
<td>4crate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. An expectation that students participate in programs and events</td>
<td>4drate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Students who don't participate are asked to leave the program following a probationary period.</td>
<td>4erate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Participation in early orientation for program</td>
<td>4frate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Meetings for both social and academic purposes. Social programs can include students eating and recreating together.</td>
<td>4grate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Participants talking more about academic issues in comparison to non participants</td>
<td>4hrate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Staff is provided assessment data of students’ perceptions about the residence hall environment relative to its academic atmosphere, involvement with faculty, use of academic resources and are then asked to translate the data into strategies to motivate more active participation in academic activities / Student feedback and end of the year evaluations are used to refine program</td>
<td>4irate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Staff gauge and encourage participation in one on one meetings. / Participation is monitored by a student and staff committee.</td>
<td>4jrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Providing leadership opportunities for students</td>
<td>4krate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Traffic and activities are channeled into public spaces.</td>
<td>4irate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Students self-select into the program</td>
<td>4mrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Posting messages about events on campus in the halls / Publicity through E-mail, flyers, posters, etc. / Students commit to promote the program by sitting at an information desk</td>
<td>4nrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eliminate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Active student learning motivates participation</td>
<td>4orate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Students share concern for each other's academic needs</td>
<td>4prate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Peer education courses on topics such as relationship violence, HIV/AIDS prevention, eating disorders, and substance abuse</td>
<td>4qrate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Last lecture series (Professors are asked to construct their last and best lecture)</td>
<td>4rrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Popular and essential academic services like advising are provided in the residence halls</td>
<td>4srate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Students are given the opportunity to participate in the program prior to the beginning of their freshmen semester (at orientation)</td>
<td>4trate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Programs that focus on relationship building to instill the value of developing relationships with neighbors</td>
<td>4urate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.5 Median Scores of Ratings for Question Five and Decisions to Keep or Eliminate Curricula in the Third Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5: Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student accessibility to live-in faculty</td>
<td>5arate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Student accessibility to faculty, on-site</td>
<td>5brate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Faculty get invitations to programs and events</td>
<td>5cbrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Faculty connections to a particular groups of students</td>
<td>5dbrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Encouraging informal / out of classroom interactions with faculty</td>
<td>5erate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Student participation levels in living-learning classes are higher in comparison to classes held outside of the residence halls.</td>
<td>5fbrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Budgets targeted for programs that involve faculty.</td>
<td>5gbrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Classroom space</td>
<td>5hrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. A network of faculty, staff, and community members who all have relationships and responsibilities to the students. All members of these networks have access to public spaces and attend programs in the residential college.</td>
<td>5irate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Students have close relationships with custodial, maintenance, and food service workers within a small residential college system.</td>
<td>5jrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Faculty members are selected who are &quot;hands on&quot; with the students.</td>
<td>5krate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. One on one meeting between professors and students to discuss course matters or any other matters related to university life.</td>
<td>5lrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Residence hall director is expected to know every students within the 1st 6 weeks of the semester</td>
<td>5mrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Bring in different faculty and staff to weekly dinners to speak on their areas of expertise.</td>
<td>5nrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Housing staff contacting the student's advisor to see if he or she has experienced any of the same behaviors that we are seeing.</td>
<td>5orate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.5 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. The first year initiative instructors and the advisers who teach the</td>
<td>5prate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university orientations courses meet before and during the semester to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discuss strategy, problems, and goals; and the faculty and advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend each others’ classes on an arranged basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Weekly lectures led by faculty</td>
<td>5qrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1.6 Median Scores of Ratings for Question Six and Decisions to Keep or Eliminate Curricula in the Third Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6: Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Needs.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Spaces that facilitate discussion and studying</td>
<td>6arate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students are permitted to decorate common areas. (Decorations are relevant to program themes)</td>
<td>6brate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Classroom spaces in residence halls</td>
<td>6crate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Equipment</td>
<td>6drate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Computer labs</td>
<td>6erate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Wired rooms</td>
<td>6frate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Living room area used for group meetings</td>
<td>6grate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Outdoor basketball court / Volleyball court / recreation room</td>
<td>6hrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Amphitheater for programs / theater</td>
<td>6irate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Classrooms that are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for meetings and studying</td>
<td>6jrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Library in house</td>
<td>6krate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Facilities for students interested in the fine and performing arts</td>
<td>6lrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Language table rooms / Foreign language laboratory</td>
<td>6mrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Most amenities/student services are decentralized in each residential college.</td>
<td>6nrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Dining services are linked to student programming</td>
<td>6orate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. A &quot;Masters House&quot; located on site that provides a significant degree of student support. (Masters are tenured faculty who do much of the work that residence life personnel do at most other institutions.)</td>
<td>6prate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Faculty apartments in residence halls</td>
<td>6qrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Designing new buildings around the needs of the program</td>
<td>6rrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6:</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s. Housing the program in an old / historic building on campus</td>
<td>6srate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Fireplaces</td>
<td>6trate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Indoor swimming pool</td>
<td>6urate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Dining hall in house</td>
<td>6vrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Large living spaces with high ceilings</td>
<td>6wrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Beautiful grounds with much green space</td>
<td>6xrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Study abroad and Americorps offices located in residence hall</td>
<td>6yrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.7 Median Scores of Ratings for Question Seven and Decisions to Keep or Eliminate Curricula in the Third Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7: Methods Used to Provide Staffing that Serve Special Populations of Students</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Program is staffed by a resident tutor, program coordinator, faculty in residence, head resident, and resident advisors.</td>
<td>7arat3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Staff receives special training to work with program</td>
<td>7brate4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peer advisors assume both traditional resident assistant responsibilities towards program and for doing so receive additional compensation</td>
<td>7crate3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Focus is on community education team comprised of peer advisors and traditional paraprofessional staff who are called community advisors</td>
<td>7drate2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Staff in first year initiative program receive training on the specific development and academic needs of first year students.</td>
<td>7erate3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Live-in staff members</td>
<td>7frate3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. All campus staff including faculty, house staff, academic advising staff, librarians, minority peer advisors support the goals of the programs</td>
<td>7grate4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Close communication between residential college staff who serve the entire population and centralized offices that serve special populations.</td>
<td>7hrate3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Signers for hearing impaired students</td>
<td>7irate3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Students taking advantage of outside academic support services like the counseling office</td>
<td>7jrate4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Strategies in place to make Human Sexual and Gender Development program welcoming to gays, lesbian, and transsexual students.</td>
<td>7krate3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Staff is recruited from the general population which gives the house peers as leaders</td>
<td>7lrate3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.7 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7:</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. Resident assistants are trained in diversity issues.</td>
<td>7mrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Disabled students are given necessary accommodations.</td>
<td>7nrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Space and resources are provided for tutoring certain populations of students, in particular under-represented minority students</td>
<td>7orate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Physical accessibility to buildings and support services</td>
<td>7prate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Extra funding is provided to staff to do more academic focused work</td>
<td>7qrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Faculty are hired who come from other residential college / living-learning program systems</td>
<td>7rrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Resident assistants and graduate assistants have academic backgrounds that are similar to the students in their halls/ Resident assistants are assigned to specialized in working with specific populations.</td>
<td>7srate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Faculty devoted to the residential college / living-learning program as their full-time responsibility</td>
<td>7trate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Undergraduate research coordinator and service learning coordinator</td>
<td>7urate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Full partnership between housing, first year college program, and other services like tutoring that are offered as part of the program.</td>
<td>7vrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.8 Median Scores of Ratings for Question Eight and Decisions to Keep or Eliminate Curricula in the Third Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8: Methods Used to Encourage Students to Explore Different Areas of Study.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kept</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Faculty participate from a wide range of disciplines</td>
<td>8arate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reading and discussion groups that cover a wide range of topics and interests. / Offering in house courses on a wide variety of topics</td>
<td>8brate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students have an opportunity to explore a wide range of artistic expression / Program focus on music, film, &amp; culture.</td>
<td>8crate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Student and professional staff are drawn from a wide range of academic disciplines and backgrounds.</td>
<td>8drate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Student culture is about encouraging difference, exploration, and open exchange of ideas</td>
<td>8erate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Emphasis of career exploration or finding alternative careers within majors</td>
<td>8frate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Students focusing on a specific theme like engineering also have to take courses in the College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>8grate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Participants are exposed to a student success center which operates outside of the living-learning program but includes an integrated operation of academic advising and career services</td>
<td>8hrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Program is open to only undeclared freshmen with prior leadership experiences</td>
<td>8irate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Course is given to familiarize new students with campus resources</td>
<td>8jrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Cross programming with other houses/living-learning programs</td>
<td>8krate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. A variety of guest speakers in classes</td>
<td>8lrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Course content has a strong emphasis on foreign languages and the arts</td>
<td>8mrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8:</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Kept</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Programs encouraging students to make thoughtful choices about majors rather than base major decisions on careers. / Workshops on exploring major</td>
<td>8nrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Programs that emphasize not putting time pressure on students to declare majors.</td>
<td>8orate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Programs are designed by faculty and students</td>
<td>8prate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Groups in program make public presentation to other groups on campus throughout the year.</td>
<td>8qrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Students self-select into programs based on major</td>
<td>8rrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Shops (i.e., wood and photo shops) lend themselves to exploration</td>
<td>8srate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Recruiting non arts majors to participate in a program that is focused on the creative and performing arts.</td>
<td>8trate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Program / Institution located in a surrounding community with lots of diversity</td>
<td>8urate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Advisors work individually with assigned students to help them plan their schedules and select majors</td>
<td>8vrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Students work with tutors from different majors across campus</td>
<td>8wrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. The involvement of the first year inquiry courses in a freshman's first semester exposes them to some of the diversity of the university's course offerings at the beginning of their college involvement.</td>
<td>8xrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.0: Refined Comparison Means and Standard Deviations of Eight Categories from Round Two Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Category 1: Providing Opportunities for Students to pursue an academic life style</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Category 2: Allowing students input into program related decisions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.33</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Category 3: Fostering Peer Support for Learning</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.71</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Category 7: Providing Staffing to Serve Special Populations of Students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59.15</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Category 5: Encouraging Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Category 4: Encouraging Active Student Participation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Category 8: Encouraging Students to Explore Different Areas of Study</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.41</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=the number of questions in each category. Outlying values were removed to refine the mean scores of each category. (Appendix N, SAS / EXCEL Output and programs)
Table 3.1 Median Differences of Ranked and Rated Curricula in Question One: Listed From Most to Least Valued by the Respondent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: Curricula that Provides Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style.</th>
<th>Ranked Median</th>
<th>Rated Median</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Learning Experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic courses / formal learning experiences in the residence halls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit / informal, group learning experiences in the residence halls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement with faculty and staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on one interactions with faculty and staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events / Programs</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program mission underlying curricular interventions</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures to meet the needs of the program</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to campus resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Median Differences of Ranked and Rated Curricula in Question Two: Listed From Most to Least Valued by the Respondent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2: Curricula to Encourage Student Input into Program Related Decisions.</th>
<th>Ranked Median</th>
<th>Rated Median</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups of students, staff, and faculty making collaborative decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement / participation in programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students having authority to make significant decisions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected student government leaders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistants trained to work in program</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff accessibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3 Median Differences of Ranked and Rated Curricula in Question Three: Listed From Most to Least Valued by the Respondent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3: Curricula to Encourage Peer Support For Learning</th>
<th>Ranked Median</th>
<th>Rated Median</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study group arrangements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes that are taught with group learning strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming initiatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having role models</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for student participation are clearly laid out to students when they enter the program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive classroom environments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizing student learning, department philosophy, and staff support during RA training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions held by student leaders</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of quiet hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4 Median Differences of Ranked and Rated Curricula in Question Four: Listed From Most to Least Valued by the Respondent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4: Curricula to Encourage Active Student Participation</th>
<th>Ranked Median</th>
<th>Rated Median</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing leadership opportunities for students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students self-select into program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings for both social and academic purposes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An expectation that students participate in programs and events</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in early orientation program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students share concern for each other's academic needs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of assessment data of program to devise strategies to motivate more active participation in academics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular and essential services like advising are offered in the residence halls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs that focus on relationship building</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants talking more about academic issues in comparison to non participants</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and activities are channeled into public spaces</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of program events through publicity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students apply for admission into program which includes a written application and an interview</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer education courses on topics such as relationship violence, AIDS, prevention, eating disorders, and substance abuse</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5 Median Differences of Ranked and Rated Curricula in Question Five: Listed From Most to Least Valued by the Respondent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5: Curricula to Encourage Close Student and Faculty / Staff Relationships</th>
<th>Ranked Median</th>
<th>Rated Median</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student accessibility to faculty, on-site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging informal / out of classroom interactions with faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty connections to particular groups of students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty invited to programs and events</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members are selected to participate who are &quot;hands on&quot; with the students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets targeted towards programs that involve faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on one meetings between professors and students to discuss course matters or any other matters related to university life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A network of faculty, staff, and community members who all have relationships and responsibilities to the students. Network members have access to public spaces and attend programs in the residential college</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring in different faculty and staff to weekly dinners to speak on their areas of expertise</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom space</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student participation levels in living-learning classes are higher in comparison to classes held outside the residence halls.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall director is expected to know every student within the 1st 6 weeks of the semester</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6 Median Differences of Ranked and Rated Curricula in Question Six: Listed From Most to Least Valued by the Respondent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6: Facilities to Meet the Needs of Students</th>
<th>Ranked Median</th>
<th>Rated Median</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spaces that facilitate discussion and study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom spaces in the residence halls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wired rooms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms that are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for meeting and studying</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer labs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living room area used for group meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing new buildings around the needs of the program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining services linked to student programming</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students decorating common areas around the theme of the program</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7 Median Differences of Ranked and Rated Curricula in Question Seven: Listed From Most to Least Valued by the Respondent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7: Curricula to Provide Staffing to Serve Special Populations of Students</th>
<th>Ranked Median</th>
<th>Rated Median</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff receive special training to work in program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All campus staff including faculty, house staff, academic advising staff, librarians, minority peer advisors support the goals of the program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-in staff members</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full partnerships between housing, first year college program, and other services like tutoring that are offered as part of the program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistants are trained in diversity issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program is staffed by a resident tutor, program coordinator, faculty in residence, head resident, and resident advisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled students are given necessary accommodations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical accessibility to buildings and support services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff in first year initiative program receive special training on the developmental needs of first year students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can take advantage of outside academic support services like counseling office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close communication between residential college staff who serve the entire population and centralized office that serve special populations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra funding is provided to staff to do more academic focused work</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident advisors assume traditional resident assistant roles and have responsibilities towards programs. Resident Assistants receive extra compensation for this</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces and resources are provided for tutoring certain populations of students, in particular under-represented minority student populations</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to make human sexual and gender development program welcoming to gays, lesbian, and transsexual students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signers for hearing impaired students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff is recruited from general population which give the house peers as leaders</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.8 Median Differences of Ranked and Rated Curricula in Question Eight: Listed From Most to Least Valued by the Respondent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8: Curricula to Encourage Students to Explore Different Areas of Study</th>
<th>Ranked Median</th>
<th>Rated Median</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty participate from a wide range of disciplines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and professional staff are drawn from a wide range of disciplines</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student culture is about encouraging difference, exploration, and open exchange of ideas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, discussion groups, and courses that cover a variety of topics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs are designed by faculty and students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops to explore different majors</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors work individually with assigned students to help them plan their schedules and select majors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross programming with other houses / living-learning programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students focusing on specific theme like engineering also have to take courses in the College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A variety of guest speakers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on career exploration or finding alternative careers in majors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
Conclusions, Discussion, and Recommendations

Research Question One: Can Consensus be Obtained?

Can consensus among living-learning program administrators be obtained on how Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components are incorporated in living-learning program curricula?

Results indicate that living-learning program administrators were able to reach consensus on how living-learning program curricula are incorporated in living-learning program design and implementation. Administrators listed specific living-learning program components during round one of the Delphi process as explanations for how their programs incorporate Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components. Administrators listed between 22 and 100 curricula for each component. Tables 1.1 through 1.8 and the second and third round questionnaires illustrate how the administrators associated the curricular components of their programs with each of Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1981) eight components. (Appendices J & K, Round two and three questionnaires)

In subsequent rounds of the process, administrators reached consensus on the specific curricula most and least important in each component area. Based on the ratings in round two of the process, mean scores and standard deviations were generated for each component to establish the broad component areas most and least valued by the group. Subtracting the group rating medians generated in round two from the group ranking
medians generated in round three revealed levels of consistency in how specific program curricula were evaluated on multiple occasions. (Tables 2.0 and 3.1 through 3.8)

**Research Question Two: Which Curricular Components are Viewed as Most Important?**

*Which curricular components are viewed as most important to the success of living-learning programs?*

Table 2.0 indicates that the highest rated curricula were those that motivate students to pursue an academic lifestyle. Given the discussion in the literature review that showed how living-learning programs evolved to support the academic mission of the institution, it is not surprising the program curricula in this category were ranked highest by the respondent group. The low standard deviation score of 3.71 shows all the administrators agreed strongly about the importance of the curricula listed in this category.

Given the discussion on how the Oxford and Cambridge residential college models were founded and built on the concept that faculty live in the residence halls with the students, it is surprising that lower categorical mean scores were tabulated for the curricula designed to establish close student and faculty relationships. Table 2.0 shows this category was ranked fifth out of eight categories.

Table 1.5 shows that item 5a, students having access to live-in faculty, was eliminated in the second round with a median rating score of 2.0. Table 3.5 shows that the median difference of students having access to onsite faculty was -2, indicating this item was prioritized by the group in the second and third rounds of the process.

It is possible that fewer of the living-learning program administrators viewed faculty in residence programs as a priority because most who participated in the study do not
have faculty living in their residence halls. Therefore most administrators could not conceptualize whether the students benefit by the kind of informal contact that takes place as a result of having faculty in residence.

