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Ten-Year Review and Five-Year Recommendations for Living and Learning at North Carolina State University

Final report from the 2012 - 2013 Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE convened in 2012-2013 to review the last ten years of development of living and learning at NC State and make recommendations for continued growth during the next five years. Additionally, the Task Force was charged to respond to the University’s strategic plan to “enhance the success of our students through educational innovation.” Based on the University’s strategic plan, presentations from current residents and analyses of national trends in higher education, local housing markets, and student success data, five primary messages emerged from the proceedings.

- University Housing and campus partners must respond to the University’s strategic goals to increase the number of freshmen participating in Living and Learning Villages, enroll a greater percentage of transfer students and provide high-impact experiences for undergraduate students.
- Students in Living and Learning Villages tend to be better prepared for the academic rigor of college, are more likely to be engaged in campus activities, maintain campus residency at a higher level, and are academically more successful than their peers.
- Current residents are very satisfied with the Village experience, particularly the strong sense of community that the Villages foster.
- In light of transformational changes occurring in higher education, universities, who want to maintain a focus on the campus experience, must blend the academic and residential experiences and promote the benefits of students living together as a means to enrich learning and to develop social competence.
- Even with a wide variety of rental options in the area, living on campus at NC State is the only option in which students can effectively blend learning and living experiences.

As a result, the faculty, staff and students of the Task Force recognize living and learning at North Carolina State University as a significant asset to student success, life of the community, recruitment of new students and a hallmark of the University’s unique culture. Final recommendations reflect an eagerness to build upon the current strengths and momentum of living and learning initiatives and contribute to achieving the University’s strategic goals by increasing participation of undergraduate students in Villages, integrating more academic partnerships and involvement, enhancing physical spaces, developing more efficient and sustainable operational practices, demonstrating impacts on student success, and extending successful village-type experiences to all students.
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I. VISION & GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR LIVING AND LEARNING AT NC STATE

The 2002 Task Force established the following vision and guidelines, which form the foundation for growth and development of living and learning at NC State.

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

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

II. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to advance the growth and development of living and learning experiences for students residing on campus at North Carolina State University and fulfill the University’s strategic goal to increase the number of freshmen participating in Living and Learning Villages, the 2012-2013 Task Force on Living and Learning recommends the following priorities for the next five years. Implementation teams will be tasked to develop action plans where appropriate.

1. Ensure all colleges are fully committed partners of Living and Learning Villages with increased faculty involvement and appropriate levels of support.

2. Recruit and retain first-year, transfer and upper-class students to live in Living and Learning Villages.

3. Develop shared and systematic values, outcomes, and practices to create, operate, assess and enhance living and learning for all campus residents.

4. Create or enhance learning, office, multipurpose, and common spaces of campus-residential buildings.

5. Evaluate and adjust campus-housing options and capacity over the next five years based on the University enrollment plan, 2007 University Housing Master Plan, and on-going market analysis.

6. Encourage campus partners to implement strategies suggested by the Task Force, which will assist in fulfilling related recommendations.

7. Develop a first-year experience program, which ensures all first-year students are immersed into special-interest communities designed to nurture an appreciation for diversity and foster academic, social, and personal growth through shared intellectual and social experiences.
III. 10 YEARS | 10 VILLAGES: LIVING AND LEARNING AT NC STATE FROM 2002 - 2013

Brief History of the Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE
The Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE has convened three times, during the last ten years, to evaluate the present status of living on campus and plan for a future of dynamic and effective growth that enhances student success and responds to the University’s strategic plan. Since its inception in 2001, the Task Force has had the fortunate honor of being chaired by Dr. Kay Moore, former dean of the College of Education and current professor of Leadership Policy and Adult and Higher Education. In addition to the valuable continuity in leadership, Dr. Moore brings a commitment to student development and insights on creating a rich and comprehensive environment that supports student success.

Established in the fall of 2001 by University Housing, the original Task Force proposed a vision and set of guiding principles to integrate the academic and personal development of students. Specifically, the Task Force called for the development of Living and Learning Villages as a means to accomplish this vision. The term “Village” was suggested by the late Coach Kay Yow, head coach for women’s basketball from 1975 – 2009, and represents intimate interest-driven communities designed to marry students’ academic and personal experiences. The Task Force also recommended increasing the student bed count. From 2002-2007, seven Living and Learning Villages were established, and almost 1,400 beds were added to campus with the completion of Wolf Village and the purchase of Western Manor Apartments.

In the spring of 2007, the Task Force reconvened to evaluate progress on the original recommendations. The 2007 Task Force issued a report illustrating the exceptional growth of Villages, development of partnerships with colleges, establishment of Village administrative councils, construction of new common spaces, and an increase in student participation.

In the fall of 2012, the Task Force assembled again to review the last ten years of development of living and learning at NC State and make recommendations for continued growth during the next five years. Dr. Mike Mullen, Vice Chancellor and Dean of Academic and Student Affairs, joined Dr. Kay Moore as co-chair for the Task Force. They charged the Task Force to respond to the University’s strategic goals to increase the number of freshmen participating in Living and Learning Villages and review the status of living and learning in campus housing. Members celebrated the development of ten Villages over the last ten years, new housing construction on Centennial Campus, and record numbers of students living on campus and participating in Villages. Presentations from current residents demonstrated an exceptional level of student satisfaction with the Village experience. Analyses of national trends, local housing markets, and student success data helped shape recommendations for the future.

Final recommendations contribute to achieving the University’s strategic goals by increasing participation of all students in Villages, integrating more academic partnerships and involvement, enhancing physical spaces and operational practices, developing measurable outcomes to demonstrate impacts on student success, and extending successful village-type experiences to all students.

Spirit of the Village Award
Named in honor of the late Coach Kay Yow, who coined the “Village” moniker, the Spirit of the Village Award was established in 2008 and recognizes outstanding Village participants.
**Development of Living and Learning Villages at NC State University**

Fall 2002  Original Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE convenes and conceptualizes the Village model and framework, which results in the recommendation to establish five Villages by 2006.

Fall 2003  The following Villages are established:

- Students Advocating for Youth Village
- University Honors Village
- University Scholars Village
- Women in Science & Engineering Village

Fall 2004  First Year College Village is established.

Fall 2005  Global Village is established.

With this Village, NC State exceeds the original recommendations of the Task Force.

Spring 2007  The Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE reconvenes for a five-year review to evaluate the progress of the original recommendations.

Fall 2007  Arts Village is established.

Fall 2009  IMPACT Leadership Village is established.

Fall 2010  Women of Welch Village is established.

Fall 2012  Second-Year Transition & Transfer Experience (S.T.A.T.E) is established.

The Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE reconvenes to review current initiatives and develop recommendations for the future.

Fall 2013  Wood Wellness Village, EcoVillage and Engineering Village will launch.

Fall 2014  Entrepreneurs Village will launch.
IV. 2012 - 2013 TASK FORCE ON LIVING AND LEARNING AT NC STATE

Charge
The 2012-2013 Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE convened in the fall of 2012 to review the last ten years of development of living and learning on campus and make recommendations for continued growth for the next five years. The results of the review were intended to assist University Housing and the Division of Academic and Student Affairs to develop initiatives consistent with the University’s strategic plan to “enhance the success of our students through educational innovation.” Specifically, the Task Force was charged to develop recommendations for enhancing living and learning with consideration to engaging students throughout their tenure at NC State, increasing faculty involvement, advising the campus community on improving the student experience and staying competitive in an increasingly on-line world.

Process
The Task Force met four times during the 2012-2013 academic year. The first two meetings were dedicated to reviewing the current status of living and learning at NC State. Eighteen students, representing NC State’s ten Living and Learning Villages, presented their perspectives on choosing to live in particular Villages and what they have gained from the experiences. Additionally, Task Force members reviewed current and future University Housing initiatives. The last two meetings focused on the future. Consultant Dr. Bill Zeller, from the University of California Irvine, reviewed national trends shaping higher education and living and learning programs. He also led the Task Force in a visioning session to identify strengths and areas for enhancement for living and learning programs at NC State. Linda Anderson of Anderson Strickler, LLC presented a local housing-market survey. Trey Standish with University Planning and Analysis presented a study of academic and engagement data for NC State students in Living and Learning Villages compared to their peers in different housing scenarios. During each meeting, significant time was allowed for brainstorming and discussion of current needs and future initiatives. The final meeting was dedicated to reviewing all suggested goals and strategies that had emerged from the various discussions and identifying final recommendations. Finally, members had the opportunity to offer feedback on the recommendations prior to a final report being published.

Timeline
October 19, 2012 Charge, University Housing Overview, Student Presentations, Small-Group Discussions

November 2, 2012 Student Presentations, Pilot Programs, Small-Group Discussions


February 1, 2013 Identify Final Recommendations

February 22 - March 1, 2013 Task Force Review of Final Recommendations

April 2013 Final Recommendations & Reported Submitted
**Membership**

Chaired by Dr. Kay Moore, Professor of Leadership Policy, Adult and Higher Education in the College of Education, and Dr. Mike Mullen, Vice Chancellor and Dean of Academic and Student Affairs, the Task Force is comprised of 26 student, faculty, and staff members representing a broad cross-section of colleges, student programs and services, and administrative units. Dr. Tim Luckadoo, Vice Provost for Campus Life, and Ms. Susan Grant, Director of University Housing, served as members and coordinated Task Force activities and proceedings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>College/Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kay Moore, Chair</td>
<td>Professor Leadership Policy, Adult and Higher Education</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mike Mullen, Chair</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor and Dean</td>
<td>Academic and Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Larry Blanton</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>University Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeff Braden</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>College of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherard Clinkscales</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jo-Ann Cohen</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>College of Physical and Mathematical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Fox</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>College of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Grant</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>University Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Harwood</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Centennial Campus Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hauschild</td>
<td>Associate Director (former)</td>
<td>First Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Hoynacke</td>
<td>Graduate Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Graduate Student Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Louis Hunt</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>Enrollment Management and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Johnson</td>
<td>University Architect</td>
<td>University Architects Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Barbara Kirby</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost</td>
<td>Academic and Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jerome Lavelle</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Lo</td>
<td>President, Senior, Business Administration</td>
<td>Inter-Residence Council, Poole College of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Tim Luckadoo</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>Campus Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan North Martin</td>
<td>Director, Outreach, Communications and Consulting</td>
<td>Office of Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Barry Olson</td>
<td>Director, Business Administration</td>
<td>Campus Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Pappenhagen</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>University Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trey Standish</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Enrollment Planning</td>
<td>University Planning and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Tasaico</td>
<td>Senior Director</td>
<td>Foundations Accounting and Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Tongsri</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Office of Student Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Katherine Titus-Becker</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Women in Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Woodard</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>Institutional Equity and Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. PRESENTATIONS

University Housing Overview

At North Carolina State University, students have a choice of where they live. Of the 21,665 full-time undergraduates enrolled in 2012-2013, over 47%, including 77% of new freshmen, chose to call University Housing their home. This occupancy level ranks NC State fifth among its peers in undergraduate housing. Current housing options at NC State include traditional suite and corridor residence halls, multiple-styles of apartments, and Greek Housing.

Fast Facts

- Total Beds: 10,244
  - Residence Halls: 6,559
  - Wolf Village Apartments: 1,208
  - ES King Village Apartments: 528
  - Western Manor Apartments: 273
  - Greek Houses: 481

- Gender Breakdown:
  - 43% women
  - 57% men

- Class representation in residence halls and Wolf Village:
  - Freshmen: 35%
  - Sophomores: 34%
  - Juniors: 18%
  - Seniors: 12%
  - Graduates: 1%

Programs

Campus residents are immersed into dynamic communities designed to support student success, embrace diversity, cultivate leadership skills, and promote personal responsibility through a wide variety of high-impact experiences and academic-support services. A dedicated staff of 115 professionals, 450 students, and a broad range of academic and student affairs partners fulfill these responsibilities.

- High-Impact Activities – All students living in campus housing have access to many high-impact activities, such as:
  - Diversity Trips
  - Leadership opportunities:
    - Resident Advisor, Inter-Residence Council, National Residence Hall Honorary, representation at state, regional and national conferences, coordinating events and activities for students, Alternative Spring Break coordinator

Almost 50% of NC State full-time undergraduates choose to live on campus taking advantage of the wide variety of housing options and diverse programming University Housing offers.

This occupancy ranks NC State fifth among its peers in undergraduate housing.