Since many American living-learning programs have excluded faculty in residence programs from the earliest adoptions, many administrators might find the concept of having faculty in residence to be completely foreign to the idea of living and learning. Contemporary American living-learning program administrators might feel that having faculty come into the residence halls to teach classes, lead programs, or hold office hours provides enough faculty and student contact. Any other informal contact might be perceived as either unnecessary or too intrusive in the personal lives of the faculty members. Determining attitudes towards faculty in residence programs warrants further research.

The facilities that were listed under category six received the lowest ratings. The high standard deviation score of 10.71 for that category also shows there was dissonance in terms of how individual facilities were evaluated. Many of the facilities listed in category six were particular to specific kinds of institutions or living-learning environments. The low mean and high standard deviation score for facilities probably reflects feeling on the part of administrators that the kinds of facilities a program houses are very institutional or program specific. (Table 2.0 Refined comparison means and standard deviations of eight categories from round two data)

In the second and third round questionnaires, there was consensus that more general kinds of facilities, like classroom spaces and spaces that facilitate discussion, should be priorities for all living-learning programs. The qualitative comment made in round two
by an administrator who felt that he did not need better rooms and common spaces to make his house system work properly supports this interpretation of the quantitative data.

Therefore, lower ratings for specific kinds of facilities do not imply that facilities are low priorities for living-learning programs. Determining particular kinds of facilities most appropriate in particular kinds of living-learning environments warrants further research.

Implications for Further Research

There is potential to use these study results and the methodology employed to gather further knowledge about living-learning program curricula. The use of web-based questionnaires can also be used in future Delphi studies.

Through the abundant qualitative responses that were gathered during round one of the Delphi process, it was apparent that the living-learning program administrators were able to identify with and relate their program curricula to Riker (1965) and Rowe's (1981) eight components.

Each of Riker (1965) and Rowe's (1981) components could be the focus of separate studies on living-learning program curricula. Examining the curricula that were derived from this study in each component area and finding ways to evaluate their effectiveness and practicality in living-learning program design would be good topics for further research.

Utilizing observational data taken from site visits could provide elaborate details on how these components are implemented. Observational studies or interviews could also reveal levels of student satisfaction and participation in curricular components. Detailed analysis of facility issues in specific kinds of living-learning environments and faculty-in-
residence programs would be helpful supplemental information to the results of this study.

The Delphi methodology could be employed to survey certain types of programs or institutions on how Riker (1965) and Rowe's (1981) components are actualized in different kinds of environments. A study that focused on colleges and universities in a state or region of the country could help a network of institutions that function under similar policies, political environments, staff, and budgetary resources.

Likewise, institutions with similar student populations and that are of similar size and mission could be surveyed using the Delphi methodology to determine trends in curricular components. For example, Delphi research could reveal a list of curricular components that are essential to living-learning environments in small private colleges. Delphi research could also be used to uncover curricular components native to theme houses since these environments were not explored in this study.

The use of web-based questionnaires to gather information in the Delphi process has not been used before this study. In previous Delphi studies, questionnaires were sent through U.S. mail or distributed via email (Shearin, 1995; Clark and Scales, 2000). In this study, the employment of web-based questionnaires yielded a high response rate and presented information and instructions in a format that respondents could easily follow.

Respondents were also given the option of seeking additional instructions or information if needed. The option of clicking on different sections of the questionnaires to view subcategories or seeing a sample questionnaire was not available in the U.S. mail or e-mail versions of Delphi questionnaires that were previously administered (Shearin,
Implications for Practice

The curricular components derived through this study have great implications for practice. Institutions that are planning, building, evaluating, and modifying living-learning programs can utilize the lists of curricula in models and processes for decision-making. The curricula that were valued by the respondents could be prioritized as core components in the planning, design, and modification phases of a program’s life span. These comprehensive lists of curricula can also be used to motivate discussion and thinking about new possibilities and opportunities to expand existing programs.

Research Question Three: Can a Model be Used to Incorporate Curricular Components?

Can a model be used to incorporate these curricular components into individual components?

The Cycle of Intentionality discussed in the review of the literature and illustrated in Appendix C is a model for which curricular components can be incorporated into living-learning programs (Ward and Mitchell, 1996). The results of this study provide structure and support in working through the four-phases of the cycle.

Having research that supports and prioritizes specific curricula and broader categories of curricula alleviates guesswork and impulsive speculation in working through all the stages of the cycle. For example, the group of administrators prioritized active learning experiences as a critical curricular component. Having this information enables living-
learning program administrators to work through the phases of the cycle in the following manner:

1. Needs assessment - Stage has been accomplished by study results that indicate active learning experiences are of the highest priority in motivating students to pursue an academic life style.

2. Articulate intended outcomes - Students will learn from their living-learning experience through engagement in active learning.

3. Design learning opportunities - Subcategory list 1C in the rounds two and three questionnaires give administrators a comprehensive list of opportunities to accomplish this intended learning outcome. (Appendices J & K Round two and three questionnaires)

4. Outcomes assessment - Summative and formative program evaluations can take place to determine if active learning did occur and student participants were engaged by learning opportunities that were chosen.

In this example, the articulation of this outcome and the design of learning opportunities are supported by the study results. Without the guidance of the results, administrators would be making decisions based on speculation that might not be supported by precedent or experts in the field.

Decision-Making Processes

The results also help with decision-making processes that involve prioritizing, enhancing, and eliminating curricula. Limited budgetary, staff, and faculty resources can
result in administrators having to make tough choices about the types of curricula that can be included or maintained in a living-learning environment. Giving administrators lists of curricula that are viewed as priorities and practiced in established programs provides guidance for these kinds of decisions.

Listing, communicating, and evaluating curricula from multiple programs created the results of this study. Increased communication and collaboration among programs can help administrators determine the best curricula and modes of practice for specific programs at individual institutions or a genre of programs that might exist at a single institution or a network of schools.

Consultants who specialize in the area of living-learning program design and evaluation can utilize these study results to assist in all stages of program growth and development processes. Institutes like The National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition at the University of South Carolina should endorse the study results to ensure that their member institutions have access to best practices in the field (University of South Carolina, 2001).

The American College Personnel Association promotes accountability for best practices in student affairs through their publication like, State of the Art of Preparation and Practice in Student Affairs (Evans and Tobin, 1998). Standards for best practice in living-learning programs could be included in publications like this to ensure that institutions are maximizing their potential to influence the lives of their students.

Some programs are designed to serve a specific population of students or are created to address goals and needs that are institutional specific. Since the Delphi process eliminated such curricula, it is difficult to generalize the study results towards all motives
and needs. It is possible however, to use the curricula that have been established and 
prioritized as tools to foster student learning and involvement as standards for practice in 
any housing environment that seeks a partnership with the academic enterprise of the 
institution.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Sponsorship Letter from ACUHO-I

Spring 2001

Dear Housing Officer,

In the coming months, you will be receiving e-mails requesting that you fill out surveys that will be published on the web. These surveys are designed to assess how your living learning program incorporates Riker (1965) and Rowe’s (1979) eight components in program management and curriculum design. The data collected will be used to create standards for living learning program curriculum and management strategies. Your living learning program has been selected as a model program. It is hoped that the information you provide will inspire other programs to follow the leadership your housing department has established.

This research has the endorsement of the ACUHO-I Research and Information Committee. Seth Leibowitz, a doctoral student at North Carolina State University, provided extensive information about the project and the survey instruments have been reviewed by the Research and Information Committee. As per the requirements for Research and Information Committee endorsement, the results of this research will be shared with the committee and included in our files. In addition, if deemed appropriate, results may be published in the Talking Stick and could be submitted for publication in the Journal of College and University Housing.

I encourage you to take some time to complete the instruments. Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important research project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Meaghan A. Brune, Chair
ACUHO-I Research and Information Committee

Cc: Rita Moser, President, ACUHO-I
    Gary Schwarzmueller, Executive Director, ACUHO-I
Appendix B

Schematic of Penshurst Place

The Great Hall, Pantry and Buttery of Penshurst Place, Kent

Penshurst Place was built by a London wool merchant, Sir John de Pulteney. Central to its design was the Great Hall built in 1341, measuring 64 ft. by 39 ft. and 48 ft. high. It had a central hearth, an open timber roof and a "louvre" allowing smoke to escape. The upper end of the hall had a raised dais and steps leading to a withdrawing room. A screen formed a passageway between the entrances and led from one court to another. A balcony, located above, was known as the Minstrels' Gallery. Three doors at this end led to the service areas, including a pantry and buttery. Penshurst Place was enlarged, first by Henry V's brother, the Duke of Bedford, in mid-fifteenth century and later by the Sidney family who have owned Penshurst since 1585.

Parallel: The design of the Great Hall is consistent with many houses built during this period. It is no great surprise, then, to find the same layout in the medieval colleges of Oxford and Cambridge. At Cambridge the halls tended to be located in the quadrangle opposite the main entrance while at Oxford they are generally located along one side. In addition to the usual dinner and supper activities that included the reading of the Bible, the hall was used in some colleges as a place for disputations, as a lecture-room and, especially at Christmas, as a theater.

The Master and Fellows sat at the high-table located on the raised dais. Long tables and benches for others were arranged lengthwise in the hall. Depending on the design and location of the kitchen, there were two or three doors leading from the hall to the service areas, typically to the buttery, pantry and kitchen. Triple doorways were common at Cambridge, while at Oxford, where kitchens were built as separate buildings, two doors were the rule. Some colleges provided other service rooms such as bakehouses, brewhouses, storerooms for salt fish and, in the case of King's College, a slaughterhouse and a skin-house.

Appendix C

Cycle of Intentionality

Appendix D

Sample

**Type**: 8 Private; 12 Public

**Size**: 4 SPR (Small Private); 2 MPR (Med Private); 2 LPR (Large Private); 2 SPL (Small Public); 3 MPL (Medium Public); 7LPL (Large Public).

**Geographic Location**: NE (North East) = 5; SE (South East) = 5; SW (South West) = 3; CN (Central North) = 6; CS (Central South) = 1.

**Type of Program**: Residential College = 6; Academic Residential = 3; Living-Learning Center = 5; Residential Learning Community = 2; FYI = 3; Residential Learning Community and FYI = 1.

**Administration**: Academic = 4; Housing = 9; Student Affairs = 2; Housing and Academics = 3; Separate = 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Type of Admin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of Penn</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>LPR</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Residential College</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Southern Cal</td>
<td>29,590</td>
<td>LPR</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Residential College</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>34,837</td>
<td>LPL</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Living-learning Centers</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>13,481</td>
<td>MPR</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Residential College</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>18,088</td>
<td>MPR</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Living-Learning Center</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>9,080</td>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Living-Learning Centers</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton</td>
<td>5,958</td>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Academic Residential</td>
<td>Housing &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Residential College</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macalester</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Living-Learning Center</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Vermont</td>
<td>9508</td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Residential Learning Community</td>
<td>Academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>11,483</td>
<td>MPL</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Residential Learning Community</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Missouri - Columbia</td>
<td>24,220</td>
<td>LPL</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>FYI</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample of Schools Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of California at Irvine</td>
<td>15874</td>
<td>MPL SW</td>
<td>MPL SW</td>
<td>Residential Learning</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communities / FYI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY – Stony Brook</td>
<td>14799</td>
<td>MPL NE</td>
<td>MPL NE</td>
<td>Living-learning Center</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>25357</td>
<td>LPL SE</td>
<td>LPL SE</td>
<td>FYI</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>34863</td>
<td>LPL SE</td>
<td>LPL SE</td>
<td>Academic Residential</td>
<td>Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>26435</td>
<td>LPL SE</td>
<td>LPL SE</td>
<td>FYI</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona State University</td>
<td>5,819</td>
<td>SPL CN</td>
<td>SPL CN</td>
<td>Residential College</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of IL at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>36,046</td>
<td>LPL CN</td>
<td>LPL CN</td>
<td>Academic Residential</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>36,306</td>
<td>LPL CN</td>
<td>LPL CN</td>
<td>Residential Colleges</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Phone Call Script

Contact Name:
Contact Title:
Phone Number:
Institution:
Living-learning Program Name:
(If program in directory no longer exists do not follow through)

My name is Seth Leibowitz. In partnership with the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International, I am researching curricular components of living-learning programs.

Your living-learning program has been chosen as a model program to be featured in this study. The results from the study may be published in the *Journal of College and University Housing Student Housing* and will be helpful to other administrators across the country who are designing, implementing, and evaluating living-learning programs.

I am asking for your help by offering to fill out questionnaires to report the features of your program. You can also opt to have a designee in your organization participate. Participation in this project will take approximately an hour total. The hour participation time will be dispersed over a four to six week period starting in mid September and ending in early to mid to late October.

Would your institution be willing to participate in this important research project?
Circle: **Yes** or **No**
Would you be willing to fill out the questionnaires or would you like to appoint someone? (If they want to appoint someone go to Section C on the script. If they can participate go to Section A)

Section A

I need to verify that you have the following qualifications to participate in the project:

Our goal is to get a representative from your program who has expert knowledge about your program. (Check if they have them)

   At least a masters degree. ____

   b. Having been working full-time with the university and living-learning program being studied for at least a year. _____

   c. Spent a minimum of 20% (average of five to eight hours a week) for at least a year.

   working with the living program being studied. ____

   d. Will be available to participate and/or have access to E-mail and an online connection through mid September _____

   (Go to section B if they have all the qualifications)

Section B

I want to explain in more detail what is involved in participating. All participation in this study is going to be done through E-mail and online forms.
• Sometime in the next few weeks you will receive an email from me indicating that you should go to a web site, follow some instructions, and fill out a questionnaire that will ask you to list components of the living-learning program that you work with. Filling out the first questionnaire will take between 20 minutes and a half-hour.

• Approximately 10 days after you have filled out the first survey, you will receive a second E-mail that will instruct you to go to a second questionnaire and rate how you feel about importance of specific curricular components in living-learning programs. Filling out this survey will take between 10-15 minutes.

• Approximately 10 days after you have filled out the second questionnaire, a third and final email will be sent to you asking you to go to a third questionnaire and rank curricular components in terms of their importance in living-learning programs.

There are 19 other participants in the project who will be responding to questionnaires at the same time you are. To keep pace with the others, it is important that you fill-out each questionnaire in the time frame allotted and participate through all three phases of the process. Can you agree to do this? Circle: **Yes or No**

If they say no, ask is there another administrator you can think of with the minimum qualifications to participate who would be willing to help out. If they give you a referral go to part C. If no, say, thank you very much for your time and hang up.
To participate in this study you need access to email and an on-line connection. Do you have this? Circle: Yes or No

If they say no, discuss the possibility of using the campus library and setting up an email account for them through hotmail, etc. If this isn't a possibility ask them if it would okay to send the questionnaire to them through the mail.

If they say yes, you need to know how to click on a "hot link" in an email to get to a web site. Do you know how to do that? Circle: Yes or No

Do you know how to use a web browser like Internet Explorer or Netscape Navigator? Circle Yes or No

If they say no, explain to them how to do this.

If they say yes to all, ask for the following information.

Full-Name ____________________
Title _________________________
Phone Number __________________
Email Address ___________________
Physical Address _________________________________

I will be sending you some information through U.S. mail. Please check your email for the first questionnaire. It should be in your inbox sometime within the next two weeks.
Thank you very much for your participation in this project. Leave them with contact information.

Section C

I need to verify with you that the person you are referring me to has the following qualifications in order to participate in the study. Our goal is to get a representative from your program who has expert knowledge on your program. (Check if they have them)

a. At least a masters degree. ____

b. Having been working full-time with the university and living-learning program being studied for at least a year. _____

c. Spent a minimum of 20% (average of five to eight hours a week) for at least a year working with the living program being studied. ____

d. Will be available to participate and/or have access to E-mail and an online connection through mid September _____

Referral's Full-Name ____________________
Referral's Title _______________________
Referral's Phone Number __________________
Referral's Email Address ________________
Referral's Physical Address _______________

Is it okay if I contact this person by phone within the next week? Let me leave you with my contact information.

Thank you for your assistance.

(Ask referral questions under section B)
Appendix F

E-mail Communications To Respondents

Dear

I have chosen your program to be featured in a study in partnership with the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I). In conjunction with ACUHO-I, I am researching curricular components of living-learning programs. The results from this project will enable me to complete my doctoral dissertation study at North Carolina State University.

The results of this study may be published in the Journal of College and University Housing. In addition, the results will be helpful to other administrators who design, implement, and evaluate living-learning programs.

To participate, I ask that you complete three on-line questionnaires that will be sent to you via E-mail. The questionnaires will be distributed over a 4 to 6 week period. Each questionnaire will take a short period of time to complete.

To participate in the study you must have the following qualifications:

a. At least a Master’s degree.
b. Working full-time with the ***** and ****** for at least one year.
c. Spend 5 hours each week involved with administration or leadership of the *****
d. Be available to participate and/or have access to E-mail and an online connection through mid October

It is helpful if you have E-mail access, know how to use a web browser like Internet Explorer or Netscape, and know how to click on a hyperlink in an E-mail message to get to a web site.

If you agree to participate, you will receive an E-mail from me within a week. This message will provide you with a link to a web site that has the first questionnaire as well as detailed instructions on how to complete the questionnaire.

This is a national study. In addition to your expertise, nineteen other experts in the area of living-learning programs will be participating at the same time. Participation will involve filling out each on-line questionnaires within a 4 to 5 day time frame from when the initial E-mail is received.

If you are unable to participate for any reason, please let me know if there is someone else within your program who does. If you can identify someone else, please E-mail me the following information:

• Name
• Title
• Phone Number
• E-mail Address
• Physical Address

Please feel free to forward this E-mail to that person.

When you determine that you can complete the questionnaires, please E-mail me the following information:

• Your title
• Work Phone Number
• E-mail Address
• Physical Address

I will be sending you a packet of relevant information via US Mail and will contact you via E-mail to inform you when the first of the three questionnaires is ready.

Please feel free to contact me at any time during the course of the study. I can be reached via E-mail at Seth_Leibowitz@unc.edu or by phone at 919.929.4546.

We appreciate your help and willingness to participate in the study. We believe that the results of the study will be helpful to living-learning program administrators.

Seth Leibowitz
Doctoral Student in Higher Education Administration
North Carolina State University

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the living-learning program study. I am excited about the expertise of the program administrators who will be participating. Each institution selected to participate has a history of providing high quality living and learning experiences for their students.

To protect the confidentiality of the participants, I have created a list serve. Using the list-serve I will send an E-mail to inform the group when each questionnaire will be published on my web site. The list-serve is for informational purposes only and individuals will not be able to post messages to the entire list.

Click on the link below to complete the on-line consent form and the first questionnaire.


Please complete the questionnaire by Friday, September 28th.
Again, thank you for your participation.

Seth Leibowitz  
Doctoral Student  
North Carolina State University

I am pleased to report that we received a return rate of 100% on the first questionnaire. I appreciate your efforts, the thoughtful comments, and the timely responses.

I hope everyone received their packets in the mail with the North Carolina State University promotional items. If you do not receive yours by the end of the week, please E-mail me and I will make sure that a packet gets to you.

The link to the second questionnaire is below:

http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/users/s/sleibow/dissertation/QUEST2.HTML

Please complete your responses by Thursday, October 11th.

Your continued participation in this project is very much appreciated.

Seth Leibowitz  
Doctoral Student  
North Carolina State University

I am pleased to report that we received a return rate of 100% on the second questionnaire. The group's overwhelming response and enthusiasm towards my project will make for very compelling results.

The link to the final questionnaire is below:

http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/users/s/sleibow/dissertation/QUEST3.HTML

Please complete your responses by Wednesday, October 24th.

I am expecting that my dissertation will be posted on the libraries portion of the North Carolina State University web site in March. I will E-mail the list when the results can be viewed there.

Thanks again for responding to the final questionnaire and your support of my research.

Seth Leibowitz  
Doctoral Student  
North Carolina State University
Appendix G

Letter and Post Card to Respondents

September 24, 2001

Dear

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study. We are confident that the results from this study will be helpful to those involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of living-learning programs.

Attached is a letter of endorsement from the research committee of the Association of College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I). Their endorsement of the project enables us to make the results of study available to a wide audience of housing, academic, and student affairs professionals.

Please enjoy these North Carolina State University promotional items as a small token of our appreciation for your participation in this project.

By now, you should have received an E-mail that will instruct you how to participate in the first round of the study. If you have any questions, feel free to E-mail or call Seth Leibowitz. His contact information is the following: Seth_Leibowitz@unc.edu; 919-929-4546

Thanks again for your enthusiasm about the project. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Seth Leibowitz
Doctoral Student
Adult and Community College Education
North Carolina State University

Dr. Timothy R. Luckadoo
Associate Vice Chancellor
Division of Student Affairs
North Carolina State University
John,

It was nice meeting you last week. Thanks again for your participation in my research. I think your first year college staff could benefit from my results and I would be happy to share them with you when I have learned at the completion stages of my project.

Seth Lebarte
Postdoc Scholar
Consent Form

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. The researcher will use your feedback to create a standard curriculum for living learning programs. A standard curriculum will assist all living learning program administrators with creating and implementing strategies to build and enhance living learning programs.

The feedback recorded through the web based questionnaires will be used for the purposes of this study only. Names of individuals participating in this study will not be published.

By participating in this study you are agreeing to complete three questionnaires that will be distributed to you via e-mail and submitted on the web during a four to six week period. Each of the three questionnaires will take only a few minutes to complete. All study participants must complete all three questionnaires.

After the results from the first questionnaire are tabulated, you will receive notification via e-mail that the second questionnaire is available on-line.

There are 20 institutions participating in this research. A list of all participating programs can be viewed on-line.

If you are ready to begin, click below and you will be taken to the first questionnaire. If you do not wish to participate in the study or have any questions, please e-mail Seth_Leibowitz@unc.edu.

I Agree to Participate in This Study
Round One Questionnaire
(On-Line Version)

Round I

Living Learning Program Questionnaire

Please answer these questions as they apply to your living learning program, residential college program, system of living learning programs, or system of residential colleges.

Below are eight questions that ask you to list the attributes of your program as they relate to eight components of living learning programs. These components were published in Riker's (1965) publication, *College Housing as Learning Centers* and Rowe's (1981) publication, *Environmental Structuring: Residence Halls as Living Learning Centers*.

If your living learning program does not provide programs or services that are relevant to one or more of the eight component categories, leave that section blank.

Click [HERE](#) to see a sample, completed questionnaire.

Once you have completed the questions, click the **SUBMIT** key on the bottom of the form.

**First & Last Name:**

**Street Address:**

**City, State, & Zip Code**

**Phone:**

**E-mail:**

**Institution:**

Type of Institution (i.e. Large Public, Large Private, Medium Public, Medium Private, Small Public, or Small Private):
## Round One Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Living Learning or Residential College Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 1

List How Your Living Learning or Residential College Program:

- Provides Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style

### Question 2

Allows Student Input into Program Related Decisions

### Question 3

Fosters Peer Support for Learning
Question 4
Encourages Active Student Participation

Question 5
Encourages Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff

Question 6
Provides Facilities to Meet Student Needs
Question 7
Provides Staffing to Serve Special Populations of Students

Question 8
Encourages Students to Explore Different Areas of Study

Please E-mail Seth_Leibowitz@unc.edu if you have questions
Sample Living Learning Questionnaire

Round I
Living Learning Questionnaire
Sample Form

This is a sample form to give you an idea of the kinds of responses that the researcher is looking for. All sample responses are bold. You can click on the bottom of this form to get back to the blank form or use the back button on your browser.

First & Last Name: Seth Leibowitz
Street Address: CB # 3105, Carr Bldg,
City, State, & Zip Code: Chapel Hill NC 27514
Phone: 919-929-4546
Email: Seth_Leibowitz@unc.edu

Institution: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Large Public

Name of Living Learning or Residential College Program:

Academic Enhancement Program

Position Title:

Area Director of Housing

Question 1:
List How Your Living Learning or Residential College Program:
Sample Living Learning Questionnaire

Provides Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style

Study Groups, Faculty Lectures, Interest Groups, Emphasis on Quiet Hours and Study Time

Questions 2:
Allows Student Input into Program Related Decisions

Student-Run Steering Committee, Student Coordinators, Resident Assistants Trained To Work in Program

Question 3:
Fosters Peer Support for Learning

Student Leaders in Program, Student-Run Meetings, Mentorship Program, Student Government Involvement

Question 4:
Encourages Active Student Participation

Students Sign Contracts Committing to Participate, All Students Are Required to Fill Set Curriculum, All Student in The Building Participate in the Program, Students Are Selected to Participate in Program Rather Than Appointed.

Question 5:
Encourages Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff

Faculty Led Lecture Series, In House Class for Freshmen, Faculty Involvement on the Steering Committee, Faculty Mentorship Program.

Question 6:
Provides Facilities to Meet Student Needs

Class Room in Building, Building is Close to Classrooms, Study Lounges Have Appropriate Tables and Chairs, Building Has Lounges Designated For Quiet and Group Study.
Question 7:
Provides Staffing to Serve Special Populations of Students

Resident Assistants Selected to Work With Program, Hall Manager Has a Background in Academic Program Administration, Resident Assistants, Coordinators, and Government are Encouraged to Work Together to Provide Academic Programming.

Question 8:
Encourages Student to Explore Different Areas of Study?

Faculty From Different Disciplines Are Recruited to Present, Interest Groups Are Formed on A Variety of Topics, Diversity in Selection of Program Participants in Emphasized, Students Are Encouraged to Provide Lectures on Their Academic Foci.

Click HERE to Go to Blank Form or use the back button on your browser.
Round II

Living Learning Program Questionnaire

Thanks for filling out the 2nd Living Learning Program Questionnaire.

The living learning program interventions below were derived from your feedback on the first questionnaires. For each of the items below, rate the importance of each criteria listed in each category. To select a rating, click your mouse in the appropriate button next to each program intervention.

While each of these living learning program interventions are impressive and unique to a particular kind of environment, give high rating to only those interventions that you feel would be most effective in motivating student learning and participation in a living learning environment. Lower rating should be given to those interventions that you feel would least affect student learning and participation in a living learning environment.

The goal of this study is to create a list of curricular interventions that are viewed as most effective by living learning program administrators. As you rate these interventions you should consider realistic factors such as budgets, staff resources, and faculty motivation levels to participate in residence hall activities.

In your ratings you should also be considering the degree to which each intervention is relevant to the major sub-heading that it is listed under. (For example, if setting up a lemonade stand on campus is listed as an intervention that provides opportunities for students to pursue an academic life style and you feel that a lemonade stand does not provide these kinds of opportunities then you should rate that intervention accordingly)
Round Two Questionnaire

The rating values have been assigned a numerical significance which is listed below:

1=should not be in any living-learning programs
2=might work for some living-learning programs
3=should be included in most living-learning programs;
4=is necessary for all living-learning programs

There is a text box below each question if you wish to input additional curricular interventions or list any additional information you feel is necessary.

Once you have completed the questions, click the SUBMIT key on the bottom of the form.

Name: 

Email: 

Institution: 

Living Learning Program Name: 

Question 1: Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style.

* The group gave 95 answers to this question. To make the rating process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.
Round Two Questionnaire

a. Academic courses / formal learning experiences in the residence halls

b. Non-credit / informal, group learning experiences in the residence halls

c. Active learning experiences

d. One on one interactions with faculty and staff

e. Events / programs

f. Facilities

g. Technology

h. Policies and procedures to meet the needs of program participants

i. Program mission underlying curricular interventions

j. Connections to campus resources
Round Two Questionnaire

**k. Student engagement with faculty and staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Not be in Any</th>
<th>Might Work for Some</th>
<th>Should Be Included In Most</th>
<th>Necessary for All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Residential colleges grant degrees and graduate students. (i.e. Student gets a BA in English from the Residential College of Literature and Sciences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Not be in Any</th>
<th>Might Work for Some</th>
<th>Should Be Included In Most</th>
<th>Necessary for All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any additional ways living learning programs provide opportunities for students to pursue an academic lifestyle. You can also use this box if you want to explain your ratings or make comments on components that are listed.

**Question 2: Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions.**

* The group gave 45 answers to this question. To make the rating process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

**a. Groups of students, staff, & faculty make collaborative decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Not be in Any</th>
<th>Might Work for Some</th>
<th>Should Be Included In Most</th>
<th>Necessary for All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. Students having authority/responsibility to make significant decisions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Not be in Any</th>
<th>Might Work for Some</th>
<th>Should Be Included In Most</th>
<th>Necessary for All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round Two Questionnaire

- **c. Elected student government leaders**

- **d. Decision making processes**

- **e. Student involvement / participation in programs**

  f. Staff accessibility (i.e., students having e-mail links from a web site to give the director feedback about the program)

  g. Giving students little input into the structure of course content

  h. Resident assistant trained to work in program

List any additional ways to allow student input into program related decisions. You can also use this box if you want to explain your ratings or make comments on components that are listed.
Question 3: Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning

* The group gave 50 answers to this question. To make the rating process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Should Not be in Any</th>
<th>Might Work for Some</th>
<th>Should Be Included In Most</th>
<th>Necessary for All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Study group arrangements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Tutoring</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Supportive classroom environments.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Classes are taught with group learning strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Having role models</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Programming initiatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. Positions held by student leaders

h. Academic support services having a strong presence in the halls so that seeking academic assistance is viewed as a very "normal" thing to do among the community

i. Clusters of peers providing support for learning

j. Enforcement of quiet hours

k. Students help each other get to class

l. Small class sizes

m. The community is informed of all the participant's majors so relationships can be formed with students in like majors
Round Two Questionnaire

n. Expectations for student participation are clearly laid out to students when they enter the program

o. Student participants are involved campus wide in a wide variety of programs and activities

p. During RA training we talk about the Student Learning Experience at the college and help them understand the philosophy of the College and Department of Residential Life. We send the message that student staff support is essential in helping students focus on their priorities.

List any additional ways to foster peer support for learning. You can also use this box if you want to explain your ratings or make comments on components that are listed.

Question 4: Methods Used to Encourage Active Student Participation

* The group gave 45 answers to this question. To make the rating process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

a. Students apply for admission into the program which includes a written application and an interview.

Should Not be in Any Might Work for Some Should Be Included In Most Necessary for All

138
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Students sign a statement of commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students pay dues additional from housing fees and tuition to be part of the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. An expectation that students participate in programs and events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Students who don't participate are asked to leave the program following a probationary period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Participation in early orientation for program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Meetings for both social and academic purposes. Social programs can include students eating and recreating together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Participants talking more about academic issues in comparison to non participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Staff is provided assessment data of students perceptions about the residence hall environment relative to its academic atmosphere, involvement with faculty, use of academic resources and are then asked to translate the data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round Two Questionnaire

into strategies to motivate more active participation in academic activities / Student feedback and end of the year evaluations are used to refine program

j. Staff gauge and encourage participation in one on one meetings. / Participation is monitored by a student and staff committee.

k. Providing leadership opportunities for students

l. Traffic and activities are are channeled into public spaces.

m. Students self-select into the program

n. Posting messages about events on campus in the halls / Publicity through e-mail, flyers, posters, etc. / Students commit to promote the program by sitting at an information desk

o. Active student learning motivates participation

p. Students share concern for each other’s academic needs

q. Peer education courses on topics such as relationship violence, HIV/AIDS prevention, eating disorders, and substance abuse.
Round Two Questionnaire

r. Last lecture series (Professors are asked to construct their last and best lecture)

s. Popular and essential academic services like advising are provided in the residence halls

t. Students are given the opportunity to participate in the program prior to the beginning of their freshmen semester (at orientation)

u. Programs that focus on relationship building to instill the value of developing relationships with neighbors.

List any additional ways to encourage active student participation. You can also use this box if you want to explain your ratings or make comments on components that are listed.

Question 5: Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff.

* The group gave 45 answers to this question. To make the rating process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Not be in Any</th>
<th>Might Work for Some</th>
<th>Should Be Included in Most</th>
<th>Necessary for All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round Two Questionnaire

Each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

a. Student accessibility to live-in faculty

b. Student accessibility to faculty, on-site

c. Faculty get invitations to programs and events

d. Faculty connections to a particular groups of students

e. Encouraging informal / out of classroom interactions with faculty

f. Student participation levels in living learning classes are higher in comparison to classes held outside of the residence halls.

g. Budgets targeted for programs that involve faculty.

h. Classroom space

i. A network of faculty, staff, and community members who all have relationships.
and responsibilities to the students. All members of these networks have access to public spaces and attend programs in the residential college.

j. Students have close relationships with custodial, maintenance, and food service workers within a small residential college system.

k. Faculty members are selected who are "hands on" with the students.

l. One on one meeting between professors and students to discuss course matters or any other matters related to university life.

m. Residence hall director is expected to know every student within the 1st 6 weeks of the semester

n. Bring in different faculty and staff to weekly dinners to speak on their areas of expertise.

o. Housing staff contacting the student's advisor to see if he or she has experienced any of the same behaviors that we are seeing.

p. The first year initiative instructors and the advisers who teach the university
Round Two Questionnaire

orientations courses meet before and during the semester to discuss strategy, problems, and goals; and the faculty and advisers attend each others classes on an arranged basis

q. Weekly lectures led by faculty

List any additional ways to encourage close relationships with faculty and students. You can also use this box if you want to explain your ratings or make comments on components that are listed.

Question 6: Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Needs.

* The group gave 60 answers to this question. To make the rating process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

a. Spaces that facilitate discussion and studying

b. Students are permitted to decorate common areas. (Decorations are relevant to program themes)
Round Two Questionnaire

c. Classroom spaces in residence halls


d. Equipment


e. Computer labs


f. Wired rooms


g. Living room area used for group meetings


h. Outdoor basketball court / Volleyball court / recreation room


i. Amphitheater for programs / theater


j. Classrooms that are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for meetings and studying
Round Two Questionnaire

k. Library in house  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

l. Facilities for students interested in the fine and performing arts  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

m. Language table rooms / Foreign language laboratory  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

n. Most amenities/student services are decentralized in each residential college.  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

o. Dining services are linked to student programming  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

p. A "Masters House" located on site that provides a significant degree of student support. (Masters are tenured faculty that do much of the work that residence life personnel do at most other institutions.)  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

q. Faculty apartments in residence halls  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

r. Designing new buildings around the needs of the program  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Round Two Questionnaire

s. Housing the program in an old / historic building on campus

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

t. Fire places

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

u. Indoor swimming pool

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

v. Dining hall in house

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

w. Large living spaces with high ceilings

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

x. Beautiful grounds with much green space

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

y. Study abroad and Americorps offices located in residence hall

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

List any other facilities that should be included in living learning programs. You can also use this box if you want to explain your ratings or make comments on components that are listed.
**Question 7: Methods Used to Provide Staffing that Serve Special Populations of Students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Not be in Any</th>
<th>Might Work for Some</th>
<th>Should Be Included In Most</th>
<th>Necessary for All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Program is staffed by a resident tutor, program coordinator, faculty in residence, head resident, and resident advisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Staff receives special training to work with program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Peer advisors assume both traditional resident assistant and responsibilities towards program and for doing so receive additional compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Focus is on community education team comprised of peer advisors and traditional paraprofessional staff who are called community advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Staff in first year initiative program receive training on the specific development and academic needs of first year students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Live-in staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round Two Questionnaire

g. All campus staff including faculty, house staff, academic advising staff, librarians, minority peer advisors support the goals of the programs

h. Close communication between residential college staff who serve the entire population and centralized offices that serve special populations.

i. Signers for hearing impaired students

j. Students can take advantage of outside academic support services like the counseling office.

k. Strategies in place to make Human Sexual and Gender Development program welcoming to gays, lesbian, and transsexual students.

l. Staff is recruited from the general population which gives the house peers as leaders

m. Resident assistants are trained in diversity issues.

n. Disabled students are given necessary accommodations.
Round Two Questionnaire

o. Space and resources are provided for tutoring certain populations of students, in particular under-represented minority students

p. Physical accessibility to buildings and support services

q. Extra funding is provided to staff to do more academic focused work

r. Faculty are hired who come from other residential college / living learning program systems

s. Resident assistants and graduate assistants have academic backgrounds that are similar to the students in their halls/ Resident assistants are assigned to specialized in working with specific populations.

t. Faculty devoted to the residential college / living learning program as their full-time responsibility

u. Undergraduate research coordinator and service learning coordinator

v. Full partnership between housing, first year college program, and other services like tutoring that are offered as part of the program.
List any other ways living learning programs should provide staffing. You can also use this box if you want to explain your ratings or make comments on components that are listed.