Campus residents are immersed into dynamic communities designed to:

- Support student success
- Embrace diversity
- Cultivate leadership skills
- Promote personal responsibility
- **Academic Support** – All students living on campus have access to many resources for academic support, including:
  - 24/7 access to 7 computing labs complete with 158 workstations and collaboration tables
  - Student lounges with group collaboration equipment
  - Writing Tutors Program
  - Tutorial services coordinated with the Undergraduate Tutorial Center
  - Summer Start for freshmen
  - First Year College walk-in advising

**Assessment**

A robust assessment plan examines the impact of University Housing’s programmatic and business practices. Measurements include GPA comparisons of residents vs. non-residents, analyses of student conduct records of alcohol and drug citations, student-satisfaction surveys of work order and assignments processes, annual market analysis, and peer reviews. Additionally, University Housing has created a position for a doctoral graduate assistant to coordinate future assessment initiatives beginning Fall 2013.

**Future Development**

Future development of on-campus housing will increase capacity and create new and improved housing options. In Fall 2013, phase one of Wolf Ridge at Centennial will open for upper-class and graduate students on Centennial Campus. Located adjacent to the Hunt Library, the apartment-style facility will be LEED Silver accredited and feature University Dining and Bookstore operations, as well as the Entrepreneurs Village and Entrepreneurs Garage. Wolf Ridge will house approximately 1,200 students upon completion in 2014. Long-range plans include replacing Lee Hall and Sullivan Hall in 2024 with a residential quad designed to support Living and Learning Villages.

**Living and Learning Villages**

NC State’s Living and Learning Villages offer campus residents the added value of living in interest-based communities designed to facilitate active and collaborative learning with peers, faculty, and staff. The Villages function as an extension of University Housing’s mission to promote academic success, diversity, leadership development, and personal responsibility. Rich partnerships with academic and student affairs departments offer unique academic, cultural, and social opportunities designed to engage students inside and outside of the classroom.

**Fast Facts:**

- 11,102 students have lived in the Villages since their inception in 2003.
- 1,930 or 29% of students currently living on campus reside in the Villages.
- 1,380 or 44% of new freshmen live in the Villages.

There are presently ten established Living and Learning Villages and two pilot programs, which are located in all areas of main campus. Villages range in size from 18 to 430 participants and represent academic, leadership, global issues, wellness, and arts concentrations. Future Village concepts include Wood Wellness Village, the EcoVillage, and Engineering Village. Nine out of the ten Villages offer a
for-credit course. All Villages offer specialized academic, cultural, social, service, and leadership experiences. Administrative councils made up of students, faculty, staff and University Housing personnel support programming, assessment, and governance functions.

**Current Villages:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>2012-2013 Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Honors Village</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Scholars Village</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Advocating for Youth Village</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Science and Engineering Village</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year College Village</td>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Village</td>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS Village</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT Leadership Village</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women of Welch Village</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Year Transition and Transfer Experience</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pilot Villages:**
- Wood Wellness Pilot
- Freshman Engineering Pilot

**New Villages in 2013:**
- Wood Wellness Village
- EcoVillage
- Engineering Village

**Village Logos**
### Student Presentations

During the initial Task Force meetings, 18 students representing the 10 Living and Learning Villages shared their perspectives on living in particular Villages and what they gained from the experiences. Following each presentation, members of the Task Force asked students questions about their experiences. The majority of students expressed their overwhelming satisfaction with the Village experience; some also identified a few areas for enhancement.

### Benefits of Village Living – Residents’ Perspectives

Students living in Living and Learning Villages value:
- Strong sense of **community** fostered by Village living
- Being surrounded by others with **similar interests and priorities**
- Discovering **social niches** and making new friends
- Developing **leadership skills**
- **Giving back** to the community through Village activities
- Encouragement of **personal and professional development**
- Availability of **cultural, service, social, and academic activities**
- **Networking opportunities** with faculty and staff members
- **Village-specific classes** encouraging interaction with faculty

> “The Village serves as an outlet to apply knowledge from classrooms, helps us to learn to work with people of diverse backgrounds and opinions, and emphasizes importance of collaboration as a lab to prepare us to solve real-world problems.”  
> **Andrew Norris, IMPACT Leadership Village**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>COMMON INTERESTS</th>
<th>SOCIAL NICHES</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>GROWTH/DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Everyone was immediately welcoming … it’s like when you walk into your living room and take off your jacket; that’s what it feels like when you come to the Quad.”  
> **Josiah Kilson, Honors Village**
| “The common interest in the arts helps break the ice.”  
> **Shakira Shipman, Arts Village**
| “I’ve had the chance to make friends from all different cultures in a shared experience.”  
> **Emma Harris, Global Village**
| “I am being molded into a better leader. I will have an advantage in the workplace because I will have practiced these skills. IMPACT taught me the skills I need to be successful at State.”  
> **Tanequa Leake, IMPACT Leadership Village**
| “The Resident Mentor program shaped my experience and gave me an outlet to be a productive member of the community.”  
> **Emily Rooks, First Year College Village**
| “I’ve conquered my procrastination habit; formed relationships with other people, such as tutoring suitmates; and learned about the strength in community, individual talents and the value of collaboration.”  
> **Andrew Norris, IMPACT Leadership Village**

---
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Growth Areas for Villages – Residents’ Perspectives

- Increased collaboration among the Villages, student organizations and graduate programs
- Additional Village leadership and programmatic opportunities for upper-class students
- More space to house interested participants
- Convenient programs for faculty to attend
- Advising offices or advising-office hours within Village locations
- Structured programs with faculty designed to help students gain confidence when interacting with them
- Leveraging programs to enhance the connections between students

Facilities Feedback

Task Force members also asked students how facilities impacted their Village experiences. In general, each group of students seemed attached to their physical space regardless of the building style. Leveraging programs to enhance the connections between students appears to be key in making any space work to the benefit of the community. Scholars Village resident Paxton Oxberg said the suite-style of Sullivan Hall “helps you get to know your roommates very well.” She added that Village activities encourage students to leave their suite and get to know other people in the program. In contrast, Arts Village resident Shakira Shipman said the hall-style of Turlington “really brings people together. Everyone hangs out in the halls and gets to know one another. It seems the suite-style would limit the friends you make.” Residents of the University Honors Village reflected on how the design of the Quad is set up to “promote community.”

“Living in the Arts Village helps me stay motivated to do well academically; so I can remain in the Village.”
Jessica Caudle, Arts Village

“Having classes in the Village makes it easy to catch professors, and they often stay and chat with students.”
Andriy Shymonyak, Honors Village

“I chose WOW because I wanted to be surrounded by people who also valued empowerment and social justice.”
Ann Chen, WOW Village
Future Perspectives of Living-Learning Communities

Transformational changes occurring within higher education are making high-impact activities, such as living and learning communities, more important than ever. Campus life is being challenged by on-line learning, which is more convenient and sometimes less expensive, but also compromises the critical skills learned from social interaction between students, staff, and faculty. According to many experts, efficiency and convenience is superseding quality of education, interpersonal face-to-face interaction, and exposure to other students of diverse backgrounds and opinions. Universities must blend the academic and residential experiences and promote the benefits of students living together as a means to enrich learning and develop social competence, according to Dr. Bill Zeller’s presentation to the 2012-2013 Task Force (Zeller, 2013).

Dr. Zeller, Graduate Division Coordinator for International Initiatives and External Funding and former Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Housing at the University of California – Irvine, is considered a national expert in living and learning communities and has assisted the Task Force on Living and Learning at NC STATE during its inception in 2002 and five-year review in 2007. On January 11, 2013, he returned to assist the 2012-2013 Task Force and share his knowledge of current trends in higher education, the challenges they present to campus life, and the related implications for living and learning communities. He also led the Task Force in a visioning session to identify current strengths and weaknesses of NC State’s Living and Learning Villages and how they might be used to shape the Task Force’s recommendations for future initiatives.

Current transformational changes in higher education:

- Massive Open On-line Courses teach thousands of students in one class.
- Flipped Classrooms present lectures on line and active engagement in the classroom.
- Hybrid Learning Classes are conducted half on line and half in class.
- Digital Badges, which are certifications of skills and competencies, are challenging degrees and grades.
- Asynchronous learning options enable students to determine what education they want and when they want it.
- Residential vs. On-line Models call into question the value of living on campus.
- Peer-to-peer education is being used as a form of instruction.
- Teaching and learning technologies require educators to constantly evaluate their methods of instruction.

Implications for Living and Learning Programs

Dr. Zeller challenged the Task Force to stretch their goals by considering how living and learning communities could be the locations for an effective blend of high tech and high touch. He suggested that Living and Learning Villages could offer:

- Locations for flipped classrooms, hybrid courses and active learning opportunities.
- Primary environments for intentional face-to-face learning and interpersonal skill development.
- Opportunities for students to share their knowledge with one another and shape their own learning environments.
- Capstones or common courses that reach multiple communities efficiently and create opportunities for graduate instruction and high-impact activities.
- Visible recognitions of participation, such as badges, which officially acknowledge achievement in competencies (diversity appreciation, leadership development, communication, etc.)
Visioning Session

Dr. Zeller led the Task Force in a visioning session to identify current strengths of NC State’s Living and Learning Villages and potential areas of enhancement.

Strengths

From the range of available options students have to the unique identity and culture each offers, diversity in Village models was most frequently identified by the Task Force as a strength of living and learning at NC State. Task Force members felt the diverse models offer flexibility, opportunities for creativity and the ability to meet students’ differing needs, goals and interests. Many other strengths were identified, including:

- **Diverse options for students**
  - Variety of Village models
  - Unique cultures and identities
  - Range of experiences
  - Flexibility to meet a variety of students’ goals, interests, and needs

- **Collaboration between student and academic affairs**
  “Best example of bringing academic and student affairs together”
  - Integration of faculty members
  - Examples of live-in faculty models
  - Number of Villages offering for-credit courses
  - Positive example of academic and social integration

- **Positive impact on campus life and culture** –
  “Villages bring life and culture to the campus.”
  - Non-Village participants indirectly benefit because of the Village influence on campus life.

- **Well respected and valued by campus community**
  - Priority in the University’s strategic plan
  - Many departments and units are eager to collaborate
  - Credible
  - Benchmark models
  - History of success and positive growth
  - Selling point for University

- **Well supported by University Housing**
  - Generous staff, funding, and spaces
  - Responsive professionals

The Task Force recognizes Living and Learning Villages as a significant asset to:

- Student success
- Life of the community
- Recruitment of new students
- The unique culture of NC State

Potential for improvements is deeply rooted in enhancing current strengths in an effort to reach more students and further marry the academic and social experiences for students.

- **Successful operations**
  - Diverse advisory councils
  - Variety of partnerships
  - Effective marketing to first-year students

- **Positive impact on student success**
  - Students are mutually supportive of academic success
  - Socially supportive climate
  - Creates highly engaged students who have an enhanced appreciation of diversity and global issues
Areas for Enhancement
In general, most areas for improvement identified by the Task Force reflect an eagerness to build upon strengths to enhance current programs and services and ensure a balance of common practices and unique models across Villages. **Integration of more academic components and faculty involvement were the most frequently mentioned improvements.** Other areas for enhancement include:

- **Academic integration and collaboration**
  - Appropriate investment from all colleges
  - More faculty engagement outside the classroom
  - General Education courses incorporated in all Villages
  - Incentives for faculty involvement
  - Meaningful and intentional integration of academics in the social experience
  - Involvement of graduate students and post-doctoral students

- **Assessment**
  - More measures of academic success and outcomes of Village programming
  - Impact on success after graduation
  - Common and unique learning outcomes
  - Evaluation of Village performance
  - Differences between Village and non-village participants
  - Additional qualitative measures of satisfaction and application

- **Program infrastructure**
  - Cross-collaboration among Villages
  - Centralized structure for operational functions
  - Process for proposing and evaluating new Villages
  - Common core values
  - Staff to student ratio
  - Staff burnout

- **Sustainable funding**
  - Appropriate levels of funding from partners and the Provost
  - External funding
  - Defined ideal model for funding existing and new Villages

- **Reaching more students**
  - At-risk students and under-represented students
  - Integrate successful Village initiatives, such as more high-impact activities, into the overall residential experience

- **Recruitment and retention**
  - Promotion of impact on student success
  - Focus on target populations
  - Market to prospective students
  - Engage those not likely to naturally select Villages
  - Identify clear paths for continuation in Villages
  - Options for transfers and upper-class students

- **Service integration**
  - Availability of advising and special services in Villages

- **Space**
  - Enhance technology in academic spaces
  - Improve quality of learning spaces
  - Design new spaces with learning as a central function

The Task Force, as a whole, considers Living and Learning Villages a successful model for integrating the academic and developmental experience for students. Faculty and staff members recognize the program as a significant asset to student success, life of the community, recruitment of new students and a hallmark of the unique culture of NC State. Potential for improvements is deeply rooted in enhancing current strengths in an effort to respond to the University’s strategic plan to reach more students and further marry the academic and social experiences for students.
Off-Campus Rental Market

Linda Anderson with Anderson Strickler, LLC, who assisted the Task Force on Living and Learning in 2002 and 2007, returned with insights into national and regional trends, the local rental market and future development (Anderson, 2013).

Raleigh/Triangle Market Trends

An analysis of the Raleigh/Triangle area markets demonstrates the following:

- Vacancy rates remain about 6%, which is higher than the regional and national averages.
- Number of new housing units has increased by 46% over the last ten years, which is consistent with regional growth (46%) and higher than national growth (33%).
- Rental rates continue to grow about 4% per year.
- Demand is expected to continue at its current rate.
- Significant new growth between 2013 and 2015 may cause supply to exceed demand.

Local Market Survey

A multi-pronged analysis of 36 local properties, identified by NC State, examined differences in rent, terms, and amenities. Comparisons were made based on whether the property rented by bed or by unit. (A summary of the data is available in Appendix A on page 26.)

- Rental rates vary widely. For example, two-bedroom rent-by-bed or unit options range from $350 - $1128. Four-bedroom rent-by-bed options range from $300 - $665.
- Rent-by-unit options tend to be less expensive per person, but include fewer utilities and amenities.
- Month-to-month, 6-9 month, and annual lease terms are available.
- Many properties offer recreational facilities, furnishings, laundry appliances or facilities.
- About half of all properties analyzed are located near Wolfline stops.
- Properties closest to campus (University Towers, Valentine Commons, University Village, and the Retreat at Raleigh) are over 90% occupied as of January 2013 and offer many student-oriented facilities, such as study lounges, computer labs, social activities, etc.

New Development

Approximately 24 new projects, totaling about 3,900 new units, are either under construction or proposed. The majority of new projects is located between campus and the downtown areas and may not be geared for college-student renters. About 130 of the new units are infill projects located within five miles of campus.

In general, consumers have a wide range of options at many price points, many of which are student oriented. However, the Living and Learning Villages at NC State ultimately offer something with which the off-campus options cannot compete. On campus, students have the option to lease a place to learn vs. just a place to live.

The local housing market offers a lot of options with many price points.

The primary difference between living on campus vs. renting off campus is students have the option to lease a place to learn vs. just a place to live.
Impact of Living and Learning Communities on Student Success

A review of the literature demonstrates that students in living and learning communities tend to be better prepared and more successful in college than their peers. Specifically, national research shows living and learning community residents have significantly higher college grade point averages than their non-participant peers (Standish, 2013). Similar results were found for students in Living and Learning Villages at North Carolina State University.

Method

Trey Standish, Assistant Director for Enrollment Planning in University Planning and Analysis, conducted a multi-prong analysis of success for NC State students in Living and Learning Villages compared to their peers in other housing scenarios. The analysis examined the Fall 2008 freshmen cohort (n=4672) based on the students’ first-semester housing choices. Sources of information included housing data for off-campus facilities, the Fall 2008 freshman survey, the Spring 2010 sophomore survey, and graduation and persistence rates. Three success factors were evaluated: preparation, participation, and performance (Standish, 2013).

Results: (A summary of the data is available in Appendix B on page 27.)

Conclusion

Students in Living and Learning Villages at NC State tend to be more successful than their peers, which is consistent with national trends. Village residents are inclined to be better prepared for the academic rigor of college, are more likely to be engaged in campus activities, continue to live on campus, and are academically more successful than their peers. Whether participation in Living and Learning Villages causes this success cannot be inferred given confounding factors, such as high-school achievement and socio-economic status. In general, however, students who choose to live in Living and Learning Villages are likely to have very successful careers at NC State University.
VI. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND STRATEGIES

In order to advance the growth and development of living and learning experiences for students residing on campus at North Carolina State University and fulfill the University's strategic goal to increase the number of freshmen participating in Living and Learning Villages, the 2012 - 2013 Task Force on Living and Learning recommends the following priorities for the next five years. Implementation teams will be tasked to develop action plans where appropriate.

1. Ensure all colleges are fully committed partners of related Living and Learning Villages with increased faculty involvement and appropriate levels of support. Given that students who live in Living and Learning Villages have better grades and higher retention rates compared to their peers, it is critical that all colleges visibly and actively participate in related Villages to further support their students and contribute to campus life.

   A. Increase involvement of faculty, across all academic ranks, in residential programming by collaborating with academic units to create additional opportunities and incentives for engagement, such as:

      i. Faculty serving on Living and Learning Village administrative councils.
      ii. Faculty developing unique academic outcomes and related programs.

   B. Work with each college to develop a partnership agreement to ensure adequate and shared financial and academic support of Living and Learning Villages.
2. **Recruit and retain first-year, transfer and upper-class students to live in Living and Learning Villages.** A primary goal of NC State’s strategic plan is to “enhance the success of our students through educational innovation.” Specifically, the strategic plan calls for increasing the number of freshmen participating in Living and Learning Villages, enrolling a greater percentage of transfer students and providing high-impact experiences for undergraduate students. The following strategies further define and create a plan for responding to these charges.

A. Increase first-year resident involvement in Living and Learning Villages to at least 50%.

B. Develop multi-year tracks within and across Living and Learning Villages to retain upper-class students.
   i. Charge Administrative Councils with investigating the development of programmatic and leadership tracks for upper-class students.
   ii. Create satellite cells and/or virtual spaces for upper-class students who move out of Living and Learning Villages.
   iii. Develop recommended Village paths, which encourage students to participate in multiple Villages while living on campus.

C. Expand Living and Learning Village options for transfer students.
   i. Work with Undergraduate Admissions to explore early conditional acceptances for new transfer students, which allow them to participate in the Village application process.

D. Create formal recognition through certificates and other awards for students who have “graduated” from Living and Learning Villages.
E. Promote the value of living together as a means to enrich learning and develop social competence by enhancing branding and marketing for students, faculty, staff and parents.

i. Develop a brand for Living and Learning Villages and unique identities for individual Villages, which reflect the programs’ respective partnerships.

ii. Request Living and Learning Village preferences at the time of application to the University and use technology to send branded messages to prospective students based on their indicated preferences.

iii. Make Living and Learning Village brands physically visible at Village locations and on student memorabilia.

iv. Highlight evidence, which demonstrates the positive relationship living on campus has with student success.

3. **Develop shared and systematic values, outcomes, and practices to create, operate, assess and enhance living and learning at NC State.** Continuous evaluation and enhancement of best practices is critical to the growth and development of living and learning at NC State. Doing so enables University Housing and its partners to engage more students, use resources more effectively, and advance student success. Whereas developing shared systems enhances effectiveness and efficiency, it is equally important for Villages to develop practices unique to their respective focus and culture.

A. Develop common values, related outcomes, and assessment plans for all Living and Learning Villages, including a process to propose and evaluate new villages.

i. Appoint an ad-hoc committee of faculty, students, and staff to develop core values and related outcomes common to all Villages.

ii. Define a process for proposing new Living and Learning Villages that includes criteria to evaluate each proposal and a method to assess its success and future viability.

iii. Encourage individual Living and Learning Village administrative councils to define additional and unique focus, outcomes and practices.

B. Identify new Living and Learning Villages based on:

i. University goals and strategies

ii. Student, college, faculty and staff interests

iii. Broad appeal across academic disciplines
iv. Representation of a wide cross-section of students with attention to those who are underserved or at risk
v. Parents’ and students’ feedback concerning the value of Living and Learning Village experiences

C. Develop sustainable funding models for Living and Learning Villages, which may include additional college and University support, grants, sponsorships, fundraising and charges for participation.

D. Evaluate current staffing patterns and explore alternative models for adequate administrative, academic and promotional support of Villages.

E. Enhance programs and services in Living and Learning Villages and other residential areas with convenient advising services, life-skills programs, social networking, and high-impact activities.

i. Expand programming to assist residents with developing life skills, such as working in diverse groups, inter-personal communication, continuing academic engagement outside the classroom, and transitioning to the world-of-work.

ii. Increase the use of social media, such as websites, blogs and on-line project spaces, in order to conveniently engage faculty, staff, alumni and other Village participants from a distance.

iii. Incorporate more high-impact activities into the residential experience.

4. Create or enhance learning, office, multipurpose, and common spaces of campus-residential buildings. Universities that want to maintain a focus on campus life must find ways to effectively blend high-tech and high-touch experiences. Creating or enhancing residential spaces with a focus on learning promotes the value of living in communities and enriches student development.

A. Continue to work with OIT to enhance technology in academic spaces, such as computer labs, classrooms, and study lounges within residence halls/apartments.

B. Create additional shared common spaces among Living and Learning Villages and residence halls/apartments.

C. Identify and brand Living and Learning Village venues so they may be recognized as a Village location and landmark.

D. Explore options for creating scholars in-residence opportunities and satellite offices for academic programs and student services.
5. Evaluate and adjust campus-housing capacity over the next five years based on the University enrollment plan, 2007 University Housing Master Plan, and on-going market analysis. An evaluation of the local market and enrollment goals demonstrates that the current University Housing Master Plan is a good fit for accommodating future campus residents. Continuous evaluation of local and national emerging trends is critical in order to identify any necessary changes to existing plans.
   A. Proceed with the 2007 Housing Master Plan to develop Wolf Ridge, Greek Village Townhomes, and West Village.
   B. Continue to monitor local markets, with attention to new housing developments on the perimeter of campus.
   C. Monitor and assess potential impact of emerging trends in higher education with particular attention to evolving technologies, including on-line education.
   D. Adjust current plans as needed with consideration given to improving current facilities as opposed to increasing bed capacity.

6. Encourage campus partners to implement strategies suggested by the Task Force to assist in fulfilling related recommendations. Learning is a shared responsibility. University Housing has a rich history of partnering with academic and student affairs units across campus to effectively blend living and learning experiences for campus residents. The 2012-2013 Task Force on Living and Learning recommends related campus partners implement the following strategies and work with University Housing to assist and fulfill the respective recommendations.
   A. Colleges create interdisciplinary research teams comprised of faculty, graduate students, and employer representatives to expose students to research and internship opportunities.
   B. Colleges include engagement of Living and Learning Villages in the faculty cluster-hire process.
   C. Colleges incorporate General Education courses, certificates, seminars, etc. in all Living and Learning Villages.
   D. Colleges recognize faculty for their involvement in Living and Learning Villages with departmental, college and campus-wide high-profile awards and additional resources for programs.
   E. Undergraduate Admissions and related partners use technology and other means to engage transfer students early in the recruitment process, such as publicize
on-campus housing options, promote study abroad, and provide an advising community.

F. Academic advisors recommend students pursue multiple Village experiences throughout their academic careers.

G. Locate satellite-advising services within University Housing buildings that are available to all residential students.

7. Develop a first-year experience program, which ensures all first-year students are immersed into special-interest communities designed to nurture an appreciation for diversity and foster academic, social, and personal growth through shared intellectual and social experiences. Given the success of students in Living and Learning Villages and national research which demonstrates competence is developed in active, exploratory and social settings, the Task Force on Living and Learning has concluded that all students at NC State, regardless of residence, should benefit from a common intellectual and social experience. The Task Force believes this can be accomplished through the development of a first-year experience program. Doing so further supports the University’s strategic plan to “enhance the success of our students through educational innovation,” while respecting students’ choices of where to live.