**Question 8: Methods Used to Encourage Students to Explore Different Areas of Study.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Not be in Any</th>
<th>Might Work for Some</th>
<th>Should Be Included In Most</th>
<th>Necessary for All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Faculty participate from a wide range of disciplines

b. Reading and discussion groups that cover a wide range of topics and interests. / Offering in house courses on a wide variety of topics

c. Students have an opportunity to explore a wide range of artistic expression / Program focus on music, film, & culture.

d. Student and professional staff are drawn from a wide range of academic disciplines and backgrounds.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Student culture is about encouraging difference, exploration, and open exchange of ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Emphasis of career exploration or finding alternative careers within majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Students focusing on a specific theme like engineering also have to take courses in the College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Participants are exposed to a student success center which operates outside of the living learning program but includes an integrated operation of academic advising and career services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Program is open to only undeclared freshman with prior leadership experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Course is given to familiarize new students with campus resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Cross programming with other houses/living-learning programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. A variety of guest speakers in classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Course content has a strong emphasis on foreign languages and the arts</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Programs encouraging students to make thoughtful choices about majors rather than base major decisions on careers. / Workshops on exploring major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Programs that emphasize not putting time pressure on students to declare majors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Programs are designed by faculty and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Groups in program make public presentation to other groups on campus throughout the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Students self-select into programs based on major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Shops (i.e., wood and photo shops ) lend themselves to exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Recruiting non arts majors to participate in a program that is focused on the creative and performing arts.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
u. Program / Institution located in a surrounding community with lots of diversity

v. Advisors work individually with assigned to students to help them plan their schedules and select majors

w. Students work with tutors from different majors across campus

x. The involvement of the first year inquiry courses in a freshman's first semester exposes them to some of the diversity of the university's course offerings at the beginning of their college involvement.

List any other ways living learning programs should encourage students to explore different areas of study. You can also use this box if you want to explain your ratings or make comments on components that are listed.

Please e-mail Seth_Leibowitz@unc.edu if you have any questions.
a. Academic Courses / Formal Learning Experiences in the Residence Halls

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)

1. 80 Different courses offered each year with enrollment restrictions to program participants
2. Small Classes offered in the residence halls
3. Self contained courses
4. Discussion sections of large courses
5. Art courses for non-majors with studio facilities in the buildings
6. University 101 (Freshman Survival Skills) offered to all first year student participants
7. Classes taught in the facilities
8. Foreign language tables
9. Freshman take a 10 hour block of classes that have integrated topics and deal with the student's social and cultural development
10. Offering classes that are reading and writing intensive
11. Offering classes that are disciplinary in content
12. Co-enrolling small clusters of no more than 20 first year students in general education courses
13. Living learning programs are connected with academic minor programs
14. Many house-based academic programs sponsored in each house
15. We have 16 residential first year courses whereby students who enroll in particular classes also live together on the same floor/wing in a residence hall. By virtue of living in close proximity, they live and learn together.
16. For the first freshmen semester, students are clustered into groups for two of their typical five courses: an orientation class and a first year inquiry course. There are structured links between two clustered courses and students are encouraged to function as groups.
17. Students taking courses that count towards graduation that are taught by faculty who are also part of the living learning community.

b. Non-Credit / Informal, Group Learning Experiences in the Residence Halls
Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)

1. Weekly reading groups
2. Weekly philosophy / theology discussion groups
3. Presentations & discussions on controversial topics led once a week by a faculty member or community leader
4. A seminar to integrate learning experiences and course work
5. Students review themes and careers related to freshman interest group themes
6. Freshman study groups for courses they have in common
7. Discussion groups with teaching assistants that teach the core curriculum classes
8. Study skills and test taking workshops
9. Supplemental instruction that reviews issues relevant to course topics but are not part of the syllabus so students can think about issues outside the context of the course
10. Non academic groups such as political activist and theater groups
11. Students work collaboratively on writing projects ranging from presentations they make in class to collaborative writing, revising, and editing projects
12. Seminar to integrate living experiences and course work
13. We also provide the first year residential course faculty with a meal plan option so they may continue class conversations in the dining hall or so they may pursue a conversation with one or more students over lunch.
14. There are structured links between two clustered courses and students are encouraged to function as groups. For the second semester, the instructors from the first year inquiry courses are encouraged to participate with students in structured activities in the resident halls.

C. Active Learning Experiences

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)

1. Community service learning followed by reflective exercises
2. Seminar to integrate learning experiences and course work
3. Private music lessons
4. Field trips
5. Expectation that students in the living learning environment should be significantly more involved than those who live in traditional residences
6. Students in living learning environment are offered extensive opportunities to be involved.
7. Students expected to arrange programs for their peers
8. Supplemental instruction that reviews issues relevant to course topics but are not part of the syllabus so students can think about other issues related to course content.
9. Student officers range from traditional to theater specific positions such as technical director
10. Outdoor education / team building activities
12. Student-run theater
13. Residents have access to and manage a stained glass shop, recording studios, print shop, wood and metal shop, darkroom, video editing studio, sewing shop, pottery studio, jewelry-making shop, and a digital media studio
14. We provide the faculty member who teaches the course one van trip for him or her to take the class off campus.
15. Involvement in community service learning that is supervised by a faculty member who gives feedback regarding the academic components of the experience.
16. Interaction with campus guests (e.g. visiting speakers.)

d. One-on-One Interaction with Faculty and Staff

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)
1. Upper-classmen peer advisors who live with first year students
2. Students interact with a faculty mentor assigned to each freshmen interest group
3. Academic advising offered in house
4. Guest in residence program
5. Academic support tutors for participants
6. Resident assistants meet individually with each first year student to discuss their academic goals, to track academic progress, refer
students to academic resources and support services and to ensure their connectedness to the university.
7. Professor who teaches class also serves as an academic advisor to each student taking the class
8. Self contained dining facility where students and faculty dine together
9. House deans with Ph.Ds function as advisors
10. We also provide the first year residential course faculty with a meal plan option so they may continue class conversations in the dining hall or so they may pursue a conversation with one or more students over lunch.

e. Events / Programs

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)
1. Spring semester art fair
2. Coffee houses organized each semester featuring residents and guest performing
3. Cultural events
4. Programming includes weekend theater, dance, musical performances, masquerade parties, audience participating showing of the cult film The Rocky Horror Picture Show, and an annual reading of Handel’s Messiah.
5. Caribbean film festival, Madrigal feast, international music series, women's speaker series

f. Facilities

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)
1. Art courses for non-majors with studio facilities in the building
2. Residents have access to and manage a stained glass shop, recording studios, print shop, wood and metal shop, darkroom, video editing studio, sewing shop, pottery studio, jewelry-making shop, and a digital media studio
3. Classes and common areas open for studying 24/7
4. Self contained dining facility where faculty and students dine together
5. Many courses taught within seminar room within the college house
6. Classroom seminar rooms in one residence hall that are used for
classes small in size and oftentimes enrolling upper-class students.

g. Technology

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)
1. All students are required to have lap tops
2. Internet ports in all rooms
3. On-line academic support for disciplinary courses taught in the
residence halls
4. Computer labs

h. Policies and Procedures to Meet the Needs of Program Participants

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)
1. Enforced quiet hours policies
2. Room assignments are not specific to a field of study, rather they are
made to create an environment fosters peer learning
3. Three day freshman orientation
4. Purposely not providing opportunities that segregate college
members along academic, social, or economic lines
5. Resident assistants are required to do 4 academic skills programs as
well as 3 academic subject / faculty involvement programs
6. Coordinate housing assignments and programs for high achieving
freshman

i. Program Mission Underlying Curricular Interventions

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)
1. Academic house sponsor attends meetings to emphasize importance
of academics in programs
2. Program allows students to pursue a variety of academic life styles
within the context of a diverse community of peers
3. Program offers a curriculum that breaks down the academic, social,
and cultural barriers of students' lives
4. Expectation that students in living learning environment should be significantly more involved on campus than those involved in traditional residences
5. Program goal is to provide space where the student's academic and social lives can intersect
6. Positive peer pressure that is created from having academically motivated students live together.

j. Connections to Campus Resources

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)
1. Department of Undergraduate Education hosts center and facilitates on going faculty involvement
2. Freshman Centers have an Academic Center for Excellence that offers passive and academic support including study skills handouts, tutoring services in the evenings, group computing lab, and study space.
3. Students receive information about and are encouraged to attend academic presentations outside the living learning community.
4. Tutoring, advising, and other services are made available in the residence halls
5. Wheels service which is an in house service for academic support in the disciplines. Examples of services include tutoring, math help, library, research help, computing, language tutorials, and help with course work related to engineering

k. Student Engagement with Faculty and Staff

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)
1. Presentations and discussions on controversial topics led once a week by a faculty member or community leader
2. Use of interactive instructional modes
3. Building is heavily staffed with resident assistants, resident director, live-in master, and faculty in residence
4. Last lecture series where faculty can speak about topics of great interest to them. (Faculty are asked to prepare their last and best lecture ever)
5. Students taking courses that count towards graduation that are taught by faculty who are also part of the living learning community.

6. Involvement in community service learning that is supervised by a faculty member who gives feedback regarding the academic components of the experience.

7. Interaction with campus guests (e.g. visiting speakers,)

**a. Groups of Students, Staff, & Faculty Make Collaborative Decisions**

Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)

1. Combination of the following staff lead the program: program coordinator, resident tutor, faculty in residence, head resident, and resident advisors / Steering Committee

2. Council made up of 7 elected students who serve as ex officio members, the program coordinator, faculty in residence, resident tutor, assistant director, and an associate dean. The council designs all programming and the recruitment and selection of new members.

3. Student coordinator is a member of the committee that runs the program and has significant input into program related decisions.

4. Student leaders and professional staff meet to determine a programming curricula that compliments a student’s core courses.

5. Having 1 student representative to the steering committee nominated by residence life and 1 nominated by hall government

6. Faculty, hall director, and director of residence life have frequent office hours where they seek feedback

7. The entire resident assistant staff is involved in most program related decisions

8. Frequently we engage students in committees and task forces to obtain their input into decisions.

**b. Students Having Authority / Responsibility to Make Significant Decisions.**

Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)

1. Students serve on all committees that make decisions about the program

2. Students serve on committees that make decisions about hiring staff

3. Programs are student initiated
4. Sophomores have responsibility to coordinate programs for first year students
5. Students designate the faculty who are invited to participate
6. Students have input into the curricular and co-curricular components of the program.
7. Student input into construction of facilities and designs in remodeling projects
8. Students maintain full discretion and accountability for financial conduct
9. A small group of freshman and sophomores manage a $7000 budget that pays for social activities, a literary magazine, and achievement awards.
10. A senior resident assistant position that is responsible for supervising hall government.

c. Elected Student Government Leaders

Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)
1. Students groups (i.e. hall councils) provide input, design, and implement programs, and make decisions.
2. Elected student leaders
3. Parliamentary processes are followed when elected groups make program related decisions.
4. Student government committee made up of all current residents who commit to attend all weekly meetings.
5. Having 1 student representative to the steering committee nominated by residence life and 1 nominated by hall government
6. In programs sponsored individually by one house, there is usually a student House council in place to weigh in.
7. We have a senior resident assistant who directly advises hall government.
8. We enlist the help and support of the Residence Hall Association in matters of policy and procedure.

d. Decision Making Processes

Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)
1. Student coordinator is a member of the committee that runs the
programs and has significant input into program related decisions.
2. Program is reviewed each fall through group discussions with peer tutors
3. Student participants provide evaluation and feedback at the conclusion of each fall semester
4. Regular meeting held by the RAs to solicit programming ideas
5. Dialogue with students about grading policies for courses taken in residence
6. Parliamentary processes are followed when elected groups make program related decisions
7. Students provide input to their resident assistants and the information is funneled up the organization
8. When appropriate programs and services are offered across the college house system they are presented to our student resident advisory board
9. Periodic evaluations are done, asking students for feedback.
10. Student surveys, and year end evaluations /Exit interviews with students
11. We establish relationships with individual students to get the singular opinion and we pursue dialogue with others to see if that opinion is shared by others

   e. Student Involvement / Participation in Programs

   Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)
1. Mentorship program
2. Student designate the faculty who are invited to participate
3. Dialogue with students about grading policies for courses taken at the residential college.
4. Programs generate internal revenue to support programs
5. Students are expected to participate and arrange one program on a topic of their choice

   a. Study Group Arrangements

   Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)
1. Study groups where better students help those less prepared
2. Rooms for group study are provided
Subcategories Questionnaire Two

3. Group tutoring sessions
4. Similar assignments are given to all students in program and informa
topportunities are set up for them to work on the assignments in teams
5. Students serve as editors and commentators on each other’s essays
6. Because the math assistance is done in groups, the students often
end up working not only with the tutors but with one another as well,
frequently forming impromptu study groups that end up working
together all semester long.
7. Assigning students based on their interests, and having them take
certain courses together fosters informal study groups.
8. Quiet and enclosed seminar rooms are available for group study
9. Students are encouraged to function and to study in clustered
groups, and group projects are assigned.

b. Tutoring

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)
1. Tutors are assigned to first year participants who represent a variety
of different majors
2. Rooms for group study are provided
3. Assign undergraduate tutors
4. Group tutoring
5. Because the math assistance is done in groups, the students often
end up working not only with the tutors but with one another as well,
frequently forming impromptu study groups that end up working
together all semester long.
6. We have tutorials
7. Assigning students based on their interests, and having them take
certain courses together fosters informal study groups.

e. Having Role Models

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)
1. Peer advisors serving as role models and seminar instructors /
mentorship program
2. Resident assistants role model academic success
3. Cross college student mentoring
4. Student staff members have high cumulative grade point averages
5. Much of the academic support in the different disciplines is handled via peer mentoring

f. Programming Initiatives

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)
1. Cross programming is done with other theme houses and staff
2. Active learning aspects of the program such as drama, the arts, language tables and service learning
3. Peers program to peers in the community
4. Community building by resident assistants
5. Resident assistants take residents out into the greater community to apply their classroom learning to their community.

g. Positions Held by Student Leaders

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)
1. Academic departments recruit student teachers from pool of living learning participants.
2. Student coordinators
3. All advisors in the academic support programs are students who serve as a level of peer support
4. We use undergraduate teaching assistants.
5. All students have access to trained resident assistants

k. Providing Leadership Opportunities for Students

Methods Used to Encourage Active Student Participation (Quest 4)
1. Participants in in campus activities and assuming leadership positions outside of the living learning environment.
2. Participants and student leaders take part in events
3. Hall council and resident assistants invite and encourage active student participation in all aspects of the community both academically and socially.
4. A leadership hierarchy in each college consisting of a multitude of formal positions and committee assignments.
5. 1/4 of the participants are required to have a leadership role
6. Most aspects of selection processes, programming, and dining have
Subcategories Questionnaire Two

a history of student involvement and a student component
7. Participation in campus wide orientation and other campus wide activities
8. Student advisor board
9. Ambassadors who volunteer, recruit new members, and give feedback
10. Student government
11. Resident assistant positions.

0. Active Student Learning Motivates Participation

Methods Used to Encourage Active Student Participation (Quest 4)
1. Community service
2. University 101 (Freshman Survival Skills Classes) are active learning environments that foster student participation.
3. Active learning aspects of the program such as drama, the arts, languages tables, service learning opportunities
4. Small discussion oriented courses
5. Required attendance at cultural events and outdoor adventure activities.
6. Students engage in a variety of in-class presentations
7. Students are given a project to photograph daily life in the suites
8. Field trips for academic or social reasons
9. Internship courses
10. Environmental studies program involved in recycling efforts and local planting projects
11. Leadership development programs
12. Community building programs
13. Monthly we hold floor dialogues on each floor in the residence hall to discuss issues such as global citizenship, stereotypes, religion, race gender/sexuality, and class.
14. There is an organization fair at the beginning of the year to get people together and explain what opportunities there are on campus to be involved

a. Student Accessibility to Live-in Faculty
Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff
(Quest 5)

1. Faculty in residence program
2. The faculty master and his family lives in the building
3. Each house has a faculty master (tenured senior professor) and at least one faculty associate who both live in the house.

b. Student Accessibility to Faculty, On-Site

Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff
(Quest 5)

1. All faculty and staff are given office space in the hall
2. Department offices located in the residence halls
3. Student’s knowing professor’s home phone number, office location, and e-mail address so they have access

d. Faculty Connections to Groups of Students

Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff
(Quest 5)

1. Seminar taught "in house" to only program participants by the resident tutor
2. Faculty mentors assigned to a freshman interest group
3. Faculty and residence directors are chosen for their expertise in the theme of the program
4. An adopt a faculty program where faculty member is linked to the residence hall community for social events and more personal connections.
5. Each RA is asked to invite a faculty member from campus to be connected with their particular floor and offer programs or just informally hang out.
6. Faculty work closely with students in arts studios and theater facilities located in the halls
7. We encourage all faculty to become associates of individual houses; by associating students can invite them to give talks and seminars.
8. Many of the graduate math tutors in facilities are also associate instructors and thus they have very close ties with the faculty and their own students.
9. Faculty from across the campus are recruited to teach the first year
e. Encouraging Informal / Out of Classroom Interactions with Faculty

Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff (Quest 5)

1. Faculty mentor co-teaches seminars and attends out of class events
2. Tickets purchased by program for faculty and students to attend cultural events
3. Faculty attend social programs
4. Meals arranged so faculty and students can eat together and/or providing funds so the student can invite faculty members out to lunch.
5. Faculty members entertain students in their homes and open their work spaces for programming and social activities with students.
6. An outdoor adventure retreat for faculty and students
7. Faculty, students, and staff being on a first name basis
8. Weekly events that bring faculty and students together outside the classroom
9. Self-contained dining facility in residence hall where students and faculty eat together
10. Faculty connected with program come to floors to informally hang out
11. Various out of class room experiences: field trips, socials, and service learning projects.
12. We work with the first year residential course faculty and provide them van trips and meal plans for them to establish deeper relationships with students.

a. Spaces that Facilitate Discussion and Studying

Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Need (Quest 6)

1. Seminar rooms in the residence halls
2. Quiet study areas
3. Office space for faculty
4. Small group study rooms
5. Spaces that facilitate one-on-one tutoring
6. Academic advising offices
7. Professor meeting with students in suite areas and using a variety of spaces in the residence hall to provide instruction and one-on-one meetings.
8. Classroom building used for study space or student programming space in the evenings.
9. We are continually remodeling our buildings to meet the needs of more student study and social space.
10. Seminar rooms, senior commons room, and study rooms on each floor
11. Lounges and an enclosed patio area to facilitate discussion

d. Equipment

Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Need (Quest 6)
1. Dry erase board in the study areas
2. Audio/Visual Equipment
3. Copiers, fax machines, and projectors
4. Students can sign out adventure equipment like tents, canoes, and kayaks
5. Large screen televisions in big lounges and smallertvs in smaller lounges
6. Many rooms are equipped for technology (LED projects, ect)
7. Computers available in the academic support centers
8. Classroom building used for study space or student programming space in the evenings.
9. We are continually remodeling our buildings to meet the needs of more student study and social space.
10. Seminar rooms, senior commons room, and study rooms on each floor
11. Lounges and an enclosed patio area to facilitate discussion

I. Facilities for Students Interested in the Fine and Performing Arts

Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Need (Quest 6)
1. Access to soundproof music practice room with pianos, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
2. Darkrooms
3. Ceramics studio
4. Electronic music studio
5. Video editing facilities
6. Dance/Aerobics space
7. Art studio
Round III
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Thanks for filling out the final living learning program questionnaire.

Rank the living learning program components in terms of importance. Provide separate rankings in the appropriate boxes for all eight questions.

While each of these living learning program interventions are impressive and unique to a particular kind of environment, give high rankings to only those interventions that you feel would be most effective in motivating student learning and participation in a living learning environment. Lower rankings should be given to those interventions that you feel would least affect student learning and participation in a living learning environment.

The goal of this study is to create a list of curricular interventions that are viewed as most effective by living learning program administrators. As you rank these interventions you should consider realistic factors such as budgets, staff resources, and faculty motivation levels to participate in residence hall activities.

In your rankings you should also be considering the degree to which each intervention is relevant to the major sub-heading that it is listed under. (For example, if setting up a lemonade stand on campus is listed as an intervention that provides opportunities for students to pursue an academic life style and you feel that a lemonade stand does not provide these kinds of opportunities then you should rank that intervention accordingly)

The median scores from the second questionnaires are listed beside each component that is listed for ranking. The median scores were tabulated on a 1-4 scale. (1 being the lowest and 4 the highest.) The median score is a measure of how strongly the group felt about the interventions on the second questionnaire. Interventions that had median scores of less than 2.01 were not included on this questionnaire.
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There are a few new program interventions that were added from comments that were made on the second questionnaire.

There is a text box below each question you can use to input additional curricular interventions or list any additional information you feel is necessary.

Once you have completed the questions, click the SUBMIT key on the bottom of the form.

First & Last Name:

E-mail:

Institution:

Question 1: Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style.

* Ninety Five answers were originally given for this question. To make the ranking process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

a. Academic courses / formal learning experiences in the residence halls (3)

b. Non-credit / informal, group learning experiences in the residence halls (4)

c. Active learning experiences (4)

d. One on one interactions with faculty and staff (4)
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|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| e. Events / programs (4) | f. Facilities (3.5) | g. Technology (3) | h. Policies and procedures to meet the needs of program participants (3) | i. Program mission underlying curricular interventions (4) | j. Connections to campus resources (3.5) | k. Student engagement with faculty and staff (3.5) |

1. The academics should be interwoven with the social and cultural components of the living learning program

m. Opportunities for students to explore majors and careers

n. Conducting a graduation ceremony for those who complete the first year or semester of a program connected to a living / learning center

Please rank (a-n) all of the interventions for question 1 from most important (#1) to least important (#14). If you feel "b" is the most important intervention on the list above, you should put the letter "b" in the box labeled #1 on "i" in the box labeled #2 to the immediate right of box #1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
<th>#10</th>
<th>#11</th>
<th>#12</th>
<th>#13</th>
<th>#14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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List any additional ways living learning programs provide opportunities for students to pursue an academic lifestyle. You can also use this box if you want to explain your rankings or make comments on components that are listed.

Question 2: Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions.

* Forty five answers were originally given to this question. To make the ranking process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

- a. Groups of students, staff, & faculty make collaborative decisions (3)
- b. Students having authority/responsibility to make significant decisions (3)
- c. Elected student government leaders (3)
- d. Decision making processes (3)
- e. Student involvement / participation in programs (4)
- f. Staff accessibility (i.e., students having e-mail links from a web site to give the director feedback about the program)
- g. Resident assistant trained to work in program (3)
- h. Curricular content and processes best determined by faculty and potential employers
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i. Alumni interviews or surveys

Please rank (a-i) all of the interventions for question 2 from most important (#1) to least important (#9). If you feel "b" is the most important intervention on the list above, you should put the letter "b" in the box labeled #1 on "f" in the box labeled #2 to the immediate right of box #1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

List any additional ways to allow student input into program related decisions. You can also use this box if you want to explain your rankings or make comments on components that are listed.

---

**Question 3: Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning**

* Fifty answers were originally given to this question. To make the ranking process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

- **a. Study group arrangements** (3)
- **b. Tutoring** (3)
- **c. Supportive classroom environments** (3)
- **d. Classes are taught with group learning strategies** (3)
e. Having role models (3)
f. Programming initiatives (4)
g. Positions held by student leaders (3)
h. Enforcement of quiet hours (3)
i. Expectations for student participation are clearly laid out to students when they enter the program (3)
j. During RA training we talk about the Student Learning Experience at the college and help them understand the philosophy of the College and Department of Residential Life. We send the message that student staff support is essential in helping students focus on their priorities (3.5)
k. Each house / programs is governed locally so the program's leadership can best address individual needs

Please rank (a-k) all of the interventions for question 3 from most important (#1) to least important (#11). If you feel "b" is the most important intervention on the list above, you should put the letter "b" in the box labeled #1 on "i" in the box labeled #2 to the immediate right of box #1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
<th>#10</th>
<th>#11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List any additional ways to foster peer support for learning. You can also use this box if you want to explain your rankings or make comments on components that are listed.
Question 4: Methods Used to Encourage Active Student Participation

* Forty-five answers were originally given to this question. To make the ranking process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

a. Students sign a statement of commitment (2.5)

b. An expectation that students participate in programs and events (3)

c. Participation in early orientation for program (3)

d. Meetings for both social and academic purposes. Social programs can include students eating and recreating together (3.5)

e. Participants talking more about academic issues in comparison to non participants (3)

f. Staff is provided assessment data of students perceptions about the residence hall environment relative to its academic atmosphere, involvement with faculty, use of academic resources and are then asked to translate the data into strategies to motivate more active participation in academic activities / Student feedback and end of the year evaluations are used to refine program (3.5)

g. Providing leadership opportunities for students (4)

h. Traffic and activities are channeled into public spaces (3)
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i. Students self-select into the program (3)

j. Posting messages about events on campus in the halls / Publicity through e-mail, flyers, posters, etc. / Students commit to promote the program by sitting at an information desk (3)

k. Active student learning motivates participation (3)

l. Students share concern for each other’s academic needs (3)

m. Peer education courses on topics such as relationship violence, HIV/AIDS prevention, eating disorders, and substance abuse (2.5)

n. Popular and essential academic services like advising are provided in the residence halls (3)

o. Programs that focus on relationship building to instill the value of developing relationships with neighbors (3)

Please rank (a-o) all of the interventions for question 4 from most important (#1) to least important (#15). If you feel “b” is the most important intervention on the list above, you should put the letter “b” in the box labeled #1 on "f" in the box labeled #2 to the immediate right of box #1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
<th>#10</th>
<th>#11</th>
<th>#12</th>
<th>#13</th>
<th>#14</th>
<th>#15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

List any additional ways to encourage active student participation. You can also use this box if you want to explain your rankings or make comments on components that are listed.
Question 5: Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff.

* Forty-five answers were originally given to this question. To make the ranking process manageable, some answers have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

a. Student accessibility to faculty, on-site (4)

b. Faculty get invitations to programs and events (4)

c. Faculty connections to groups of students (3)

d. Encouraging informal / out of classroom interactions with faculty (4)

e. Student participation levels in living learning classes are higher in comparison to classes held outside of the residence halls (3)

f. Budgets targeted for programs that involve faculty (3)

g. Classroom space (3)

h. A network of faculty, staff, and community members who all have relationships and responsibilities to the students. All members of these networks have access to public spaces and attend programs in the residential college (3)
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i. Faculty members are selected who are "hands on" with the students (3)

j. One on one meeting between professors and students to discuss course matters or any other matters related to university life (3)

k. Residence hall director is expected to know every student within the 1st 6 weeks of the semester (3)

l. Bring in different faculty and staff to weekly dinners to speak on their areas of expertise (2.5)

Please rank (a-l) all of the interventions for question 5 from most important (#1) to least important (#12). If you feel "b" is the most important intervention on the list above, you should put the letter "b" in the box labeled #1 on "i" in the box labeled #2 to the immediate right of box #1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
<th>#10</th>
<th>#11</th>
<th>#12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

List any additional ways to encourage close relationships with faculty and students. You can also use this box if you want to explain your rankings or make comments on components that are listed.

---

Question 6: Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Needs.

* Sixty answers were originally given to this question. To make the ranking process manageable, some answers
have been broken down into subcategories. The interventions placed in each subcategory can be viewed by clicking on the subcategories below.

a. Spaces that facilitate discussion and studying (4)

b. Students are permitted to decorate common areas. (Decorations are relevant to program themes) (3)

c. Classroom spaces in residence halls (3)

d. Equipment (3)

e. Computer labs (3)

f. Wired rooms (4)

g. Living room area used for group meetings (3)

h. Classrooms that are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for meetings and studying (3)

i. Dining services are linked to student programming (3)

j. Designing new buildings around the needs of the program (3)

Please rank (a-j) all of the interventions for question 6 from most important (#1) to least important (#10). If you feel "b" is the most important intervention on the list above, you should put the letter "b" in the box labeled #1 on "i" in the box labeled #2 to the immediate right of box #1.
List any other facilities that should be included in living learning programs. You can also use this box if you want to explain your rankings or make comments on components that are listed.

**Question 7: Methods Used to Provide Staffing that Serve Special Populations of Students**

a. Program is staffed by a resident tutor, program coordinator, faculty in residence, head resident, and resident advisors. (3)

b. Staff receives special training to work with program (4)

c. Peer advisors assume both traditional resident assistant and responsibilities towards program and for doing so receive additional compensation (3)

d. Staff in first year initiative program receive training on the specific development and academic needs of first year students (3)

e. Live-in staff members (3.5)

f. All campus staff including faculty, house staff, academic advising staff, librarians, minority peer advisors support the goals of the programs (4)
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g. Close communication between residential college staff who serve the entire population and centralized offices that serve special populations. (3)

h. Signers for hearing impaired students (3)

i. Students can take advantage of outside academic support services like the counseling office (4)

j. Strategies in place to make Human Sexual and Gender Development program welcoming to gays, lesbian, and transsexual students. (3)

k. Staff is recruited from the general population which gives the house peers as leaders (3)

l. Resident assistants are trained in diversity issues. (4)

m. Disabled students are given necessary accommodations. (3)

n. Space and resources are provided for tutoring certain populations of students, in particular under-represented minority students (3)

o. Physical accessibility to buildings and support services (4)

p. Extra funding is provided to staff to do more academic focused work (3)

q. Full partnership between housing, first year college program, and other services like tutoring that are offered as part of the program. (3)
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Please rank (a-q) all of the interventions for question 7 from most important (#1) to least important (#17). If you feel "b" is the most important intervention on the list above, you should put the letter "b" in the box labeled #1 on "f" in the box labeled #2 to the immediate right of box #1.

List any other ways living learning programs should provide staffing. You can also use this box if you want to explain your rankings or make comments on components that are listed.

---

**Question 8: Methods Used to Encourage Students to Explore Different Areas of Study.**

a. Faculty participate from a wide range of disciplines (3)

b. Reading and discussion groups that cover a wide range of topics and interests. / Offering in house courses on a wide variety of topics (3)

c. Student and professional staff are drawn from a wide range of academic disciplines and backgrounds (3)

d. Student culture is about encouraging difference, exploration, and open exchange of ideas (3.5)

e. Emphasis on career exploration or finding alternative careers within majors (2.5)

f. Students focusing on a specific theme like engineering also have to take courses in the College of
Arts and Sciences (3)

g. Cross programming with other houses/living-learning programs (3)

h. A variety of guest speakers in classes (3)

i. Programs encouraging students to make thoughtful choices about majors rather than base major decisions on careers. / Workshops on exploring major (3)

j. Programs are designed by faculty and students (3)

k. Advisors work individually with assigned to students to help them plan their schedules and select majors (3)

Please rank (a-k) all of the interventions for question 8 from most important (#1) to least important (#11). If you feel "b" is the most important intervention on the list above, you should put the letter "b" in the box labeled #1 on "f" in the box labeled #2 to the immediate right of box #1.

List any other ways living learning programs should encourage students to explore different areas of study. You can also use this box if you want to explain your rankings or make comments on components that are listed.

Please E-mail Seth_Leibowitz@unc.edu if you have questions
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[Submit]
Subcategories Questionnaire # 3

a. Academic Courses / Formal Learning Experiences in the Residence Halls

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)

1. 80 Different courses offered each year with enrollment restrictions to program participants
2. Small Classes offered in the residence halls
3. Self contained courses
4. Discussion sections of large courses
5. Art courses for non-majors with studio facilities in the buildings
6. University 101 (Freshman Survival Skills) offered to all first year student participants
7. Classes taught in the facilities
8. Foreign language tables
9. Freshman take a 10 hour block of classes that have integrated topics and deal with the student’s social and cultural development
10. Offering classes that are reading and writing intensive
11. Offering classes that are disciplinary in content
12. Co-enrolling small clusters of no more than 20 first year students in general education courses
13. Living learning programs are connected with academic minor programs
14. Many house-based academic programs sponsored in each house
15. We have 16 residential first year courses whereby students who enroll in particular classes also live together on the same floor/wing in a residence hall. By virtue of living in close proximity, they live and learn together.
16. For the first freshmen semester, students are clustered into groups for two of their typical five courses: an orientation class and a first year inquiry course. There are structured links between two clustered courses and students are encouraged to function as groups.
17. Students taking courses that count towards graduation that are taught by faculty who are also part of the living learning community.

b. Non-Credit / Informal, Group Learning Experiences in the Residence Halls
Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)

1. Weekly reading groups
2. Weekly philosophy / theology discussion groups
3. Presentations & discussions on controversial topics led once a week by a faculty member or community leader
4. A seminar to integrate living learning experiences and course work
5. Students review themes and careers related to freshman interest group themes
6. Freshman study groups for courses they have in common
7. Discussion groups with teaching assistants that teach the core curriculum classes
8. Study skills and test taking workshops
9. Supplemental instruction that reviews issues relevant to course topics but are not part of the syllabus so students can think about issues outside the context of the course
10. Non academic groups such as political activist and theater groups
11. Students work collaboratively on writing projects ranging from presentations they make in class to collaborative writing, revising, and editing projects
12. Seminar to integrate living experiences and course work
13. We also provide the first year residential course faculty with a meal plan option so they may continue class conversations in the dining hall or so they may pursue a conversation with one or more students over lunch.
14. There are structured links between two clustered courses and students are encouraged to function as groups. For the second semester, the instructors from the first year inquiry courses are encouraged to participate with students in structured activities in the resident halls.

c. Active Learning Experiences

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style
(Quest 1)

1. Community service learning followed by reflective exercises
2. Seminar to integrate living learning experiences and course work
3. Private music lessons
4. Field trips
5. Expectation that students in the living learning environment should be significantly more involved than those who live in traditional residences
6. Students in living learning environment are offered extensive opportunities to be involved.
7. Students expected to arrange programs for their peers
8. Supplemental instruction that reviews issues relevant to course topics but are not part of the syllabus so students can think about other issues related to course content.
9. Student officers range from traditional to theater specific positions such as technical director
10. Outdoor education / team building activities
12. Student-run theater
13. Residents have access to and manage a stained glass shop, recording studios, print shop, wood and metal shop, darkroom, video editing studio, sewing shop, pottery studio, jewelry-making shop, and a digital media studio
14. We provide the faculty member who teaches the course one van trip for him or her to take the class off campus.
15. Involvement in community service learning that is supervised by a faculty member who gives feedback regarding the academic components of the experience.
16. Interaction with campus guests (e.g. visiting speakers,)

d. One-on-One Interaction with Faculty and Staff

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)
1. Upper-classmen peer advisors who live with first year students
2. Students interact with a faculty mentor assigned to each freshmen interest group
3. Academic advising offered in house
4. Guest in residence program
5. Academic support tutors for participants
6. Resident assistants meet individually with each first year student to discuss their academic goals, to track academic progress, refer
students to academic resources and support services and to ensure their connectedness to the university.