A. Identify outcomes for the freshman year.

B. Develop common experiences available in a variety of settings and opportunities.

C. Explore creating tiered experiences in which all students receive a tier-one experience. Tier-two experiences are defined by specific experiential requirements.
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Jessica Caudle</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>ARTS Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Chen</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>WOW Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Dewane</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>History, Social Studies Education</td>
<td>Global Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Dong</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>IMPACT Leadership Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Harris</td>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Global Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayleigh Jernigan</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Polymer and Color Chemicals</td>
<td>Scholars Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah Keilson</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Honors Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanequa Leake</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Fashion and Textile Management</td>
<td>IMPACT Leadership Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda McKnight</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>WOW Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Norris</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>IMPACT Leadership Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxton Oberg</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Scholars Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Quinn</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>First Year College</td>
<td>FYC Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anya Raspopvic</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Computer Science Engineering</td>
<td>WISE Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Rooks</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>FYC Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikalah Shaw</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Middle Grades Education</td>
<td>SAY Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakira Shipman</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>ARTS Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andriy Shymonyak</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Honors Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko Wadsworth</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Microbiology, Genetics minor</td>
<td>WISE Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Jennifer Kendall, *Public Communication Specialist, University Housing* – contributing to the report design

Dr. Tim Luckadoo, *Vice Provost for Campus Life* – providing direction to Task Force development, proceedings, and documentation
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Appendix A: Summary of Local Market Data

A multi-pronged analysis of 36 local properties, identified by NC State, examined differences in rent, terms, and amenities. Comparisons were made based on whether the property rented by bed or by unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent by bed (n=16)</th>
<th>Rent by unit (n=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent (low to high)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BDR</td>
<td>$884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BDR</td>
<td>$350 - $775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BDR</td>
<td>$392 - $705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BDR</td>
<td>$300 - $665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>$435-$639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BDR</td>
<td>$495-$930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BDR</td>
<td>$668-$1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BDR</td>
<td>$775 - $1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lease Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other terms</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9 Mos.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-M</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9 Mos.</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-M</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities Included</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elec, Heat, Internet, Cable</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet, Cable</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect., Heat</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major appliances</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnished</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool and other rec</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfline stops</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City bus stops</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle to campus</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry facilities</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW, AC</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D, WDC</td>
<td>72-84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnished</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landry facilities</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfline stop</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle to campus</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details about the following properties located closest to NC State are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NC State University</th>
<th>University Towers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 meals/week</td>
<td>$3856*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 meals/week</td>
<td>$3976*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited meals/week</td>
<td>$4226*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*incl. Cable, Internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 meals/week</td>
<td>$4170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 meals/week</td>
<td>$4292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited meals/week</td>
<td>$4464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valentine Commons</th>
<th>University Village</th>
<th>Retreat at Raleigh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to campus</td>
<td>1.8 miles to campus</td>
<td>4.2 miles to campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% occupancy (Jan. 13)</td>
<td>98% occupied</td>
<td>96% occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-story high rise</td>
<td>Shuttle provided</td>
<td>Shuttle provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928 beds</td>
<td>288 beds</td>
<td>549 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/4-bed units</td>
<td>4 bed/4 bath units</td>
<td>“Cottage-style” housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and utilities included</td>
<td>Furnishings included</td>
<td>Furnishings not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational amenities</td>
<td>Utilities not included</td>
<td>Utilities included ($30 electric cap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-oriented amenities</td>
<td>Recreational amenities</td>
<td>Student-oriented amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional phase(s) planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Summary of Student-Success Data

### DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All FR</th>
<th>College Inn</th>
<th>Commuters</th>
<th>Living &amp; Learning Villages</th>
<th>On-Campus Residence Halls</th>
<th>University Towers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st-Semester Housing Choice</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Return Rate – 2nd Yr.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Represented Minorities</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Residents</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All FR</th>
<th>College Inn</th>
<th>Commuters</th>
<th>Living &amp; Learning Villages</th>
<th>On-Campus Residence Halls</th>
<th>University Towers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. HS GPA</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td><strong>4.25</strong></td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. SAT Score</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td><strong>1200</strong></td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAMPUS PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All FR</th>
<th>College Inn</th>
<th>Commuters</th>
<th>Living &amp; Learning Villages</th>
<th>On-Campus Residence Halls</th>
<th>University Towers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Intended Activities*</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Visits to Gym 1st Semester</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of campus activities students intended to participate based on responses to 2008 freshman survey.

### ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE (Fall 08 – Fall 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All FR</th>
<th>College Inn</th>
<th>Commuters</th>
<th>Living &amp; Learning Villages</th>
<th>On-Campus Residence Halls</th>
<th>University Towers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st-Semester GPA</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td><strong>3.10</strong></td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year Retention Rates</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td><strong>94%</strong></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Credit Hours Passed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persist to Graduation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Graduation</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cumulative GPA:** Students in Living and Learning Villages consistently retained a higher GPA than the comparison groups. They maintained a 3.1 - 3.2 across four academic years.

- Commuter, residence hall and University Towers students consistently earned about a 2.85 – 2.9 GPA from Fall 2008 – Fall 2012. Commuter students’ GPAs peaked at 3.0 in Spring 2009, but gradually decreased to 2.9.

- College Inn students initially earned about a 2.75 GPA, which gradually increased to 2.8.
Appendix C: Supplemental Materials

Available at http://www.ncsu.edu/housing/forms/taskforcereport2013.pdf

1. **PowerPoint Presentations**
   a. Future Perspectives of Learning Communities  
      *Dr. Bill Zeller, January 11, 2013*
   b. Living and Learning Villages at North Carolina State University  
      (Student Success Analysis)  
      *Trey Standish, January 11, 2013*
   c. Off-Campus Rental Market  
      *Linda Anderson, January 11, 2013*
   d. University Housing Overview  
      *Susan Grant and Dr. Tim Luckadoo, October 19, 2012*

2. **Comprehensive List of all Suggested Recommendations and Strategies**
   This list represents ideas and suggestions generated during each of the Living and Learning Task Force meetings and all recommendations considered by the Task Force.

3. **Summary of Living and Learning Villages**

Appendix D: **References**
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Future Perspectives of Learning Communities

NCSU Ten Year Review
Jan. 11, 2013
By Dr. Bill Zeller
Predicting The Future Isn’t Easy…

“It's hard to make predictions, especially about the future”

Yogi Berra
But We Need To Plan Anyway

“If you don't know where you're going, you might not get there.”

Yogi Berra
Reinventing Undergraduate Ed. At Research Universities

- make research-based learning the standard;
- construct an inquiry-based freshman year;
- build on the freshman foundation;
- remove barriers to interdisciplinary education;
- link communication skills and course work;
- use information technology creatively;
- culminate with a capstone experience;
- educate graduate students as apprentice teachers;
- change faculty reward systems; and
- cultivate a sense of community.

Carnegie Foundation (1998)
“Thirty years from now the big university campuses will be relics. Universities won’t survive. It’s as large a change as when we first got the printed book.”

Forbes Magazine “Seeing Things As They Really Are”
Higher Ed. Is Undergoing Transformational Change

- MOOC’s
- Flipped Classrooms
- Hybrid/Blended Learning Structures
- Digital Badges
- Degrees and Grades Being Challenged
- Asynchronous “Convenient” Learning Options
- “Residential” vs On-Line Models
- Peer to Peer Instruction
Higher Ed. Is Undergoing Transformational Change

- State supported funding reductions
- Student debt
- Greater calls for accountability
- Reduced job options for graduates
- Reform in undergraduate and graduate education
- Teaching and Learning Technologies
Taskforce Goals/Considerations

- Expand number of students in Villages (assess freshman live-in requirement)
- Expand number of Villages
- Increase high-impact educational activities
- Increase faculty engagement (Student-Faculty Interaction)
- Increase student engagement (Student-Student Interaction especially across diverse populations)
- Define a common FYE at NCSU
- Support NCSU strategic planning priorities
- Sustainable financial model
Concerns With On-Line Classes

“The Coursera model doesn't create a learning community; it creates a crowd”. Doug Guthtrie, Dean, GWU School of Business

- Diminished educational quality
- The loss of interpersonal face-to-face interaction
- “Residential vs On-Line” education
- High Tech vs High Touch
- Unprepared graduates with inadequate interpersonal skills
And Concerns With Large Classes...
High Impact Educational Practices Have More Importance Than Ever

- First-Year Seminars and Experiences
- Common Intellectual Experiences
- Learning Communities
- Writing-Intensive Courses
- Collaborative Assignments and Projects
- Undergraduate Research
- Diversity/Global Learning
- Service Learning, Community-Based Learning
- Internships
- Capstone Courses and Projects

(AAC&U)
Enriched Learning Experiences

“Learning research indicates that competence is developed in active, exploratory and social settings. When participants are asked to think conceptually and critically, involving both peers and experts, learning is enriched”

Diana Oblinger
STRETCH GOAL For NCSU Villages: High Tech *Increases* High Touch

- Increase Faculty-Student Interaction
- Increase Student – Student Interaction
- Increase Interactions Across Diverse Populations
- Increase Collaborative and Experiential Learning
- Incorporate All High Impact Educational Practices
“Social interaction between students remains a crucial part of university education. "If the online or blended delivery can capture that social aspect of learning then that's good as well. But that needs to be quite intentionally enabled. It will not happen by chance."

Sally Kift, deputy vice-chancellor of James Cook University
Universities that want to maintain a focus on their campuses need to offer additional value in their courses.

Universities should also promote the benefits of students living together and forming networks as part of the "residential experience" on campus.

Australian National University Vice-Chancellor Ian Young
New types of learning spaces not only incorporate technology, they also create new patterns of social and intellectual interaction. Taken altogether these trends suggest new strategies for overall campus design. In essence, the entire campus becomes an interactive learning device.

Diana Oblinger, Educause
To Mr. Agarwal (MIT) many aspects of e-learning are better than campus lectures, where attendance often plummets by semester's end.

"Ten years from now most of our classes will be using blended (hybrid) learning."
"Hybrid" is the name commonly used nationwide to describe courses that combine face-to-face classroom instruction with computer-based learning. Hybrid courses move a significant part of course learning online and, as a result, reduce the amount of classroom seat time.

University of Wisconsin Hybrid Course Project
The flipped classroom is a pedagogical model in which typical lecture and homework elements of a course are reversed.

It repurposes class time into a workshop where students can inquire about lecture content, test their skills in applying knowledge and interact with one-another in hands-on activities.

Educause 2012
The Flipped Classroom

The Traditional Classroom
Teacher’s Role: Sage on the Stage
LECTURE TODAY
Homework: Reading and questions due tomorrow

The Flipped Classroom
Teacher’s Role: Guide on the Side
ACTIVITY TODAY
WATCH lecture online tonight!
Flipped Classrooms Must Have

A Clear Information Component

AND

A Clear Engagement Component
The range of options for technology supporting the collaborative work teams essential to the flipped classroom approach is large. A starting, and one of the oldest explorations, is the SCALE UP classrooms pioneered at NC State.

John Sticklen Michigan State University
Implications for Living Learning Programs

- Potentially increases their importance as learning environments
- Could become the campus location for many flipped classrooms, hybrid courses and active learning opportunities
- Will be the focus of **intentional** face-to-face learning and “human interaction” skill development.
- Creates new opportunities for graduate student and peer instructors.
The astonishing enrollment in MOOC's in the past few years has taught us an important lesson about the powerful motivation people have to learn. From voluntary, participatory sites such as Yelp or Wikipedia, we also see that people love to contribute what they know and are willing to learn from one another, not just from experts. That's the paradigm shift that, as educators committed to the future well-being of our students, we need, fearlessly, to embrace.

Cathy N. Davidson is a professor of interdisciplinary studies at Duke University
Possible Living Learning On-Line
A Freshman Capstone?

Faculty

Grad Student
Group Instructors

Upper Level Peer Facilitators
Faculty

- One Professor Teaching Many Students Across Village Populations
- Multiple Professors Team Teaching
- New Hybrid/Flipped Classroom Possibilities
- Creates Opportunities for High-Impact Activities Facilitated By Grads/Undergrads
Facilitate Small-Group, Post-Lecture, High-Impact Activities Within A Village

- Oversees and Facilitates Small Group Activities
- Partners with Professor in Teaching and Learning
- Creates Opportunities for Mentoring at all levels
Upper Level Undergraduates

- Receive professional training in teaching, mentoring and tutoring
- Partners with Faculty and Graduate Students
- Enhanced understanding of subject matter
- Remain engaged in villages for longer time
- Facilitates active alumni
“Badges can help speed the shift from credentials that simply measure seat time, to ones that more accurately measure competency. We must accelerate that transition. And, badges can help account for formal and informal learning in a variety of settings.”

Arne Duncan, Secretary of Education 2011
“Badges offer an important way to recognize non-traditional ways of learning. They're a way to give credence – and ultimately, credit – for the skills learners and teachers acquire in a broader set of learning environments, and a wider range of content.”

Arne Duncan, Secretary of Education 2011
Badges and L-L Programs

Badges can acknowledge learning achievements in:

- Living Learning program participation
- Leadership experiences
- Teaching experiences
- Mentoring experiences
- Service learning/engagement experiences
- Internships
- Others?
Thrun suggests that we should abolish false divisions of the human life span into separate stages of play (early childhood), education, work, and then play again (retirement). He wants all of those mixed and merged—play with learning, work with childhood, education lifelong.
Change…

“When the rate of change outside exceeds the rate of change inside, the end is in sight.”