7. Professor who teaches class also serves as an academic advisor to each student taking the class

8. Self contained dining facility where students and faculty dine together

9. House deans with Ph.Ds function as advisors

10. We also provide the first year residential course faculty with a meal plan option so they may continue class conversations in the dining hall or so they may pursue a conversation with one or more students over lunch.

e. Events / Programs

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)

1. Spring semester art fair

2. Coffee houses organized each semester featuring residents and guest performing

3. Cultural events

4. Programming includes weekend theater, dance, musical performances, masquerade parties, audience participating showing of the cult film The Rocky Horror Picture Show, and an annual reading of Handel's Messiah.

5. Caribbean film festival, Madrigal feast, international music series, women's speaker series

f. Facilities

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)

1. Art courses for non-majors with studio facilities in the building

2. Residents have access to and manage a stained glass shop, recording studios, print shop, wood and metal shop, darkroom, video editing studio, sewing shop, pottery studio, jewelry-making shop, and a digital media studio

3. Classes and common areas open for studying 24/7

4. Self contained dining facility where faculty and students dine together
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5. Many courses taught within seminar room within the college house
6. Classroom seminar rooms in one residence hall that are used for classes small in size and oftentimes enrolling upper-class students.

**g. Technology**

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)

1. All students are required to have laptops
2. Internet ports in all rooms
3. On-line academic support for disciplinary courses taught in the residence halls
4. Computer labs

**h. Policies and Procedures to Meet the Needs of Program Participants**

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)

1. Enforced quiet hours policies
2. Room assignments are not specific to a field of study, rather they are made to create an environment that fosters peer learning
3. Three day freshman orientation
4. Purposely not providing opportunities that segregate college members along academic, social, or economic lines
5. Resident assistants are required to do 4 academic skills programs as well as 3 academic subject / faculty involvement programs
6. Coordinate housing assignments and programs for high achieving freshman

**i. Program Mission Underlying Curricular Interventions**

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)

1. Academic house sponsor attends meetings to emphasize importance of academics in programs
2. Program allows students to pursue a variety of academic life styles within the context of a diverse community of peers
3. Program offers a curriculum that breaks down the academic, social, and cultural barriers of students' lives
4. Expectation that students in living learning environment should be significantly more involved on campus than those involved in traditional residences
5. Program goal is to provide space where the student's academic and social lives can intersect
6. Positive peer pressure that is created from having academically motivated students live together.

j. Connections to Campus Resources

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)
1. Department of Undergraduate Education hosts center and facilitates ongoing faculty involvement
2. Freshman Centers have an Academic Center for Excellence that offers passive and academic support including study skills handouts, tutoring services in the evenings, group computing lab, and study space.
3. Students receive information about and are encouraged to attend academic presentations outside the living learning community.
4. Tutoring, advising, and other services are made available in the residence halls
5. Wheels service which is an in house service for academic support in the disciplines. Examples of services include tutoring, math help, library research help, computing, language tutorials, and help with course work related to engineering

k. Student Engagement with Faculty and Staff

Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style (Quest 1)
1. Presentations and discussions on controversial topics led once a week by a faculty member or community leader
2. Use of interactive instructional modes
3. Building is heavily staffed with resident assistants, resident director, live-in master, and faculty in residence
4. Last lecture series where faculty can speak about topics of great interest to them. (Faculty are asked to prepare their last and best lecture ever)

5. Students taking courses that count towards graduation that are taught by faculty who are also part of the living learning community.

6. Involvement in community service learning that is supervised by a faculty member who gives feedback regarding the academic components of the experience.

7. Interaction with campus guests (e.g. visiting speakers,)

a. Groups of Students, Staff, & Faculty Make Collaborative Decisions

Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)

1. Combination of the following staff lead the program: program coordinator, resident tutor, faculty in residence, head resident, and resident advisors / Steering Committee

2. Council made up of 7 elected students who serve as ex officio members, the program coordinator, faculty in residence, resident tutor, assistant director, and an associate dean. The council designs all programming and the recruitment and selection of new members.

3. Student coordinator is a member of the committee that runs the program and has significant input into program related decisions.

4. Student leaders and professional staff meet to determine a programming curricula that compliments a student’s core courses.

5. Having 1 student representative to the steering committee nominated by residence life and 1 nominated by hall government

6. Faculty, hall director, and director of residence life have frequent office hours where they seek feedback

7. The entire resident assistant staff is involved in most program related decisions

8. Frequently we engage students in committees and task forces to obtain their input into decisions.

b. Students Having Authority / Responsibility to Make Significant Decisions
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Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)
1. Students serve on all committees that make decisions about the program
2. Students serve on committees that make decisions about hiring staff
3. Programs are student initiated
4. Sophomores have responsibility to coordinate programs for first year students
5. Students designate the faculty who are invited to participate
6. Students have input into the curricular and co-curricular components of the program.
7. Student input into construction of facilities and designs in remodeling projects
8. Students maintain full discretion and accountability for financial conduct
9. A small group of freshman and sophomores manage a $7000 budget that pays for social activities, a literary magazine, and achievement awards.
10. A senior resident assistant position that is responsible for supervising hall government.

c. Elected Student Government Leaders

Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)
1. Students groups (i.e. hall councils) provide input, design, and implement programs, and make decisions.
2. Elected student leaders
3. Parliamentary processes are followed when elected groups make program related decisions.
4. Student government committee made up of all current residents who commit to attend all weekly meetings.
5. Having 1 student representative to the steering committee nominated by residence life and 1 nominated by hall government
6. In programs sponsored individually by one house, there is usually a student House council in place to weigh in.
7. We have a senior resident assistant who directly advises hall government.
8. We enlist the help and support of the Residence Hall Association in matters of policy and procedure.
d. Decision Making Processes

Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)

1. Student coordinator is a member of the committee that runs the programs and has significant input into program related decisions.
2. Program is reviewed each fall through group discussions with peer tutors
3. Student participants provide evaluation and feedback at the conclusion of each fall semester
4. Regular meeting held by the RAs to solicit programming ideas
5. Dialogue with students about grading policies for courses taken in residence
6. Parliamentary processes are followed when elected groups make program related decisions
7. Students provide input to their resident assistants and the information is funneled up the organization
8. When appropriate programs and services are offered across the college house system they are presented to our student resident advisory board
9. Periodic evaluations are done, asking students for feedback.
10. Student surveys, and year end evaluations /Exit interviews with students
11. We establish relationships with individual students to get the singular opinion and we pursue dialogue with others to see if that opinion is shared by others

e. Student Involvement / Participation in Programs

Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. (Quest 2)

1. Mentorship program
2. Student designate the faculty who are invited to participate
3. Dialogue with students about grading policies for courses taken at the residential college.
4. Programs generate internal revenue to support programs
5. Students are expected to participate and arrange one program on a topic of their choice
a. Study Group Arrangements

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)

1. Study groups where better students help those less prepared
2. Rooms for group study are provided
3. Group tutoring sessions
4. Similar assignments are given to all students in program and informa opportunities are set up for them to work on the assignments in teams
5. Students serve as editors and commentators on each other's essays
6. Because the math assistance is done in groups, the students often end up working not only with the tutors but with one another as well, frequently forming impromptu study groups that end up working together all semester long.
7. Assigning students based on their interests, and having them take certain courses together fosters informal study groups.
8. Quiet and enclosed seminar rooms are available for group study
9. Students are encouraged to function and to study in clustered groups, and group projects are assigned.

b. Tutoring

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)

1. Tutors are assigned to first year participants who represent a variety of different majors
2. Rooms for group study are provided
3. Assign undergraduate tutors
4. Group tutoring
5. Because the math assistance is done in groups, the students often end up working not only with the tutors but with one another as well, frequently forming impromptu study groups that end up working together all semester long.
6. We have tutorials
7. Assigning students based on their interests, and having them take certain courses together fosters informal study groups.

e. Having Role Models

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)
1. Peer advisors serving as role models and seminar instructors / mentorship program
2. Resident assistants role model academic success
3. Cross college student mentoring
4. Student staff members have high cumulative grade point averages
5. Much of the academic support in the different disciplines is handled via peer mentoring

f. Programming Initiatives

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)
1. Cross programming is done with other theme houses and staff
2. Active learning aspects of the program such as drama, the arts, language tables and service learning
3. Peers program to peers in the community
4. Community building by resident assistants
5. Resident assistants take residents out into the greater community to apply their classroom learning to their community.

g. Positions Held by Student Leaders

Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning (Quest 3)
1. Academic departments recruit student teachers from pool of living learning participants.
2. Student coordinators
3. All advisors in the academic support programs are students who serve as a level of peer support
4. We use undergraduate teaching assistants.
5. All students have access to trained resident assistants

g. Providing Leadership Opportunities for Students

Methods Used to Encourage Active Student Participation (Quest 4)
1. Participants in in campus activities and assuming leadership positions outside of the living learning environment.
2. Participants and student leaders take part in events
3. Hall council and resident assistants invite and encourage active
student participation in all aspects of the community both academically and socially.

4. A leadership hierarchy in each college consisting of a multitude of formal positions and committee assignments.

5. 1/4 of the participants are required to have a leadership role

6. Most aspects of selection processes, programming, and dining have a history of student involvement and a student component

7. Participation in campus wide orientation and other campus wide activities

8. Student advisor board

9. Ambassadors who volunteer, recruit new members, and give feedback

10. Student government

11. Resident assistant positions.

**k. Active Student Learning Motivates Participation**

Methods Used to Encourage Active Student Participation (Quest 4)

1. Community service

2. University 101 (Freshman Survival Skills Classes) are active learning environments that foster student participation.

3. Active learning aspects of the program such as drama, the arts, languages tables, service learning opportunities

4. Small discussion oriented courses

5. Required attendance at cultural events and outdoor adventure activities.

6. Students engage in a variety of in-class presentations

7. Students are given a project to photograph daily life in the suites

8. Field trips for academic or social reasons

9. Internship courses

10. Environmental studies program involved in recycling efforts and local planting projects

11. Leadership development programs

12. Community building programs

13. Monthly we hold floor dialogues on each floor in the residence halls to discuss issues such as global citizenship, stereotypes, religion, race gender/sexuality, and class.
14. There is an organization fair at the beginning of the year to get people together and explain what opportunities there are on campus to be involved

        a. Student Accessibility to Faculty, On-Site

Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff. (Quest 5)

1. Faculty in residence program
2. The faculty master and his family lives in the building
3. Each house has a faculty master (tenured senior professor) and at least one faculty associate who both live in the house.

c. Faculty Connections to Groups of Students

Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff. (Quest 5)

1. Seminar taught "in house" to only program participants by the resident tutor
2. Faculty mentors assigned to a freshman interest group
3. Faculty and residence directors are chosen for their expertise in the theme of the program
4. An adopt a faculty program where faculty member is linked to the residence hall community for social events and more personal connections.
5. Each RA is asked to invite a faculty member from campus to be connected with their particular floor and offer programs or just informally hang out.
6. Faculty work closely with students in arts studios and theater facilities located in the halls
7. We encourage all faculty to become associates of individual houses; by associating students can invite them to give talks and seminars.
8. Many of the graduate math tutors in facilities are also associate instructors and thus they have very close ties with the faculty and their own students.
9. Faculty from across the campus are recruited to teach the first year inquiry (FYI) courses

 d. Encouraging Informal / Out of Classroom Interactions
Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff. (Quest 5)

1. Faculty mentor co teaches seminars and attends out of class events
2. Tickets purchased by program for faculty and students to attend cultural events
3. Faculty attend social programs
4. Meals arranged so faculty and students can eat together and / or providing funds so the student can invite faculty members out to lunch.
5. Faculty members entertain students in their homes and open their work spaces for programming and social activities with students.
6. An outdoor adventure retreat for faculty and students
7. Faculty, students, and staff being on a first name basis
8. Weekly events that bring faculty and students together outside the classroom
9. Self contained dining facility in residence hall where students and faculty eat together
10. Faculty connected with program come to floors to informally hang out
11. Various out of class room experiences: field trips, socials, and service learning projects.
12. We work with the first year residential course faculty and provide them van trips and meal plans for them to establish deeper relationships with students.

a. Spaces that Facilitate Discussion and Studying

Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Need (Quest 6)

1. Seminar rooms in the residence halls
2. Quiet study areas
3. Office space for faculty
4. Small group study rooms
5. Spaces that facilitate one-on-one tutoring
6. Academic advising offices
7. Professor meeting with students in suite areas and using a variety of spaces in the residence hall to provide instruction and one-on-one meetings.
8. Classroom building used for study space or student programming space in the evenings.
9. We are continually remodeling our buildings to meet the needs of more student study and social space.
10. Seminar rooms, senior commons room, and study rooms on each floor
11. Lounges and an enclosed patio area to facilitate discussion

d. Equipment

Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Need (Quest 6)
1. Dry erase board in the study areas
2. Audio/Visual Equipment
3. Copiers, fax machines, and projectors
4. Students can sign out adventure equipment like tents, canoes, and kayaks
5. Large screen televisions in big lounges and smaller TVs in smaller lounges
6. Many rooms are equipped for technology (LED projects, etc)
7. Computers available in the academic support centers
8. Classroom building used for study space or student programming space in the evenings.
9. We are continually remodeling our buildings to meet the needs of more student study and social space.
10. Seminar rooms, senior commons room, and study rooms on each floor
11. Lounges and an enclosed patio area to facilitate discussion
Appendix L

Kuncl's and Jordan's Resumes / Monitoring Team Communications

PROFESSIONAL RESUME

PERSONAL DATA
NAME: Wayne T. Kuncl
HOME ADDRESS: 2537 Booker Creek Road
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
BIRTHPLACE: Chicago
HEALTH: Excellent
EMAIL: wayne_kuncl@unc.edu
TELEPHONE: (919) 967-2273 (Home)
(919) 962-5405 (Office)
(919) 962-106 (FAX)
FAMILY: Wife - Sharon - Kindergarten Teacher
Sons - Thomas - UNC-Chapel Hill Graduate / Married
- Andrew - Miami University Senior

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
Ed.D. Degree University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Educational Psychology - 1976
M.S. Degree Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Higher Education Administration - 1963
B.S. Degree Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Speech Education - 1961

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA at CHAPEL HILL
Director of Housing and Residential Education, July 1983 -
CENTER FOR EDUCATION AND MANAGEMENT Greeley, Colorado
Educational Consultant, January 1983 - June 1983
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO Greeley, Colorado
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Associate
Professor of College Student Personnel Administration,
Director of Housing and Assistant Professor of College
Over my career, I have presented programs and participated on panels at regional, state and national meetings of:

- American College Personnel Association
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
- Association of College and University Housing Officers - International
- Southeast Association of Housing Officers
- Inter-Mountain Association of Housing Officers
- North Carolina College Student Personnel Association
- North Carolina Housing Officers Association
- Mountain/Plains Deans Annual Conferences

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY AFFILIATIONS

Current

- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
- American College Personnel Association
- Association of College and University Housing Officers - International
- Orange Community Housing Corporation - Board of Directors
- State Employees' Credit Union Advisory Board

Past Years

- Greater Orange County United Way - Board of Directors
- Orange County Complete Count Census Committee
- Orange County School Merger Task Force
- Orange County Human Services Advisory Council
- Greeley Congregational Church - Board of Deacons
Elizabeth Anne Jordan

Academic Advising Programs for the General College and Arts & Sciences
110 Steele Building CB #3110
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3110
(919) 843-8916
eajordan@email.unc.edu

Education

Ph.D. University of New Hampshire, 1993
Specialization: Developmental Psychology
Dissertation title: Family system, object relations, and psychosocial development in late adolescence

M.A. University of New Hampshire, 1989
Thesis title: Sex differences in control and compliance during mother-toddler play

B.S. Bowling Green State University, 1987
Major: Psychology

Professional Experience

Academic Advisor, January 2000 to present
Academic Advising Programs for the General College and Arts & Sciences
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC

Academic Advisor/Faculty Associate, Fall 1997 through Summer 1999
Department of Psychology
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ

Assistant Professor, Fall 1993 through Fall 1996
Department of Psychology
Kalamazoo College
Kalamazoo, MI

Full-time Lecturer, Fall 1992 through Summer 1993
Part-time Instructor, Fall 1989 through Summer 1992
Graduate Teaching and Research Assistant, Fall 1987 through Summer 1989
Department of Psychology
University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH
Awards and Fellowships

1999  Finalist, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Award for Excellence in Teaching
1992  University of New Hampshire Summer Fellowship for Teaching Assistants
1991  New Hampshire Psychological Organization Distinguished Graduate Student Award
1991  The Pew Charitable Trusts Teaching Leadership Award

Courses Taught

At Arizona State University

- Introduction to Psychology
- Introduction to Statistics
- Developmental Psychology

At Kalamazoo College

- General Psychology
- Developmental Psychology
- Adult Development and Aging
- Psychology of Women
- Experimental Methods
- Senior Seminar

At University of New Hampshire

- Introduction to Psychology
- Telecourse: Introduction to Psychology
- Statistics in Psychology
- Child Development
- Training in Academic Skills: College Sampler

At University of Southern Maine

- Human Growth and Development

Publications


Manuscripts under editorial review

McCartney, K., Buchanan, T.M., & Jordan, E.A. Using growth curve analysis and the social relations model to assess fine tuning in child directed speech.