Jack Welch, former CEO of General Electric,
Live-On Requirements

- Housing Guarantees
- No Requirement
- Freshman Requirement
- Fr.-So. Requirement
- L-L Requirement (University of Iowa)
NCSU Strategic Planning Goals

- Undergraduate Student Success (High Impact Educational Experiences)
- Graduate and Postdoctoral Program Development
- Faculty Excellence
- Research and Scholarship
- Comprehensiveness and Interdisciplinarity
- Global Engagement and Competitiveness: Partnerships, Innovation and Entrepreneurship
- Campus Culture and Community
- Resource Strategies
Living and Learning Villages at North Carolina State University

Trey Standish
University Planning and Analysis
January 11, 2013
Purpose

• Summarize data from Fall 2008 Cohort by first semester housing choice
• Evaluate preparation, participation, and performance of LLV residents
• Review literature on Learning Community participation and increased success
2008 Cohort Freshman Cohort

• Why Fall 2008?
  – Housing data for University Towers and College Inn provided by Preiss
  – Fall 2008 Freshmen Survey data available
  – Spring 2010 Sophomore Survey data available
  – Four years of graduation and persistence data available
2008 Cohort Housing Choices

Fall 2008 Freshmen Cohort Housing

College Inn | Commuter | Learning Village | On Campus Apartment | On Campus Residence Hall | University Towers
---|---|---|---|---|---
49 | 343 | 1477 | 3 | 2152 | 648
2008 Cohort Learning and Living Villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYC - Owen</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYC - Tucker</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Village</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAY</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISE</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2008 Cohort in LLVs
2008 Cohort Demographics by Housing Choice

Percent Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Inn</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Village</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Campus Residence Hall</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Towers</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008 Cohort Demographics by Housing Choice

![Bar Chart](percent_under_represented_minority.png)

- **College Inn**: 30%
- **Commuter**: 25%
- **Learning Village**: 20%
- **On Campus Residence Hall**: 15%
- **University Towers**: 10%

Bar chart showing the percentage of underrepresented minority students in different housing choices.
2008 Cohort Demographics by Housing Choice

Percent North Carolina Resident

- College Inn: 78%
- Comuter: 84%
- Learning Village: 90%
- On Campus Residence Hall: 86%
- University Towers: 98%

Bar chart showing the percentage of North Carolina residents for different housing choices.
Literature Review

• Limitations to research
  – Self Selection – Learning Community residents choose to participate biasing research
  – Random Assignment – No known research using random assignment into Learning Communities
• Instrumental Variables (IV) Approach – uses other variables as proxy for a student’s motivation, isolating effect of the Learning Community
  – OLS regression: 0.28 GPA boost for Learning Community participation
  – IV regression: 0.01 GPA boost for Learning Community participation
• Learning Community residents are more successful and better prepared than their peers
• Pike, Hansen, & Lin, 2010
2008 Cohort College Preparation by Housing Choice

Average High School GPA

- Commuter
- Learning Village
- On Campus Residence Hall
- University Towers

College Inn
2008 Cohort College Preparation by Housing Choice

![Average SAT Score](chart.png)
2008 Cohort Campus Participation by Housing Type
2008 Cohort Campus Participation by Housing Type

Number of Gym Visits in Semester

- College Inn
- Commuter
- Learning Village
- On Campus Residence Hall
- University Towers

1/11/2013
2008 Cohort Performance by Housing Type
2008 Cohort Performance by Housing Type

One Year Retention Rate

- College Inn: 90%
- Commuter: 85%
- Learning Village: 100%
- On Campus Residence Hall: 85%
- University Towers: 95%
2008 Cohort Performance by Housing Type

Cumulative GPA

- College Inn
- Commuter
- Learning Village
- On Campus Residence Hall
- University Towers
2008 Cohort Performance by Housing Type

Average Credit Hours Passed

- College Inn
- Commuter
- Learning Village
- On Campus Residence Hall
- University Towers

Fall 08 - Fall 12

S:\UPA\IR\Adhoc\university housing\Living Learning Village\Spring 2013 Presentation llv.ppt
2008 Cohort Performance by Housing Type

Persistence Rates

- College Inn
- Commuter
- Learning Village
- On Campus Residence Hall
- University Towers

Fall 08, Spring 09, Fall 09, Spring 10, Fall 10, Spring 11, Fall 11, Spring 12, Fall 12
2008 Cohort Performance by Housing Type

![Four Year Graduation Rate Chart]

- College Inn
- Commuter
- Learning Village
- On Campus Residence Hall
- University Towers
2008 Cohort Performance and Housing Choice

Four Year Persistence by First Semester GPA and Housing Choice

- Commuter
- Learning Village
- On Campus Residence Hall
- University Towers

First Semester GPA

- 2.00 & Below
- 2.01-2.50
- 2.51-3.00
- 3.01 & Above

Four Year Persistence

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
# 2008 Cohort Performance and Housing Choice

Duncan Tests for First Year Success Metrics by First Semester Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2008 Freshman Cohort</th>
<th>Average First Year GPA</th>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>First Year Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>On Campus - Village</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>University Towers</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>On Campus - No Village</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>College Inn</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*excludes GPAs from students withdrawing before completion of first year
2008 Cohort Satisfaction by Housing Choice

*For Learning Village and On Campus Residence Hall, any on campus residence hall is considered same housing choice
Conclusion

• NC State is consistent with the literature:
  – LLV students are better prepared and more successful
  – Causality of LLV participation and increased success cannot be inferred
  – More participatory students are in LLVs
  – LLV participants are retained to University Housing
Questions or Comments?
Index
Fall 2008 Demographics by Housing Choice

- **College Inn residents**
  - Over represented by scholarship student-athletes
  - 27% under represented minorities
  - 86% North Carolina residents
  - 20% use student loans
  - Over represented with majors in DASA (49%) and PCOM (16%)
  - Under represented with majors in Engineering (6%) and CALS (10%)

- **Commuters**
  - 39% female
  - 30% use student loans
  - Have major distribution identical to total cohort

- **Living and Learning Village residents**
  - 52% female
  - Over represented with majors in DASA (36%)
  - Under represented with majors in CHASS (6%) and Textiles (1%)

- **Non LLV, on campus residents**
  - 45% use student loans
  - Over represented with majors in Engineering (35%)
  - Under represented with majors in DASA (5%)

- **University Towers residents**
  - 4% under represented minorities
  - 97% North Carolina residents
  - 26% use student loans
  - Over represented with majors in Textiles (7%) and PCOM (16%)
  - Under represented with majors in Engineering (19%)
Fall 2008 College Preparation by Housing Choice

• College Inn residents  
  – Significantly less prepared using all metrics
• Commuters  
  – Below average preparation using all metrics
• Living and Learning Village residents  
  – Best prepared students using all metrics
• Non LLV, on campus residents  
  – Below average preparation using all metrics
• University Towers residents  
  – Higher than average high school GPAs  
  – Less prepared than average using all other metrics
Fall 2008 Campus Participation by Housing Type

• College Inn residents
  – Intentionally less participative in co-curricular activities than other students (excludes intercollegiate athletics)

• Commuters
  – Only group to believe it’s difficult to get involved in campus activities
  – Not as active in campus activities as other groups

• Living and Learning Village residents
  – Plan to be involved as new freshmen
  – Follow through on participative plans

• Non LLV, on campus residents
  – Middle tier of involvement
  – Visit the gym more often than average

• University Towers residents
  – Middle tier of involvement
  – Visit the gym less often than average (but have in building fitness facility)
Fall 2008 Performance by Housing Type

- **College Inn residents**
  - Lowest GPA students
  - Outperform their expectations

- **Commuters**
  - Low retention, low GPA group
  - Students who persist past first semester are high performers

- **Living and Learning Village residents**
  - Highest GPAs
  - Highest persistence rates
  - Pass more SCHs than other students
  - Outperform their expectations

- **Non LLV, on campus residents**
  - Middle tier of success
  - Perform below their expectations

- **University Towers residents**
  - Higher than average GPAs
  - Higher than average persistence rates
  - Perform below their expectations, rebound later in student career
OFF-CAMPUS RENTAL MARKET

January 10-11, 2013
Methodology

» Gathered background information

» Surveyed 36 complexes identified by NCSU
  ■ Visited majority of properties over two days
  ■ Conducted web research
  ■ Followed up by telephone

» Analyzed pipeline
  ■ Used Real Data report
  ■ Conducted web research
  ■ Interviewed city planners
National Multifamily Market

» In the 3rd Q 2012:

- Permits:
  ✓ 14% over 2nd Q 2012
  ✓ 56% over 3rd Q 2011

- Starts:
  ✓ 8% over 2nd Q 2012
  ✓ 24% over 3rd Q 2011

- Under construction:
  ✓ 3% over 2nd Q 2012
  ✓ 32% over 3rd Q 2011

- Completions:
  ✓ 26% over 2nd Q 2012
  ✓ 20% over 3rd Q 2011

- Absorption:
  ✓ 7% over 2nd Q 2012
  ✓ 16% over 2nd Q 2011
  ✓ 67% rented within 3 months

- Rents
  ✓ Statistically insignificant changes

- Vacancy rates
  ✓ 0% from 2nd Q 2012
  ✓ 1.2 percentage points lower from 3rd Q 2012

Red = statistically insignificant
Source: US Dept of Housing and Urban Development
US Southeast Region Multifamily Market

» Multifamily permits between Sept 2011/12:
  - Multifamily permits increased by 31,100 or 114% to 58,400 (130% in North Carolina)
  - From 2007 to 2010 average annual decline in permits was 19%
  - From 2004 to 2006 average annual permits were 129,000

» Vacancy rates:
  - Decreased in all of the 22 areas surveyed
  - Exception – Raleigh/Durham – 4.6% up to 5%

Source: US Dept of Housing and Urban Development
Raleigh Economy

» Population:
- Increase of 68% between 2000 and 2010 to 403,892
- Estimated growth of 59% between 2005 and 2035

» Employment:
- Unemployment rate of 7.2% in 2011 vs. 10.5% in NC and 8.9% in the US
- 3% increase in jobs between 2010 and 2011 in Wake Co. vs. 1% in NC
- 2010 median income of $77,700 in Raleigh/Cary MSA – highest median in NC

» Housing:
- 46% increase in new housing units between 2000 and 2010

Source: City of Raleigh
**NC State Enrollment Trends**

» **New Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral (+40%)</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers (+38%)</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVM (+23%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's (+22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Institute</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCSU Website
NC State Enrollment Trends

> Total Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral (+29%)</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>3,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVM (+25%)</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's (+16%)</td>
<td>6,070</td>
<td>5,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total (+6%)</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>34,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (+3%)</td>
<td>24,180</td>
<td>23,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree-seeking (-10%)</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCSU Website
Area Market

» Vacancies
  ■ Triangle market: 6.0%
  ■ Raleigh-Central area: 5.7%
  ■ Surveyed complexes (rent by the bed): 2.5%
  ■ Surveyed complexes (rent by the unit): 3.5%

» Rental rates
  ■ Triangle market: up 3.3%
  ■ Raleigh-Central area: up 3.1%

Source: Real Data; survey
Background Information

Vacancy and Rate Trends - Triangle

- Average Rent/Mo. (Left Scale)
- Vacancy Rate (Right Scale)

Source: Real Data
Background Information

Apartment Building Permit Trends

Source: City of Raleigh
Background Information

Predictions – Triangle Area

» Vacancy rates remain in the 6% range

» Rental rates continue to grow 4% per year

» Demand is expected to continue at its current rate

» However, there will be significant supply growth over the next two years causing supply to exceed demand

Source: Real Data
Rent per Bed

1BR (at 1 complexes) | Low $84 | Median $84 | High $84
2BR (at 8 complexes) | Low $350 | Median $573 | High $775
3BR (at 10 complexes) | Low $392 | Median $531 | High $705
4BR (at 14 complexes) | Low $300 | Median $500 | High $665
## Market Survey

### Rent per Bed – Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lease Terms</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YR</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9 Mo.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-M</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities Included</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elec</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Cable</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Market Survey

### Rent per Bed - Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Amenities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnished</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Amenities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clubhouse</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Ctr</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Ctr</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSU Shuttle</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Bus</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Shuttle</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Parking</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
## 2012 Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meals/Week</th>
<th>University Towers</th>
<th>NC State Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 meals/week</td>
<td>$4,170</td>
<td>$3,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14 meals/week</td>
<td>$4,292</td>
<td>$3,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited meals</td>
<td>$4,464</td>
<td>$4,226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valentine Commons

» Adjacent to campus
» Capstone project
» 90% occupancy (1/13)
» 10-story high rise
» 14 styles of 2-/3-/4-bed units (928 beds)
» Furnishings and utilities included
» Recreational amenities
» Student oriented amenities:
  - Floor study lounges
  - Social activities
  - Computer lab
» Additional phase(s) planned
University Village at 2505

» 1.8 miles to campus
» Preiss project
» 98% occupied
» Shuttle provided
» All 4-bed/4-bath units (288 beds)
» Furnishings included
» Utilities not included
» 42” TV in each apartment

Recreational amenities
- “Resort-style” swimming pool
- Clubhouse
- Internet café
- Fitness center
- Game room
- Sand volleyball
Market Survey

Retreat at Raleigh

- 4.2 miles to campus
- Landmark Properties project
- 96% occupied
- Shuttle provided
- “Cottage-style” housing (549 beds)
- Furnishings not included (+$25)
- Utilities included ($30 electric cap)

Amenities
- “Home of the largest pool in Raleigh”
- 9,000 sf clubhouse with:
  - iPod docking stations
  - Plasma TVs
  - Computer lab
  - Fitness center
  - Group study rooms
## Median Rent Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Valentine Commons</th>
<th>University Village at 2505</th>
<th>Retreat at Raleigh</th>
<th>Wolf Village</th>
<th>Wolf Ridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR/1BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR/2BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BR/2BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BR/3BA</td>
<td>$705</td>
<td></td>
<td>$660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR/2BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$631</td>
<td>$719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR/3BA</td>
<td>$620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR/4BA</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR/4.5BA</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term (months)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Utilities In Year</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Market Survey

Rent per Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>1BR</th>
<th>2BR</th>
<th>3BR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(at 3</td>
<td>(at 16</td>
<td>(at 17</td>
<td>(at 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complexes)</td>
<td>complexes)</td>
<td>complexes)</td>
<td>complexes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$435</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td>$668</td>
<td>$775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$470</td>
<td>$729</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>$1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$639</td>
<td>$930</td>
<td>$1,128</td>
<td>$1,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low  | Median | High
Market Survey

Rent per Unit - Terms

Lease Terms:
- YR: 95%
- 6/9 Mo.: 76%
- Other: 47%
- M-M: 18%

Utilities Included:
- W/S: 53%
- Internet: 22%
- Basic Cable: 22%
- Elec: 11%
- Heat: 11%
## Rent per Unit - Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Amenities</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>WDC</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>Furnished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Amenities</th>
<th>City Bus</th>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>Laundry</th>
<th>Fitness Ctr</th>
<th>Clubhouse</th>
<th>NCSU Shuttle</th>
<th>Business Ctr</th>
<th>Volleyball</th>
<th>Garage Parking</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Own Shuttle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Projects Under Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401 Oberlin</td>
<td>401 Oberlin Road</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425 South Boylan</td>
<td>425 South Boylan</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925 West Morgan</td>
<td>Hillsborough and Morgan Streets</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery at Cameron Village</td>
<td>Corner of Oberlin Road and Clark Avenue</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Parkside at Wade</td>
<td>5435 Wade Park Blvd</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Square</td>
<td>600 St.Mary's</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gallery at Cameron Village, April 2012, The Raleigh Telegraph
## Proposed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valentine Commons Phase 2</td>
<td>3009 ME Valentine Drive</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Apartments</td>
<td>413 N. Harrington Street</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616 Oberlin</td>
<td>616 Oberlin Road</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Avenues</td>
<td>2621 Ratchford Drive</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacarra</td>
<td>6300 Western Blvd.</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gramercy</td>
<td>630 W. North Street</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Grant Apartments</td>
<td>Wake Forest Road and East Six Forks Road</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Av &amp; Ashe Av</td>
<td>SW corner of Hillsb. St btw Ashe and Park Ave</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramblewood Lantern</td>
<td>109 Ramblewood Drive</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SkyHouse Raleigh</td>
<td>313 S Wilmington Street</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

616 Oberlin, April 2012, The Clayton News-Star
Sample Infill Projects

» Completed

- Bristol Creek Apartments
  ✓ 2011 completion
  ✓ 24 units: 2BR, 2BA
  ✓ $980-$1,050/mo
  ✓ 998-1,029 sf/unit
  ✓ 100% occupied

- “Student Housing”
  ✓ 4BR units
Pipeline

Proposed Infill Projects <5 miles

» Cameron Place Condominiums, 6 units
  ■ 616 Daniels Street

» Glenwood Vintage Condominiums, 8 units
  ■ 1300/1306 Glenwood Avenue

» Centennial Park Townhomes, 30 units
  ■ 2513 Avent Ferry Road

» Passage Homes, 18 units
  ■ 1002 Coleman Street

» Lake Ridge Townhomes, 17 units
  ■ 2703 Lake Wheeler Road

» 2604 Hillsborough, 15 units
Discussion

Off-Campus Rental Market
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Mission

University Housing complements the mission of North Carolina State University through intentional programs, services, and facilities that promote educational and personal development of campus residents.

With NC State faculty and other campus partners, University Housing creates enriched living and learning environments. Living on campus is a unique and integral part of the student’s educational experience.

Students living on campus will:

- Create dynamic residential communities that embrace diversity.
- Have opportunities for leadership, self-governance and civic engagement.
- Expand individual responsibility and achieve personal growth.
- Experience living and learning in a technology-rich environment.
- Develop a strong connection to NC State University.
University Housing and Greek Life Commitment to Inclusion and Diversity

University Housing and Greek Life are committed to embracing diversity in all forms so that people are treated with dignity and respect. We foster inclusive communities of learners that offer everyone the opportunity to develop skills necessary to become contributing members of a diverse and multicultural world. Acknowledging that learning can occur through uncomfortable experiences, our goals are to:

- Create an environment where students, faculty and staff are valued and engaged.
- Expose students, faculty and staff to cultural differences through dialogue, leadership, and program opportunities.
- Recruit, develop, and retain talented staff members committed to diversity and who are representative of our students.
- Strive for multicultural competency among our students and staff.
- Examine beliefs and address conduct when they reflect an origin of fear, anger, ignorance, or hate.

We welcome and affirm the value, dignity, and uniqueness that each individual brings to our diverse communities. Join us in honoring the humanity that connects us, while appreciating the differences that distinguish us.
Diversity Initiatives

• Over 360 diversity programs/activities for residential students in 2011-2012

• Diversity Committee Initiatives
  ▪ Department-wide assessment for professional development
  ▪ Delving into Diversity effort that highlights workshops, article discussions, and university events
  ▪ Driving Toward Diversity Recognition Program
  ▪ Multimedia marketing pieces highlight partnership efforts addressing diversity such as the Scholar’s Village Language Exchange Program and a children’s leadership series.
## Housing System Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Bed Spaces</th>
<th>10,244</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls</td>
<td>6,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Village</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES King Village</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Manor</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Houses</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Ridge</td>
<td>1,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 78 Buildings
- 2.9 Million Square Feet
- $565 Million Inventory Replacement Value
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Undergraduate NC State Peer Institutions</th>
<th>Housing Capacity</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent Housed</th>
<th>Full-Time UG Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent Housed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>8,359</td>
<td>17,117</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13,515</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>9,997</td>
<td>27,945</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19,679</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13,882</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>16,312</td>
<td>42,700</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32,409</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>NC State University</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,244</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>47%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23,097</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29,627</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>8,125</td>
<td>37,146</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23,072</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana</td>
<td>10,387</td>
<td>41,918</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30,639</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>12,533</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37,077</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>10,993</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35,368</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>8,127</td>
<td>40,446</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27,802</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>6,826</td>
<td>33,620</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24,552</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of California-Davis</td>
<td>6,344</td>
<td>30,685</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22,991</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>8,537</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31,121</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>10,112</td>
<td>50,995</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37,629</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>7,117</td>
<td>51,175</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27,636</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fast Facts

• 77% (3,330) of new freshmen live on campus.

• Students returning to housing have increased 48% between 2005 and 2010 (growth from 2,727 to 4,042).

• Gender breakdown: 43% women
  57% men

• Class Representation in Residence Halls and Wolf Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### University Housing Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Beds/Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suites</td>
<td>2,256 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>3,426 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubles off breezeway</td>
<td>890 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four bedroom apartments</td>
<td>2,264 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio, one and two-bedroom apartments</td>
<td>502 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E.S. King Village

- 295 apartments, community center
- Family-oriented environment
- 50th Anniversary Celebration, 2010
- Residents from 30 different countries; 45% International students

Ongoing activities:
- ESL Class for spouses, Kids Carnival, Halloween Celebration, Ramadan Celebration, Multi-Cultural Festival, Garden Plots, Trans Siberian Orchestra Event
Conference Services

• Staffing
  ▪ 2 Full-time professional staff
  ▪ Student Staff
    • 5 Summer conference coordinators
    • 1 Community Director
    • 4 Graduate interns and 1 ACUHO-I Intern
    • 1 Lead SCA and 36 Summer Conference Assistants (SCA)

• 2012 Revenue: $1,070,038

• 79 Camps
  ▪ 9,500 Participants
  ▪ 44,300 bed nights

• Guest Rooms
  ▪ 2011 798 guests, 5,258 bed nights
  ▪ 2012 (1/1 – 10/3) 731 guests, 4,388 bed nights
Conference Groups

• Regular conference groups:
  - NC Special Olympics (1,800 athletes)
  - SC State 4H Congress (544 participants)
  - General Shelton Leadership Challenge (211 participants)
  - Hugh O’ Brien Youth Leadership Camp (205 participants)

• Sports camps:
  - Offense/Defense Football Camp (111 athletes)
  - Kenny Smith Basketball Camp (211 athletes)

• Academic connections:
  - WISE ESCAPE Camp (48 participants)
  - REU (145 participants, entire summer)
  - Guild of Natural Science illustrators (76 participants)
  - Duke Food Science Boost Program (54 participants)
Financial Overview

• $43 Million Annual Budget
  ▪ $25 million operating
    • $825 k in general maintenance
    • $3.3 million utilities
    • $3.4 million housekeeping
  ▪ $12 million in bond payments
  ▪ $3.3 million in capital projects

• Dedicated $4 million for Housing Development
  ▪ Greek Townhouses
  ▪ West Village
Wolf Ridge at Centennial

- Apartments for upper-class and graduate students
  - University Dining and Bookstore operations included
  - Entrepreneurs Village Garage in development
- Prime location on Centennial Campus Oval, adjacent to Hunt Library
- LEED Silver Accredited buildings
- Approximately $137 million (entire site)
- 1,195 beds
- Phase I open Fall, 2013
West Village

• Long Range - 2020
• Demolition of Lee and Sullivan Halls
• Replace with residential quad that supports Living and Learning Villages.
• May include a village commons with classrooms and other support spaces.
Professional Staff

• 12 full-time, live-in staff
  • Assistant Directors (8)
    – Masters degree with at least 3 years experience
  • Community Directors (4)
    – Masters degree, entry level

• 65 full-time facilities professionals
  • 24/7 coverage
  • Shared responsibilities with Facilities Operations

• 3 Finance professionals
• 4 IT professionals
• 2 Marketing professionals
Professional Activities

• Professional staff and graduate assistants present at state, regional, and national conferences
• Professional staff and graduate assistants serve in leadership roles at the state, regional, and national level
• Professional staff and graduate assistants regularly attend conferences sponsored by the following organizations:
  • NCHO, NCCPA, SEAHO, ACUHO-I, APPA, ACPA, NACAS, NACUBO, NASPA, OPE
Student Staff

• We hire approximately 450 students each year, contributing $1.47 million in annual student salaries.

• 210 Resident Advisors
  • Minimum GPA: 2.75
  • Average GPA: 3.39
  • Must complete ECD220 (Topics in Student Development)
  • Student to RA ratio: 35:1

• 18 Graduate Assistant Residence Directors
  • Enrolled in masters programs in Higher Education Administration and Counselor Education
  • Comprehensive training for full-time employment
  • Living, learning laboratory
Student Development Philosophy

• Students living on campus will:
  § Create dynamic residential communities that embrace diversity.
  § Have opportunities for leadership, self-governance and civic engagement.
  § Expand individual responsibility and achieve personal growth.