Presentations


Other Professional Activities

Counseling and advising

1998 to 1999 Arizona State University Department of Psychology academic advisor
1993 to 1996 Kalamazoo College undergraduate academic advisor
1988 to 1989 University of New Hampshire Graduate and Professional School Advising Program mentor/counselor

Committee work

1995 to 1996 Kalamazoo College Student Life Committee
1994 to 1995 Kalamazoo College Calendar and Curriculum Committee
1994 to 1996 Kalamazoo College Human Development and Social Relations Program Advisory Committee
1991 to 1993 University of New Hampshire Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee
1988 to 1991 Department of Psychology Program Development and Operations Committee
Monitoring Team Communications

From: "Seth Leibowitz" <leibowitz@email.unc.edu>
Date: Sat, 29 Sep 2001 18:33:12 -0700
To: "Wayne & Sharon Kuncl" <skuncl@mindspring.com>, "Elizabeth Jordan" eajordan@email.unc.edu>
Subject: First Questionnaire

Wayne & Beth,

I got 18 out of 20 responses to my 1st questionnaire which is great! All the data that came back from the submission form is in the word attachment. I still might get the other 2 back and if I do I will just work those responses in.

I was concerned over the volume of information that people had written which would of created an overwhelming questionnaire # 2. I consulted with Aaron Clark and he suggested that I use qualitative coding techniques to break up the responses into smaller categories which I did. The respondent from Creighton was unwilling to fill out the questionnaire but sent an E-mail response. Aaron said this was fine. Attached in an acrobat pdf file, is my draft of the second questionnaire. If you want to print it out it will be easier to do in acrobat. The web site below will also take you to it. I also included the link to the 1st questionnaire so you can see that if you forgotten what it looks like.


It would be helpful if you could do the following things:

1. Scan the responses and make sure the 2nd questionnaire represents what the respondents intentions.

2. Look at the subcategories I created and see if the titles of these categories make sense based on the interventions in them.

3. Look at the instructions on the questionnaire to see if they clearly explain the objectives of the study and give the respondents good direction for completing it.

Thanks so much for your help. I will need your feedback by Tuesday afternoon. My goal is to have the 2nd questionnaire out Tues night so the respondents can have it in their E-mail boxes by Wed morning.

Seth Leibowitz

Sent 10/12/01

Howdy,

The 3rd questionnaire is ready. I got 19 out of 20 back on questionnaire # 2 which I am excited about. I still might get the 20th in which case I will work her #s in.
I supplied you with lots of information but you don't need to go over it all in great detail. I used excel to compute the medians which helped me decide what to include and exclude on the 3rd questionnaire. The code sheet is just to help me organize everything and the pdf file will help you view questionnaire 3 in printed form. (Wayne, you will have trouble with your printer again, so I will drop a printed out copy by your house this weekend)

You can also view the questionnaire at the web site below:

http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/users/s/sleibow/dissertation/QUEST3.HTML

The most help I could use with all this is if you look over questionnaire # 3, read the directions, and see if it makes sense. Also there were some additional qualitative comments that came from questionnaire # 2 that I worked into everything. Those are the comments on the questionnaire that don't have ratings scores next to them.

Thanks again and it would be most helpful if you could get any revisions to me sometime early next week. The earlier I can get the questionnaire out to the respondents, the less likely it is that they will forget about my study.

There is another part of processing questionnaire that involves using SAS but no immediacy there because those results will just be included in my dissertation. I will get those to you whenever.

From: Seth Leibowitz [mailto:leibowitz@email.unc.edu]
Sent: Saturday, October 13, 2001 3:13 PM
To: Wayne & Sharon Kuncl; Elizabeth Jordan
Subject: 20th questionnaire

I got the 20th questionnaire back this morning which makes for 100% response rate on round 2.

I put the new numbers into excel and it resulted in the slight change of including item 4B from questionnaire # 2 in questionnaire #3. That is the item that dealt with students signing a commitment contract. Some of the medians went up and down slightly as well.

Wayne, I put a printed, draft copy of questionnaire # 3 in your mailbox this morning.

Thanks again for your help.

Sent 11/10/01
I still am awaiting the arrival of 1 more set of responses for quest. 3. I got 17 back from the E-mail questionnaire and lost 2. One of the 3 who did not return one, requested that I print it out and mail it to her. I am still awaiting her responses in snail mail.

In the mean time I crunched some numbers and came to some conclusions about the 2nd questionnaire. I also wrote up the results for the 1st questionnaire, 2nd questionnaire and part of the 3rd.
I figure I would send you this stuff and let you look it over and then I will send you the results from crunching the other data once I get the 18th questionnaire back. I would expect that to be 1 table, a few paragraphs, and some more sas output in addition to what I have already done. Hopefully I will get that to you later next week.

The first file is a draft of my results chapter, the 2nd one is some tables to explain the round 2 data, and the 3rd is SAS output that I cut and pasted into word.

Let me know what your thoughts are. I am looking to see if what I have so far in the results chapter makes sense based on the data you already reviewed and the feedback that has come back from the respondent group.

Wayne and Beth,
I finally finished! Attached is the second part of the results which includes excel tables that shows how I calculated my results and a word document that has the tables and observations I generated from these calculations.

I changed my methodology around for analyzing the round three data. When I did the correlations I thought they made the data very complicated for the reader to interpret so I devised a system where I evaluated the consistency of the rated and ranked data by simply calculating medians and then subtracting the rating medians from the ranked medians. I cut and pasted my revised mythology into the attachment.

Let me know if you have any comments or revisions on this word document or the one I sent you a few weeks ago that has the information about how I prioritized the 8 categories.

Responses From Monitoring Team

From: Wayne Kuncl [skuncl@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2001 1:00 PM
To: Seth Leibowitz
Subject: Feedback of First Questionnaire & Second Questionnaire

Seth:
Just finished my review. I think you have done an excellent job of classifying responses. I have a couple of suggestions for your consideration. Question 5 - "a. Student accessibility to faculty" - You have included the items under an appropriate category but I wonder if you want to separate out the two issues, "faculty live-in" and "faculty on site offices". When some look at the six items you included in this category, their feeling about this issue might sway their vote one way or the other. Under Question 6 you do have the two items "p. A Masters House." and "q. Faculty apartments in residence halls" do give them an opportunity to rate these two items.

I found two minor spelling issues: Question 4 -h. Academic support "serves" - I wonder if you meant "services" Question 8 -u. Program / Institutions "is" locations in a community with "allot" of diversity. I assume you can make editorial changes for clarification without changing the meaning.
I found your instructions clear and unambiguous. I hope that 100% of the participants take the time to respond recognizing the importance of the results. I personally found the items extremely helpful as I thought about my own beliefs about the various components. I think each of the participants will begin to look at their own programs as a result of responding to the instrument. Your work will make a real contribution to the profession.

Let me know how I can be of further assistance.

Wayne
967-2275

From: Wayne Kuncl [skunci@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2001 10:00 AM
To: Seth Leibowitz
Subject: Re: 20th questionnaire

Seth:

My review of the Round 3 Questionnaire and related data has been completed. I only have a couple of questions and I found two typos. Did the question about faculty living-in the residence hall have a median score of 2.01 or less? I am surprised that this one would be eliminated.

Another observation.
I hope that everyone takes a look at the items connected to the hyperlinks. It would be easy to pass over an item as not being important when just read the brief item that appears on the page of the questionnaire. I don't know how you can do anything about it. Let's just hope they do not feel rushed and just whip through the items.

Another observation, I think it is easier to keep track of ones ranked items on a piece of paper than on the computer monitor. On paper, I can check off the ones I have ranked to see what is left. Do you expect everyone to rank all of the items under each question? If, for example, I only rank 7 of the 14 items, does that make a difference? My question may be getting too technical.

The two typos I found are on the first page. The beginning of paragraph 5 is missing the "I" in "In". In paragraph 6, the first word in the second sentence is "This". I think you want to say "The". The only other nit pick is in that same paragraph, that reads " The median score is a measure of how strongly... " There is an extra space between "how" and "strongly". [My old high school manual type setting skills are coming in handy :-)]

I have an idea for you. At the end of the study, you might want to get feedback from the twenty participants regarding completing the questionnaire on-line vs. the usual pencil and paper approach. It is a tremendous time saving but I wonder if there is any downside to the methodology. This may go beyond the bounds of you study but the feedback could be useful to future researchers wanting to use the internet.

Good luck. You are making great strides and I can see the light at the end of the tunnel. Let me know how I can help.
Wayne

Received 11/27/01
Seth:
Congratulations! Great that you got 17 out of 20 to stay with you through three rounds. I will have to defer to others on your methodology. What you have reported appears clear to me. Let me know how I can be of further assistance.
Wayne

Received 10/03/01
Seth,

Hello. I have had some time this morning to look over your work. Wow! This must have been a lot of work. And it looks very good. I don't have any major comments because I think that it all makes sense. When I read some of the items, I thought they didn't seem as related to the topic, but it should be that way in order to reflect differences among your respondents.

Beth

Received 10/17/01
Seth,

Hello. I've had time to go over the 3rd questionnaire. It looks good! I have several suggestions for small changes. I've written them on a printed copy of the questionnaire, and I'll put that in your mailbox here in Steele. Let me know if any of my suggestions aren't clear.

Beth

Communications Between Researcher and Aaron Clark

Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2001 11:44 AM
To: Seth Leibowitz
Subject: Re: delphi data

That's actually common in most Delphi studies, just show that all responded and you will find out that typically, three or four will do most of the writing in the first round, that's fine, you gave everyone an opportunity to suggest information. Most will save their expertise when they have something to look at. I call those few that do most of the writing in the first round the vanguard group.

At 08:12 PM 9/26/01 -0700, you wrote:
Aaron,
I met with you last year and you gave me great advice about how to perform a delphi study and process delphi data.

I am in the middle of the data collection process of my dissertation Project which happens to be a delphi study.

One of my participants who was selected as an expert panel member and meets all the criteria of an expert does not feel she can contribute much to the 1st questionnaire because she does not have allot of
information to offer. She did give some feedback on the 1st questionnaire but not as much information as the others on the panel. However, she is willing to follow through with the 2nd and 3rd questionnaires.

1. Is this okay?
2. If it is, would it be okay if I just reported in the results section when I am talking about questionnaire return rate something like, "1 out of the 19 panel members contributed some thoughts on the 1st questionnaire but felt she could not fill out the questionnaire completely. This panel member did follow through with completing the 2nd and 3rd questionnaires."

Thanks for your help and all the advice you gave me so far I am implementing and it is working out great.

Seth Leibowitz

your on-line instruments look good, let me know the outcome

Aaron

Hey Aaron,

Thanks again for your great advice. I coded my round 1 responses into broader categories and was able to cut the items down considerably that way. I think this will make for an easier ranking round 3 among the respondents.

When the dust settles I have to show you how I am working the delphi using on-line forms. It is working out great.

You can view my forms at the web sites below if you wish:

http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/users/s/sleibow/dissertation/QUEST1.HTML
http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/users/s/sleibow/dissertation/QUEST2.HTML

Thanks again for your support.

-----Original Message-----
From: Aaron Clark [mailto:Aaron_Clark@ncsu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2001 5:35 PM
To: Seth Leibowitz
Subject: RE: delphi data

The statistical mean from round two usually does not eliminate a lot of things. You may want to break it down into categories if you can for round 3.

At 03:26 PM 9/27/01 -0700, you wrote:

Thanks Aaron.

I have found that by going ahead and ranking them, it makes for a better study, either way will work. If I remember right, you can include them in the ranking, just note to the panel that they are new.
Aaron,

Another question, in my round 2 survey I offered the respondents the opportunity to give more qualitative comments which has created some additional items in each category that were never rated. Should I put those items up for ranking in round 3? If I do that, I guess I can figure out how the group prioritized them by doing a frequency table since there were no ratings to correlate them to. Another option would just be sticking those additional items in my results section.

Thanks you sooooo much for your help. You made it into my acknowledgements sections.
### Round 1 Questionnaire in Bold
### Round 2 Questionnaire in Italics
### Round 3 Questionnaire Underline

**First and Last Name**

**Name**

**Street Address**

**City, State, and Zip Code**

**E-mail Address**

**E-mail Address**

**Institution**

**Institution**

**Type of Institution**

**Living-learning Program Name**

**Living-learning Program Name**

**Position Title**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: Methods Used to Provide Opportunities for Students to Pursue an Academic Life Style.</th>
<th>Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1Arate</strong></td>
<td>a. Academic courses / formal learning experiences in the residence halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1Brate</strong></td>
<td>b. Non-credit / informal, group learning experiences in the residence halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1Crate</strong></td>
<td>c. Active learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1Drate</strong></td>
<td>d. One on one interactions with faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1Erate</strong></td>
<td>e. Events / programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Fr</td>
<td>f. Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Gr</td>
<td>g. Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Hr</td>
<td>h. Policies and procedures to meet the needs of program participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Ir</td>
<td>i. Program mission underlying curricular interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Jr</td>
<td>j. Connections to campus resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Kr</td>
<td>k. Student engagement with faculty and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Lr</td>
<td>l. Residential colleges grant degrees and graduate students. (i.e. Student gets a BA in English from the Residential College of Literature and Sciences)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The academics should be interwoven with the social and cultural components of the living-learning program.
Opportunities for students to explore majors and careers.
Conducting a graduation ceremony for those who complete the first year or semester of a program connected to a living / learning center.

Total of ranked and rated scores for question 1 | Totrank

| 2Ar | a. Groups of students, staff, & faculty make collaborative decisions | 2Arank |
| 2Br | b. Students having authority/responsibility to make significant decisions. | 2Brank |

2. **Student Input into Program Related Decisions (STUDINPUT)**

<p>| Rated | Question2: Methods Used to Allow Student Input into program related decisions. | Ranked |
| 2Ar | a. Groups of students, staff, &amp; faculty make collaborative decisions | 2Arank |
| 2Br | b. Students having authority/responsibility to make significant decisions. | 2Brank |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Crate</th>
<th>c. Elected student government leaders</th>
<th>2Crank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Drate</td>
<td>d. Decision making processes</td>
<td>2Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Erate</td>
<td>e. Student involvement / participation in programs</td>
<td>2Erank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Frate</td>
<td>f. Staff accessibility (i.e, students having E-mail links from a website to give the director feedback about the program)</td>
<td>2Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Grate</td>
<td>g. Giving students little input into the structure of course content</td>
<td>2Grank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Hrate</td>
<td>h. Resident assistant trained to work in program</td>
<td>2Hrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident assistant trained to work in program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni interviews or surveys</td>
<td>2Irank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totrate</td>
<td>Total of ranked and rated scores for question 2</td>
<td>Totrank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Foster Peer Support for Learning (PEERSUPT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated</th>
<th>Question 3: Methods Used to Foster Peer Support for Learning</th>
<th>Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3Arate</td>
<td>a. Study group arrangements</td>
<td>3Arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Brate</td>
<td>b. Tutoring</td>
<td>3Brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Crate</td>
<td>c. Supportive classroom environments.</td>
<td>3Crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Drate</td>
<td>d. Classes are taught with group learning strategies</td>
<td>3Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Erate</td>
<td>e. Having role models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Frate</td>
<td>f. Programming initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Grate</td>
<td>g. Positions held by student leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Hrate</td>
<td>h. Academic support serves having a strong presence in the halls so that seeking academic assistance is viewed as a very &quot;normal&quot; thing to do among the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Irake</td>
<td>i. Clusters of peers providing support for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Jrate</td>
<td>j. Enforcement of quiet hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Krate</td>
<td>k. Students help each other get to class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3lrate</td>
<td>l. Small class sizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mrate</td>
<td>m. The community is informed of all the participant's majors so relationships can be formed with students in like majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3nrate</td>
<td>n. Expectations for student participation are clearly laid out to students when they enter the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3orate</td>
<td>o. Student participants are involved campus wide in a wide variety of programs and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3prate</td>
<td>p. During RA training we talk about the Student Learning Experience at the college and help them understand the philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the College and Department of Residential Life. We send the message that student staff support is essential in helping students focus on their priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>totrate</th>
<th>Total of ranked and rated scores for question 3</th>
<th>totrank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Encourage Active Student Participation (STUDPART)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated</th>
<th>Question 4: Methods Used to Encourage Active Student Participation</th>
<th>Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Arate</td>
<td>a. Students apply for admission into the program which includes a written application and an interview.</td>
<td>4Arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Brate</td>
<td>b. Students sign a statement of commitment</td>
<td>4Arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Crate</td>
<td>c. Students pay dues additional from housing fees and tuition to be part of the program</td>
<td>4Brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Drate</td>
<td>d. An expectation that students participate in programs and events</td>
<td>4Brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Erate</td>
<td>e. Students who don’t participate are asked to leave the program following a probationary period.</td>
<td>4Crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Frate</td>
<td>f. Participation in early orientation for program</td>
<td>4Crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Grate</td>
<td>g. Meetings for both social and academic purposes. Social programs can include students eating and recreating together.</td>
<td>4Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Hrate</td>
<td>h. Participants talking more about academic issues in comparison to non participants</td>
<td>4Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Irate</td>
<td>i. Staff is provided assessment data of students perceptions about the residence hall environment relative to its academic atmosphere, involvement with faculty, use of academic resources</td>
<td>4Fr ank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and are then asked to translate the data into strategies to motivate more active participation in academic activities.

4Jrate

j. Staff gauge and encourage participation in one on one meetings. Participation is monitored by a student and staff committee.

4Krate

k. Providing leadership opportunities for students

4Lrate

l. Traffic and activities are channeled into public spaces.

4Mrate

m. Students self-select into the program

4Nrate

n. Posting messages about events on campus in the halls / Publicity through E-mail, flyers posters, ect. / Students commit to promote the program by sitting at an information desk

4Orate

o. Active student learning motivates participation

4Prate

p. Students share concern for each other's academic needs

4Qrate

q. Peer education courses on topics such as relationship violence, HIV/AIDS prevention, eating disorders, and substance abuse.