• Through:
  § Community-building
  § Leadership programs
  § Employment opportunities, comprehensive training
  § Activities (academic, social, cultural, recreational, community service) that connect students with their peers, campus staff and resources providing an opportunity to learn more about themselves and their communities
Leadership and Governance

• **University Housing Advisory Committee** — 17 members comprised of faculty, staff, students; meets twice per semester

• **Inter-Residence Council** — leadership team comprised of 7 executive board members and a general assembly of over 40 residents; weekly meetings; plans leadership development, community service and social programs for residents

• **Hall Councils** — leadership teams in each residential facility that plan activities for residents and advise University Housing staff
Partnerships

- Graduate School
- Engineering
- Design
- Natural Resources
- Textiles
- Ag and Life Sciences
- Physical and Mathematical Sciences
- Humanities and Social Sciences
- Education
- First Year College
- Entrepreneurial Initiative Program

- University Honors Program
- University Scholars Program
- International Student Services
- Enrollment Management
- Campus Police/Fire Protection
- OIT
- Multicultural Student Affairs
- Athletics
- DASA Units
- Women’s Center
- GLBT Center
Academic Support Efforts

• 7 computer labs with 115 workstations, jointly funded by ETF monies, 24/7 access to campus community

• Student study lounges in each residential facility with group collaboration equipment

• Partnership with Writing Tutors program

• Various other tutoring efforts coordinated with Undergraduate Tutorial Center

• Collaboration with Summer Start program
Student Success Initiatives

• 78 reported programs with Faculty
• Program organizers select a primary desired outcome. Of the reported programs,
  ▪ 118 programs supported intellectual and cognitive growth
  ▪ 247 programs addressed supporting diversity among people, cultures and perspectives
  ▪ 106 programs supported personal and academic goals
Assessment

• Assessment committee and plan
  ▪ A process to assess learning outcomes and business practices
  ▪ Living and Learning villages conduct annual assessments
    • Women in Science and Engineering program have increased retention and GPA than non-WISE counterparts
    • Students living in the First Year College Village study more than FYC students who don’t live in the Village
• Student surveys of work order and assignment processes
• Analysis of student conduct records related to drug and alcohol use
• Annual Market study
• Ongoing peer review and comparison
• Analysis of resident vs. non-resident GPA
Assessment

• Bi-annual Educational Benchmarking, Inc. Student Satisfaction Survey
  ▪ 100 item survey, response rate 83%
  ▪ Items organized into factors which impact student satisfaction
  ▪ Comparisons with Carnegie class institutions and all participating institutions
Assessment

• Findings
  - feel fellow residents are more respectful (#1, #1, and #2)
  - feel a stronger sense of community (#1, #1, #18)
  - rated time management, ability to study, and solve problems (#1, #1, #17) highly
Assessment

• Areas for continued focus
  i.e., efforts to maintain or improve
  ▪ Room/Floor environment (Factor 3)
  ▪ Room Assignment/Change Process (Factor 6)
  ▪ Personal Interactions (Factor 12)
  ▪ Time, Study, Solve Problems (Factor 14)
Living and Learning Villages

• 1,930 or 29% of residence hall students live in one of ten Villages
• 1,380, or 44% of new freshmen live in one of ten Villages
• 3,776 or 59% of residence hall students live in buildings that house Villages
• Between 2003 and 2012, there were 11,102 individual students in living and learning villages.
Living and Learning Villages

- First Year College Village (430)
- Global Village (244)
- Impact Leadership Village (108)
- ARTS Village (135)
- Honors Village (359)
- Scholars Village (178)
- Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) Village (292)
- Students Advocating for Youth (SAY) Village (58)
- Women of Welch (WOW) Village (18)
- Wellness Village (108)
Living and Learning Pilots

• Second-Year Transition and Transfer Experience
  ▪ Gray Hall, Wolf Village Apartments
  ▪ 127 participants

• Freshmen Engineering Pilot
  ▪ Avent Ferry Complex
  ▪ 154 participants
Spirit of the Village Awards

• Named in honor of Kay Yow
  ▪ For her participation in the initial Task Force and five year review
  ▪ Initially verbalized “Village” concept
• Initiated in 2008
• Recognizes outstanding village participants
  ▪ One or two participants from each village
• Presented at a spring ceremony each year
The following recommendations were identified based on themes that emerged from each Task Force discussion. A comprehensive list of suggested strategies per recommendation follow on the subsequent pages.

1. Integrate and enhance academic components in every Village.
2. Increase faculty involvement in Villages.
3. Increase number of freshmen participating in Villages.
4. Recruit and retain transfer, upper-class and graduate students to live in Villages.
5. Enhance practices to create and operate Villages.
6. Enhance programs and services in Villages.
7. Promote Villages to students, faculty, and staff with enhanced branding and marketing.
8. Develop common values, related outcomes, and assessment plans for all Villages.
9. Develop new Villages.
10. Define a common First-Year Experience.
12. Determine Housing capacity over the next five years based on information in enrollment plan and market analysis
1. **Integrate and enhance academic components in every Village.**

   **Suggested Strategies:**

   A. Ensure all colleges and academic units are fully committed to and participate in related Villages.
   
   B. Define “learning” in “living and learning” and who is ultimately responsible for that part of the experience, such as faculty, post-docs and graduate students.
   
   C. Require classes and cohorts specific to each Village.
   
   D. Integrate the General Education Program with the residential experience
      1. Reinforce concepts of the General Education program through residential programs.
      2. Explore allowing LLV experiences to fulfill the general education requirements.
      3. Coordinate LLV and college classes to avoid duplication and competition.
      4. Develop a project for LLV residents that will fulfill a requirement for General Education.
   
   E. Increase graduate student involvement with the academic discipline of the respective Village.
      1. Offer research opportunities to graduate assistants within Village communities.
      2. Hire Resident Directors in graduate disciplines related to the Village, i.e. Engineering master’s or doctoral students serve as RDs in Honors Village.
      3. Pay graduate students to teach seminars in residence halls.
      4. Merge Resident Director and teaching roles.

2. **Increase faculty involvement in Villages.**

   **Suggested Strategies:**

   A. Define the role faculty may serve within the Villages.
      1. Teaching:
         - Presentations
         - Courses
         - In-residency
      2. Leadership roles:
         - Serve on operating/administrative councils
         - Assist with defining outcomes
         - Coordinate assessment
B. Increase faculty’s sense of ownership of the community and related activities.

1. Collaborate on academic and social development programs.
   - For example, the Office for Faculty Development has service-learning models, such as the Summer Institute on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, with frequent vacancies that Village residents could fill.
   - WISE Silent Spring Celebration, co-sponsored by Inter-Disciplinary Studies and the Department of Entomology, had great student participation.
2. Instruct classes on site in the Villages.
3. Create connections with research.
4. Establish advising centers in residence halls to support strategic plan for the professional advisor model.
5. Encourage direct faculty-to-student contact.
   - House academic advisors in residence halls or schedule regular office hours with academic advisors within the halls.
   - Increase involvement with groups of students at risk
   - Serve as mentors to Village residents.

C. Offer incentives.

1. Create professional fellows program.
2. Develop funding incentives.
   - Pay to teach courses in Villages at comparable classroom rates.
   - Fund trips and initiatives created or suggested by faculty.
3. Create recognition program for involved faculty.
   - For example, Impact Global Village gives certificate and shirt and invites faculty to banquet.
   - Send letter from DASA Dean to academic deans.
4. Propose that advising, mentoring, living on-campus, coordinating programs, and other Village activities apply towards tenure requirements.
5. Increase access to technology in Villages.
6. Expand Scholar-in-Residence program to other Villages.

D. Increase support and convenience.

1. Reduce class demands for Village faculty.
2. Build faculty interactions into the students’ schedule, so faculty do not have to stay on campus after hours.
3. Collectively plan Village events, so faculty may reach more Villages during single programs.
4. Offer faculty and advisors office space in Village locations.
5. Add sections of courses and other academic support as Village size increases.
E. Develop branding and marketing plan to recruit and retain faculty

1. Brand the opportunity.
   a. Work to shed mystery that may exist between faculty and staff; shed intimidation of coming to students on their turf.
   b. Have currently involved faculty recruit and present to other faculty to encourage involvement.
   c. Develop a campaign of defined and consistent messages for faculty, i.e. opportunity to recruit future graduate students.
   d. Identify the "champion" faculty members that have proven successful to implement in other Villages.

2. Involve Office of Faculty Development in recruitment and retention.

F. Collect feedback from faculty.

1. Assess differences between faculty who come to present for an hour vs. those who are immersed in Villages.
2. Survey/conduct focus groups of faculty about what would attract them, their fears, etc.

G. Build faculty involvement in Villages into University’s strategic plans.

3. Increase number of freshmen participating in Villages.

Suggested Strategies:

A. Require all freshmen living on campus to live in a Village.

B. Increase appeal to all freshmen.
   1. Encourage Villages to consider diversity when defining application and admissions processes in order to increase minority student participation.
   2. Account for students’ access to social and/or leadership development opportunities in secondary education when considering their eligibility for acceptance into a Village.

4. Recruit and retain transfer, upper-class and graduate students to live in Villages.

Suggested Strategies:

A. Increase appeal to upperclassmen.
   1. Create “satellite cells” of residents so students who move away from Villages may remain involved in the community.
   2. Create programs to connect upperclassmen to the world of work.
   3. Explore additional resources to meet the unique needs of upperclassmen.
   4. Offer unique opportunities beyond leadership roles.
B. Develop a 2nd year program to retain sophomores.
1. Work with current freshmen Villagers to plan for transitioning to other Villages as upperclassmen. Pilot with FYC Villagers.
2. Develop Villages intended for 2nd years, such as a research Village.
3. Promote Villages to parents of sophomores.

C. Respond to increase in transfer student class size.
1. Explore developing a “pre-NC State” program. Students who narrowly miss acceptance are admitted contingent on attending specific community colleges and taking certain classes. Suggest having academic representation at those colleges; so those students come to NC State as a cohort. Have them live together in a Village, possibly at Centennial Campus.
2. Work with community-college partners to encourage students transferring to NC State to live in Villages.
3. Review and revise admissions cycle for transfers; so they may apply for Villages when space is available

D. Define clear paths for continuation of upper-classmen in Villages and promote during the room-assignment process.

E. Encourage Village staff to advise students to participate in multiple Villages during their living experience on campus.

F. Expand Village options for transfers and upper-classmen.

G. Develop more on-campus living and learning options for graduate students.
1. Create Village options.
2. Improve amenities specific to graduates.

5. Enhance practices to create and operate Villages.

Suggested Strategies

A. Develop sustainable business model for Villages.
1. Share resources among the Villages.
   - Cross promotion of events and activities
   - Co-sponsored events
   - Shared calendar
   - Common Village newsletter to increase communication among residents and staff
2. Consider merging Villages with related themes, i.e. social justice (WoW, IMPACT).
3. Evaluate available staffing and resources when considering new Villages.
4. Identify diverse sources of funding.
   a. Charge Village administrative councils with finding new sources of funding.
   b. Identify campus resources, such as:
- Provost Office
- DASA
- Charging additional money for the experience
c. Identify new external sources of funding, such as:
   - Development:
     DASA Development Office
     Village alumni
     Annual giving option
   - Grants:
     Pursue national grants, such as the National Science Foundation
     Engage related faculty to assist with grants
     Encourage Multi-Village grant proposals
   - Corporate partners:
     Centennial Campus sponsors for existing Villages or Centennial Village
     RTP sponsors for WISE

B. Enhance partnerships.
   1. Develop a letter of agreement with Village partners that outlines expectations and responsibilities of involved parties.

   2. Explore new partners, such as:
      - Centennial partners as mentors and/or live in opportunities
      - Student leaders and organizations within colleges
      - Village alumni
      - Greater Raleigh community
      - Local K-12 schools
      - Parents of Village residents

C. Explore increasing number of staff to student ratio.
   1. Define an optimum student to staff ratio for Villages.
   2. Review existing staffing models in Villages to determine where additional staff may be needed.
   3. Ensure all new Villages are appropriately staffed.
   4. Create new positions dedicated to Village activities.
      - Full-time directors per Village independent of hall directors
      - Additional administrative staff to free up programmatic staff for Village programs and services

D. Centralize processes common to all Villages.
   1. Coordinate common Village practices, such as:
      - Marketing/Branding
      - Recruitment
      - Assessment
   2. Create seamless process to assist students in selecting Villages and housing.
   3. Define and promote a process to create a Village.
   4. Centralize training for resident mentors.
   5. Create central resource for grant writing, finding resources, etc.
6. **Enhance programs and services in Villages.**

A. Initiate partnerships among Villages.
   1. Encourage Villages to co-sponsor programs.
   2. Retain connections between Village advisors and advisees after a student’s matriculation.
   3. Explore First Year College advisors working with new advisors to assist with a student’s transition after matriculation.

B. Explore collaboration with China and other international initiatives.
   1. Create a program in which students spend two years at NC State and two years at a university in China and other international locations.
   2. Situate cohort in residence halls with Chinese students and other international students for language immersion.

C. Expand programming in all Villages to assist residents with developing life skills, such as:
   1. Learning to communicate and work in groups.
   2. Engaging with one another, i.e. how to do a handshake.
   3. Changing culture of “class is over, I’m done.”

D. Create programming for upperclassmen to address the transition from college to the world of work.

E. Expand grant writing for undergraduate research projects and initiatives to more Villages in order to expose more students to research.

F. Include student mentors in each Village classroom.
   For example, Honors Village Student Mentors participate in Village classes each semester.

G. Provide more services, such as:
   1. ESL in the Global Village.
   2. Academic and career advising in the Villages.

H. Identify what Village students need as it relates to in-hall resources to enhance their experiences.

I. Create virtual spaces for Villages to reside so that students who move out of the Village may remain connected.

J. Recognize students who participate in Villages.
   1. Explore a project for which there is an artifact and is identified as an accomplishment – a means for which they can demonstrate what they have learned from the Village experience.
   2. Include Village participation on Leadership Transcript.
   3. Develop a “badge” to recognize students’ participation in a Village.

K. Offer additional high-impact activities in all Villages.
7. Promote Villages to students, faculty and staff with enhanced branding and marketing.

Suggested Strategies:

A. Explore a common marketing and branding plan for all Villages that includes:
   - Faculty
   - Prospective students and their families
   - Upperclassmen and their families

B. Emphasize messages, such as:
   - The residential experience as an asset to college success.
   - “Renting a place to learn vs. renting a place to live.”
   - Villages as “destinations” – something to work toward.
   - Benefits to remaining on campus as an upper-classmen.
   - Key words used by the current residents to develop marketing, such as “welcoming,” “connected’’ “communication between faculty and staff,” “connections with faculty and staff,” “easier to talk to faculty and staff,” etc.

C. Develop a marketing plan based on recruitment goals for Villages.

D. Include student success data in marketing.

E. Focus marketing on diversity of Villages in order to recruit a diverse population of students.

F. Improve a coordinated effort to broadly market the Villages for campus recruitment efforts.

G. Market NC State and the Village experience to K-12 students who attend summer programs.

H. Explore marketing to students who are not already engaged and self-selecting as active participants.
8. Develop common values, related outcomes and assessment plans for all Villages.

Suggested Strategies:

A. Identify common core values.

B. Use current national outcomes and identify additional ones as needed to develop common outcomes across Villages.
   1. Allow Villages to add outcomes unique to the respective interest areas.
   2. Develop common assessment metrics to measure outcomes.

C. Develop an assessment plan common to all Villages that collect quantitative and qualitative data to measure success of outcomes.

D. Assess recruitment and retention in the Villages.
   1. Assess if having options to live in Villages yields students to NC State.
   2. Survey why students choose not to live in the Villages.
   3. Survey why students choose to leave the Villages and where they go.

E. Research students who are underrepresented or underserved in the Villages.
   1. Investigate why some Villages are racially disproportionate compared to the student body.
   2. Assess needs of students who are not active in the Villages.
   3. Explore how Villages could serve students who may not naturally possess leadership skills and likely would not pursue the Villages.

F. Collect feedback and recommendations from partners of the Villages.
   1. Survey constituents of the SAY Village.
   2. Survey current and prospective faculty partners.

G. Demonstrate Village impact on the following and compare to non-LLV residents to determine differences in experiences.
   1. Retention rates
   2. GPA
   3. Alumni donations
   4. Diversity and moral development
   5. Involvement with campus activities and the related outcome achieved as compared to a control group
   6. Personal growth

H. Assess how the number of years participating in a Village impacts student success.

I. Assess effects of Village community and resources on non-Village residents of the same hall.
J. Survey Village alumni, learning how their Village experience may have impacted their success on campus and in the world of work.

K. Assess the value added for Village residents.
   1. Examine if students, who are already socially and academically ambitious, are truly growing.
   2. Examine impact on all campus if high-achieving students of the Villages were more proportionately spread across campus.

L. Determine and define the best size for the optimum Village experience.

M. Engage assessment expertise.
   1. Permanent staff
   2. Graduate students
   3. Faculty

N. Calculate cost per student in Village and related impact on student success.

9. Develop new Villages.

A. Choose new Villages by strategic priorities, such as:
   1. Expressed student-interest
   2. Demonstrated student need
   3. Availability of adequate and diverse sources of funding
   4. Availability of adequate academic and student affairs staff

B. Develop an incubator process to test Village concepts.

C. Consider under-represented populations in development of new Villages, such as:
   1. Academically-at-risk students
   2. Socially-at-risk students
   3. Minority students

D. Explore students initiating their own learning communities.

E. Consider new Village concepts, such as:
   1. The three-year Village, i.e. attend classes year-round, finish in 3 years.
   2. Graduate Student Village
   3. Engineering Village
10. Define a common First-Year Experience.
   A. Identify outcomes for the freshman year for all students.
   B. Identify current common Village experiences and make available to all students.
   C. Develop tiered experiences in which all students receive Tier 1 experience. Tier 2 experiences are defined by specific experiential requirements.
   D. All students begin in First Year College.
   E. Require a living and learning experience for all freshmen.

   A. Ensure adequate offices, classrooms, lounges, and multipurpose rooms are available in all Villages. For example, can the amenities of the Quad be replicated in other Villages?
   B. Locate Villages near related academic units or have academic offices in Villages.
   C. Increase number of gathering spaces
      - Critical with Talley off line
      - Spaces faculty can access easily
      - Common spaces
   D. Enhance technology in academic spaces within residence halls; FYC model is a good example.

12. Determine Housing capacity over the next five years based on information in enrollment plan and market analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Comparisons (as of Fall 2012)</th>
<th>Women in Science and Engineering Village</th>
<th>Honors Village</th>
<th>First Year College Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Established</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participants</td>
<td>56 students</td>
<td>53 students</td>
<td>332 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Participants</td>
<td>293 students</td>
<td>391 students</td>
<td>428 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change Since Established</td>
<td>423%</td>
<td>637%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Lee Hall Floors 7-9 + 32 beds</td>
<td>Bagwell, Becton, Berry Halls</td>
<td>Owen and Tucker Halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Women 293</td>
<td>Males 255 and Females 136</td>
<td>Males 223 and Females 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Freshmen 210 72%</td>
<td>Freshmen 159 41%</td>
<td>Freshmen 428 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore 73 25%</td>
<td>Sophomore 123 31%</td>
<td>Sophomore - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior 8 3%</td>
<td>Junior 65 17%</td>
<td>Junior - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 2 1%</td>
<td>Senior 44 11%</td>
<td>Senior - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other - -</td>
<td>Other - -</td>
<td>Other - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Engineering 115 39.3%</td>
<td>Engineering 221 57%</td>
<td>Engineering - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textiles 7 2.4%</td>
<td>Textiles 12 3%</td>
<td>Textiles - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management 1 0.3%</td>
<td>Management 11 3%</td>
<td>Management - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNR 6 2%</td>
<td>CNR 4 1%</td>
<td>CNR - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHASS 4 1.3%</td>
<td>CHASS 24 6%</td>
<td>CHASS - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALS 124 42.3%</td>
<td>CALS 60 15%</td>
<td>CALS - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DASA - -</td>
<td>DASA 6 2%</td>
<td>DASA 428 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAMS 35 12%</td>
<td>PAMS 33 8%</td>
<td>PAMS - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design - -</td>
<td>Design 16 4%</td>
<td>Design - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education 1 0.3%</td>
<td>Education 4 1%</td>
<td>Education - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNEX - -</td>
<td>UNEX - -</td>
<td>UNEX - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Partners</td>
<td>CALS, PAMS, CNR, Textiles, Engineering</td>
<td>University Honors Program</td>
<td>First Year College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Experience(s)</td>
<td>HON Seminars</td>
<td>Intro to University Education I, II (USC 101, 102)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Programs</td>
<td>BRIDGE— 1.5 day workshop prior to move-in</td>
<td>HV Fellows in Honors Seminars</td>
<td>Battle for the Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome Luncheon with Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Immersion Honors Seminar &amp; Spring Break Trip</td>
<td>Rock Climbing and Kayaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries Amazing Alumni Series</td>
<td>Honors Village Committees</td>
<td>Dessert Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planet Earth Day Celebration – Service</td>
<td>Student Media Board</td>
<td>March Madness Service Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pizza and a Professor Series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Demographic Summary of Living and Learning Villages
### Village Comparisons (as of Fall 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Comparison</th>
<th>Arts Village</th>
<th>IMPACT Leadership Village</th>
<th>Students Advocating for Youth Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Established</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Participants</td>
<td>125 students</td>
<td>78 students</td>
<td>38 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Participants</td>
<td>136 students</td>
<td>117 students</td>
<td>58 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change Since Established</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Turlington Hall</td>
<td>Bowen Hall, Floors 2-4</td>
<td>Syme Hall, Floors 2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Males 42 Females 94</td>
<td>Males 60 and Females 48</td>
<td>Males 11 and Females 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Freshmen 75  55%</td>
<td>Freshmen 89  82%</td>
<td>Freshmen 43  74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore 47  35%</td>
<td>Sophomore 13  12%</td>
<td>Sophomore 14  24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior 10  7%</td>
<td>Junior 6  6%</td>
<td>Junior 1  2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 4  3%</td>
<td>Senior -</td>
<td>Senior -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other -</td>
<td>Other -</td>
<td>Other -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Engineering 32  24%</td>
<td>Engineering 34  31%</td>
<td>Engineering 2  3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textiles 9  7%</td>
<td>Textiles 4  4%</td>
<td>Textiles 2  3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management 3  2%</td>
<td>Management 11  10%</td>
<td>Management -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNR 3  2%</td>
<td>CNR 4  4%</td>
<td>CNR -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHASS 28  21%</td>
<td>CHASS 22  20%</td>
<td>CHASS 10  17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALS 23  17%</td>
<td>CALS 14  13%</td>
<td>CALS 7  12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DASA 6  4%</td>
<td>DASA 8  7%</td>
<td>DASA -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAMS 8  6%</td>
<td>PAMS 7  6%</td>
<td>PAMS 2  3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 21  15%</td>
<td>Design 2  2%</td>
<td>Design 3  5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education 3  2%</td>
<td>Education 2  2%</td>
<td>Education 32  55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNEX -</td>
<td>UNEX -</td>
<td>UNEX -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Housing + respective partners</th>
<th>Arts Forum (AVS 100)</th>
<th>ILV Leadership Course (NPS 395)</th>
<th>Students Advocating for Youth Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS NC State</td>
<td>CHASS, Institute for Non-Profit Studies, CSLEPS, Shelton Leadership Forum</td>
<td>EAC 301</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS, Institute for Non-Profit Studies, CSLEPS, Shelton Leadership Forum</td>
<td>ILV Leadership Course (NPS 395)</td>
<td>Students Advocating for Youth I, II (ED 150, 151)</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classroom Experience(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts Forum (AVS 100)</th>
<th>ILV Leadership Course (NPS 395)</th>
<th>Students Advocating for Youth Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haunted House, Masquerade Ball</td>
<td>Fall Orientation</td>
<td>Annual SAY Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mural Painting, Open-Mic nights</td>
<td>Leadership Practices Initiatives – Student Led Conference</td>
<td>22 weeks of field experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Art Events – Renaissance</td>
<td>Fall Orientation</td>
<td>State Fair Trip, DAY DC Trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts Forum (AVS 100)</th>
<th>ILV Leadership Course (NPS 395)</th>
<th>Students Advocating for Youth Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haunted House, Masquerade Ball</td>
<td>Fall Orientation</td>
<td>Annual SAY Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mural Painting, Open-Mic nights</td>
<td>Leadership Practices Initiatives – Student Led Conference</td>
<td>22 weeks of field experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Art Events – Renaissance</td>
<td>Fall Orientation</td>
<td>State Fair Trip, DAY DC Trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>