4Rrate

r. Last lecture series (Professors are asked to construct their last and best lecture)

4Srave

s. Popular and essential academic services like advising are provided in the residence halls

4Trate

t. Students are given the opportunity to participate in the program prior to the beginning of their freshmen semester (at orientation)
4Urate  | Programs that focus on relationship building to instill the value of developing relationships with neighbors.  | 4Orank

4Urate  | Total of ranked and rated scores for question 4  | 4Orank

### 5. Close Student and Faculty/Staff Relationships (RELATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated</th>
<th>Question 5: Methods Used to Encourage Students to Have Close Relationships with Faculty and Staff.</th>
<th>Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5Arate</td>
<td>a. Student accessibility to live-in faculty</td>
<td>5Arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Brate</td>
<td>b. Student accessibility to faculty, on-site</td>
<td>5Brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Crate</td>
<td>c. Faculty get invitations to programs and events</td>
<td>5Crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Drate</td>
<td>d. Faculty connections to a particular groups of students</td>
<td>5Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Erate</td>
<td>e. Encouraging informal / out of classroom interactions with faculty</td>
<td>5Erank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Frate</td>
<td>f. Student participation levels in living-learning classes are higher in comparison to classes held outside of the residence halls.</td>
<td>5Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Grate</td>
<td>g. Budgets targeted for programs that involve faculty.</td>
<td>5Grank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Hrate</td>
<td>h. Classroom space</td>
<td>5Grank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Irate</td>
<td>i. A network of faculty, staff, and community members who all have relationships and responsibilities to the students. All members of these networks have access to public spaces and attend programs in the residential college.</td>
<td>5Hrank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 6: Methods Used to Provide Facilities that Meet Students Needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated</th>
<th>Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6Arate</strong></td>
<td>a. Spaces that facilitate discussion and studying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6Brate</strong></td>
<td>b. Students are permitted to decorate common areas. (Decorations are relevant to program themes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Crate</td>
<td>c. Classroom spaces in residence halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Drate</td>
<td>d. Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Erate</td>
<td>e. Computer labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Frate</td>
<td>f. Wired rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Grate</td>
<td>g. Living room area used for group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Hrate</td>
<td>h. Outdoor basketball court / Volleyball court / recreation room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Irate</td>
<td>i. Amphitheater for programs / theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Jrate</td>
<td>j. Classrooms that are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for meetings and studying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Krate</td>
<td>k. Library in house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Lrate</td>
<td>l. Facilities for students interested in the fine and performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Mrate</td>
<td>m. Language table rooms / Foreign language laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Nrate</td>
<td>n. Most amenities/student services are decentralized in each residential college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Orate</td>
<td>o. Dining services are linked to student programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Prate</td>
<td>p. A &quot;Masters House&quot; located on site that provides a significant degree of student support. (Masters are tenured faculty that do much of the work that residence life personnel do at most other institutions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Qrate</td>
<td>q. Faculty apartments in residence halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Rrate</td>
<td>r. Designing new buildings around the needs of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Srate</td>
<td>s. Housing the program in an old / historic building on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Trate</td>
<td>t. Fire places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Urate</td>
<td>u. Indoor swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Vrate</td>
<td>v. Dining hall in house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Wrate</td>
<td>w. Large living spaces with high ceilings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Xrate</td>
<td>x. Beautiful grounds with much green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Yrate</td>
<td>y. Study abroad and Americorps offices located in residence hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total of ranked and rated scores for question 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Staffing (STAFF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7Arate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Brate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Crate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Drate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Erate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Frate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Grate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Hrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Irate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Jrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Krate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Lrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Explore Different Areas of Study (DIFFSTUD)

Question 8: Methods Used to Encourage Students to Explore Different Areas of Study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Faculty participate from a wide range of disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Reading and discussion groups that cover a wide range of topics and interests. / Offering in house courses on a wide variety of topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Students have an opportunity to explore a wide range of artistic expression / Program focus on music, film, &amp; culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Student and professional staff are drawn from a wide range of academic disciplines and backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Student culture is about encouraging difference, exploration, and open exchange of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Emphasis of career exploration or finding alternative careers within majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Students focusing on a specific theme like engineering also have to take courses in the College of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Participants are exposed to a student success center which operates outside of the living-learning program but includes an integrated operation of academic advising and career services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Program is open to only undeclared freshman with prior leadership experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Course is given to familiarize new students with campus resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Cross programming with other houses/living-learning programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>A variety of guest speakers in classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>m.</strong></td>
<td>Course content has a strong emphasis on foreign languages and the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n.</strong></td>
<td>Programs encouraging students to make thoughtful choices about majors rather than base major decisions on careers. Workshops on exploring major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>o.</strong></td>
<td>Programs that emphasize not putting time pressure on students to declare majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p.</strong></td>
<td>Programs are designed by faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>q.</strong></td>
<td>Groups in program make public presentation to other groups on campus throughout the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>r.</strong></td>
<td>Students self-select into programs based on major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>s.</strong></td>
<td>Shops (i.e., wood and photo shops) lend themselves to exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t.</strong></td>
<td>Recruiting non arts majors to participate in a program that is focused on the creative and performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>u.</strong></td>
<td>Program / Institutions is located in a community with allot of diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v.</strong></td>
<td>Advisors work individually with assigned students to help them plan their schedules and select majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>w.</strong></td>
<td>Students work with tutors from different majors across campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>x.</strong></td>
<td>The involvement of the first year inquiry courses in a freshman’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8xrate</td>
<td>first semester exposes them to some of the diversity of the university's course offerings at the beginning of their college involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totrank</td>
<td>Total of ranked and rated scores for question 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N

SAS/EXCEL Output and Programs

SAS Programs

Programs for Quest 1

libname sll"a:\";
data one; set sll.q1;
proc freq;
tables quest1;
run;

libname sll"a:\";
data one; set sll.q1;
if quest1 le 37 then quest1 = .;
proc univariate;
var quest1;
run;

Programs for Quest 2

libname sll"a:\";
data one; set sll.q2;
proc freq;
tables quest2;
run;

libname sll"a:\";
data one; set sll.q2;
if quest2 le 42 then quest2 = .;
if quest2 ge 74 then quest2 = .;
proc univariate;
var quest2;
run;

Programs for Quest 3

libname sll"a:\";
data one; set sll.q3;
proc freq;
tables quest3;
run;

libname sll"a:\";
data one; set sll.q3;
if quest3 le 41 then quest3 = .;
if quest3 ge 71 then quest3 = .;
proc univariate;
var quest3;
run;

Programs for Quest 4
libname sll"a:\";  
data one; set sll.q4;  
proc freq;  
tables quest4;  
run;  

libname sll"a:\";  
data one; set sll.q4;  
if quest4 le 44 then quest4 = .;  
proc univariate;  
var quest4;  
run;  

Programs for Quest 5  
libname sll"a:\";  
data one; set sll.q5;  
proc freq;  
tables quest5;  
run;  

libname sll"a:\";  
data one; set sll.q5;  
if quest5 le 45 then quest5 = .;  
if quest5 ge 77 then quest5 = .;  
proc univariate;  
var quest5;  
run;  

Programs for Quest 6  
libname sll"a:\";  
data one; set sll.q6;  
proc freq;  
tables quest6;  
run;  

libname sll"a:\";  
data one; set sll.q6;  
if quest6 le 26 then quest6 = .;  
if quest6 ge 77 then quest6 = .;  
proc univariate;  
var quest6;  
run;  

Programs for Quest 7  
libname sll"a:\";  
data one; set sll.q7;  
proc freq;  
tables quest7;  
run;  

libname sll"a:\";  
data one; set sll.q7;  
if quest7 le 39 then quest7 = .;  
if quest7 ge 78 then quest7 = .;  
proc univariate;  
var quest7;  
run;
Programs for Quest8
libname sll"a:\";
data one; set sll.q8;
proc freq;
tables quest8;
run;

libname sll"a:\";
data one; set sll.q8;
if quest8 le 33 then quest8 = .;
if quest8 ge 69 then quest8 = .;
proc univariate;
var quest8;
run;

SAS Output

```
The SAS System       08:17 Monday, November 5, 2001  28
The FREQ Procedure
Quest 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
The SAS System       08:17 Monday, November 5, 2001  31
The FREQ Procedure
Quest 1 After outlier of 37 Was Removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Frequency Missing = 1

```
The SAS System       08:17 Monday, November 5, 2001  32
The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: Quest 1
```
Moments

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>69.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>3.71483512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.8439852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrected SS</td>
<td>52509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coef Variation</td>
<td>5.38381902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum Weights</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum Observations</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-1.0186936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected SS</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error Mean</td>
<td>1.12006493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Statistical Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>69.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>71.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>72.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>3.71484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>13.80000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>9.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interquartile Range</td>
<td>7.000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The FREQ Procedure

quest2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quest2</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 2
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The FREQ Procedure

quest2 after outliers of 42 and 74 were removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quest2</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 2
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The UNIVARIATE Procedure

Variable: quest2 (quest2)

Moments

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>62.3333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>3.44480285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.67843611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrected SS</td>
<td>23372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coef Variation</td>
<td>5.52642168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum Weights</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum Observations</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>11.8666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.81429112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected SS</td>
<td>59.3333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Error Mean</td>
<td>1.40633487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Statistical Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>62.3333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>62.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>62.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>3.44480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>11.86667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>10.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interquartile Range</td>
<td>4.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

233
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quest3
quest3 Frequency Percent Cumulative Frequency Cumulative Percent
41 1 6.25 1 6.25
47 1 6.25 2 12.50
55 1 6.25 3 18.75
57 2 12.50 5 31.25
60 1 6.25 6 37.50
61 3 18.75 9 56.25
62 1 6.25 10 62.50
63 2 12.50 12 75.00
66 1 6.25 13 81.25
67 1 6.25 14 87.50
70 1 6.25 15 93.75
71 1 6.25 16 100.00
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The FREQ Procedure
quest3 after 41 & 71 were removed
quest3 Frequency Percent Cumulative Frequency Cumulative Percent
47 1 7.14 1 7.14
55 1 7.14 2 14.29
57 2 14.29 4 28.57
60 1 7.14 5 35.71
61 3 21.43 8 57.14
62 1 7.14 9 64.29
63 2 14.29 11 78.57
66 1 7.14 12 85.71
67 1 7.14 13 92.86
70 1 7.14 14 100.00
Frequency Missing = 2
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quest3 after 41 & 71 were removed
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The FREQ Procedure

The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: quest3 (quest3)

Moments
N        14 Sum Weights        14
Mean     60.7142957 Sum Observations 850
Std Deviation 5.6490785 Variance 31.9120879
Skewness -0.8194491 Kurtosis 1.76562141
Uncorrected SS 52022 Corrected SS 414.857143
Coeff Variation 9.30436459 Std Error Mean 1.50977974

Basic Statistical Measures
 Location Variability
Mean     60.71429 Std Deviation 5.64908
Median   61.00000 Variance 31.91209
Mode     61.00000 Range 23.00000
Interquartile Range 6.00000
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The FREQ Procedure
### Frequency Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quest4</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The SAS System 08:17 Monday, November 5, 2001 44**

**The FREQ Procedure**

quest4 after 44 is removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quest4</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency Missing = 1**
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**The UNIVARIATE Procedure**

Variable: quest4 (quest4)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sum Weights</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>Sum Observations</td>
<td>66.0421053</td>
<td>1.2264307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>8.12662939</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>66.0421053</td>
<td>1.2264307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.01231699</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-1.2264307</td>
<td>1.81716957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrected SS</td>
<td>67810</td>
<td>Corrected SS</td>
<td>1254.8</td>
<td>13.50000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Statistical Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interquartile Range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The mode displayed is the smallest of 4 modes with a count of 2.
### The FREQ Procedure

#### quest5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quest5</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Frequency Missing = 2

#### The UNIVARIATE Procedure

**Variable:** quest5  (quest5)

### Basic Statistical Measures

#### Location

| Mean  | 57.80000  | Std Deviation | 7.12340  | Median  | 58.00000  | Variance | 50.74286 |

#### Variability

| Coeff Variation | 12.324225 | Std Error Mean  | 1.83925451 |
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The FREQ Procedure

quest6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quest6</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 2
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quest6 after 26 and 77 were removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quest6</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 2
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The UNIVARIATE Procedure

Variable: quest6 (quest6)

Moments

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sum Weights</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>Sum Observations</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>10.3747946</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>107.636364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Statistical Measures

Location
Mean 49.00000  Std Deviation 10.37479
Median 46.00000  Variance 107.63636
Mode 36.00000  Range 39.00000
Interquartile Range 16.00000

Varialbility
Skewness 0.54486588  Kurtosis -0.3522505
Uncorrected SS 57591  Corrected SS 2368
Coeff Variation 21.1730503  Std Error Mean 2.16329422

NOTE: The mode displayed is the smallest of 5 modes with a count of 2.

The FREQ Procedure

quest7

quest7  Frequency  Percent  Cumulative  Frequency  Cumulative  Percent
39   1          4.55        1            4.55
40   1          4.55        2            9.09
41   1          4.55        3           13.64
42   1          4.55        4           18.18
45   1          4.55        5           22.73
52   1          4.55        6           27.27
53   1          4.55        7           31.82
54   1          4.55        8           36.36
55   1          4.55        9           40.91
57   1          4.55       10           45.45
58   1          4.55       11           50.00
59   1          4.55       12           54.55
60   1          4.55       13           59.09
64   1          4.55       14           63.64
66   1          4.55       15           68.18
68   1          4.55       16           72.73
70   1          4.55       17           77.27
72   1          4.55       18           81.82
73   1          4.55       19           86.36
77   2          9.09       21           95.45
78   1          4.55       22          100.00

The FREQ Procedure
quest7 after 39 and 78 were removed

quest7  Frequency  Percent  Cumulative  Frequency  Cumulative  Percent
40   1          5.00        1            5.00
41   1          5.00        2           10.00
42   1          5.00        3           15.00
45   1          5.00        4           20.00
52   1          5.00        5           25.00
53   1          5.00        6           30.00
54   1          5.00        7           35.00
55   1          5.00        8           40.00
57   1          5.00        9           45.00
58   1          5.00       10           50.00
59   1          5.00       11           55.00
60   1          5.00       12           60.00
64   1          5.00       13           65.00
66   1          5.00       14           70.00
68   1          5.00       15           75.00
70   1          5.00       16           80.00
72   1          5.00       17           85.00
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The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: quest7 (quest7)

Moments

N                          20    Sum Weights                 20
Mean                    59.15    Sum Observations          1183
Std Deviation      11.6766749    Variance            136.344737
Skewness            -0.115222    Kurtosis            -0.9569249
Uncorrected SS          72565    Corrected SS           2590.55
Coeff Variation     19.740786    Std Error Mean      2.61098388

Basic Statistical Measures

Location          Variability
Mean     59.15000     Std Deviation           11.67667
Median   58.50000     Variance               136.34474
Mode     77.00000     Range                   37.00000
Interquartile Range     16.50000

The FREQ Procedure
quest8 after 33 and 69 are removed

quest8Frequency Percent Cumulative Frequency Cumulative Percent
38    1    4.55         1     4.55
39    1    4.55         2     9.09
40    1    4.55         3    14.64
45    1    4.55         5    22.27
46    1    4.55         6    27.27
49    3    13.64        10    45.45
61    1    4.17         22    91.67
63    1    4.17         23    95.83
69    1    4.17         24    100.00
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 2
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The UNIVARIATE Procedure
Variable: quest8 (quest8)

Moments

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sum Weights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>50.4090909</td>
<td>Sum Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>6.96699082</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.096885</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrected SS</td>
<td>56923</td>
<td>Corrected SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeff Variation</td>
<td>13.8209015</td>
<td>Std Error Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Statistical Measures

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>50.40909</td>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>50.50000</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>49.00000</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interquartile Range</td>
<td>10.00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excel Output

Median Differences for Question 1

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>erank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>hrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>irank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>jrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>kr ank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of Question 1 Curricula From Lowest to Highest Ranked

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>krank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br ank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar ank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir ank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er ank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir ank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hrank 134
grank 173
mrank 178
nrank 198

Median Differences for Question 2

arate 3 arank 1 arank-arate -2
brate 3 brank 3 brank-brate 0
crate 3 crank 5 crank-crate 2
drate 3 drank 4 drank-drate 1
erate 4 erank 3 erank-erate -1
frate 3 frank 6 frank-frate 3
hrate 3 drank 5.5 drank-hrate 2.5

Listing of Question 2 Curricula From Lowest to Highest Ranked
arank 35
erank 56
brank 60
drank 70
grank 83
frank 93
crank 96
hrank 129
irank 134

Median Differences of Question 3

arate 3 arank 3 arank-arate 0
brate 3 brank 3 brank-brate 0
crate 3 crank 6 crank-crate 3
drate 3 drank 4 drank-drate 1
erate 4 erank 5 erank-erate 1
frate 3 frank 4 frank-frate 1
grate 3 drank 8 drank-grate 5
jrate 3 drank 8 drank-jrate 5
nrate 4 drank 7 drank-nrate 3
prate 3.5 drank 7 drank-prate 3.5

Median Differences for Question 4

brate 2.5 Arank 12 arank-brate 9.5
drate 3 Brank 6 drank-brate 3
frate 3 Crank 7 crank-frate 4
grate 3.5 Drank 5 drank-grate 1.5
hrate 3 Erank 10 drank-hrate 7
irate 4 Frank 8 drank-irate 4
krate 3.5 Grank 4 drank-krate 0.5
lrate 3 Hrank 10.5 drank-lrate 7.5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Median Difference</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Irank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Krank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Mrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>srate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Orank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median Differences for Question 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Median Difference</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Erank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Irank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Krank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nrate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Lrank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median Differences for Question 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Median Difference</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Erank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Irank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jrank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median Differences for Question 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Median Difference</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Erank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Krank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Median Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Qrank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median Differences For Question 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Median Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erate</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Erank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Irank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jrank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Krank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>