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Convene

1. **U. T. System: Update on Faculty Advisory Council Recommendations**

2. **U. T. System: Overview and discussion of undergraduate student housing**

Adjourn 4:30 p.m.
1. **U. T. System: Update on Faculty Advisory Council Recommendations**

**REPORT**

Dr. Teresa A. Sullivan, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, will provide an update on responses to the recommendations presented to the Board by the Faculty Advisory Council at the February 10, 2005 Board meeting.

The Faculty Advisory Council presented the following recommendations for consideration:

a. bridge funding for "fundable", but non-funded research grants (as presented by Dr. James Bartlett),

b. creation of a System-wide database of research background and research interests of faculty and graduate students (as presented by Dr. Robert Nelsen), and

c. issues concerning nursing education (as presented by Dr. Terese Verklan).

2. **U. T. System: Overview and discussion of undergraduate student housing**

**PURPOSE**

Executive Vice Chancellor Sullivan will lead a discussion regarding undergraduate student housing focusing on programmatic initiatives, specific housing data, and building enhancements. Dr. Sullivan will be joined by Ms. Roberta Rincón, Research and Policy Analyst, U. T. System; Mr. Sid Sanders, Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning and Construction, U. T. System; Ms. Dawn Remmers-Roebe, Director of Student Success Programs, U. T. Arlington; and Mr. Wylvan Parker, Director of Housing, U. T. Arlington for a PowerPoint presentation set forth on Pages 84.1 – 84.21.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Research shows that students who live on campus have a better retention and graduation rate than those who commute. A review of historical information showing student growth versus construction will identify challenges faced in defining housing types, the benefits of various types of housing, and associated costs.
Student Housing Overview
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Benefits of Living on Campus

• National Study of Living-Learning Programs (2004)
  • Higher campus involvement
  • Greater interaction with faculty
  • More time studying and attending classes
Benefits of Living on Campus, cont.

• **Indiana State University (2002)**
  • Residential learning communities: 0.16 points higher first semester GPA
  • First-year residence halls: 0.11 points higher first semester GPA
  • First-year residence halls increased first year retention by 3.5% in two years

Compacts: Housing Goals

• Improve recruitment
• Improve retention and enhance campus life
• Expand housing options
U. T. System Housing Construction Over Time

U. T. System Beds versus Headcount

U. T. System Freshmen/Sophomore Headcounts versus Total Number of Student Housing Beds Available
Fall 1999 to Fall 2003
Supply versus Demand

Current Housing Demand versus Beds Planned by Fall 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Beds</th>
<th>Waiting List</th>
<th>Planned Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. T. Arlington</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. T. Austin</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. T. B Paso</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. T. Pan American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. T. Permian Basin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. T. Pan American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. T. San Antonio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. T. Tyler</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marketing Trends

- **Room layout**
  - Greater demand for privacy and personal space
    - More beds share private bath areas
    - More beds have private vanity area with a private shower
  - Private beds often are part of suites with common living area and kitchenette
  - Housing Complex amenities often include study halls, computer labs, lounge space and outdoor recreation such as basketball/volleyball courts
  - Food service is typically handled separately at a central dining facility on campus
Marketing Trends

- Safety issues
  - Fire sprinklers in all new facilities, retrofitting of existing facilities
  - Security card access in newer facilities, retrofitting of existing facilities
  - Control access to immediate housing site

Housing Types

- 50 Year Institutional Dorm
  - (example: Almetris Duren Residence Hall at U. T. Austin)

- Hybrid Dorm
  - (example: Kalpana Chawla Hall at U. T. Arlington)

- Apartment Style
  - (examples: Chaparral Village at U. T. San Antonio and Student Housing Phase II at U. T. Permian Basin)
Housing Types: 50 Year Institutional

- **50 Year Institutional Dorm:**
  - Almetris Duren Residence Hall
  - San Jacinto Hall
    - 1,454 Beds (since 2000)
    - Average Cost per Bed = $67,303 (in 2005 dollars)

Almetris Duren Residence Hall at U. T. Austin
Housing Types: 50 Year Institutional

- 50 Year Institutional Dorm Attributes:
  - Intricate masonry exterior
  - Clay tile roof system
  - Concrete frame w/ metal stud wall framing
  - Institutional quality centralized HVAC systems
  - High quality and more durable materials
  - Greater level of architectural articulation
  - High level of site development fitting an urban environment
Housing Types: Hybrid

- **Hybrid Dorm:**
  - Kalpana Chawla Hall at U. T. Arlington
  - Arlington Hall
  - Student Dormitory & Academic Excellence Center at U. T. Tyler
    - 1,218 Beds (since 2000)
    - Average Cost per Bed = $48,508 (in 2005 dollars)
Housing Types: Hybrid

• **Hybrid Dorm Attributes:**
  - Simple masonry exterior
  - Composition tile or metal roof systems
  - Wood frame w/ partial light steel/concrete framing
  - Durable but less robust HVAC systems
  - Durable but less robust finish materials
Housing Types: Apartment Style

- **Apartment Style:**
  - Miner Village at U. T. El Paso
  - University Village West Apartments at U. T. Arlington
  - Chaparral Village at U. T. San Antonio
  - Student Housing – Phase II at U. T. Permian Basin
    - 5,013 Beds (since 2000)
    - Average Cost per Bed = $36,132 (in 2005 dollars)
Housing Types: Apartment Style

Chaparral Village at U. T. San Antonio

Chaparral Village at U. T. San Antonio - Floor Plan of Bldg Units
Housing Types: Apartment Style

- **Apartment Attributes:**
  - Wood frame
  - Masonry and wood exterior
  - Composition tile roof system
  - Multifamily/Residential quality HVAC
  - Multifamily/Residential quality finish materials
  - Budget conscious materials

Comparing: Housing Types

- **50 Year Institutional Dorm**
  - 1,454 Beds
  - $67,303/Bed

- **Hybrid Dorm**
  - 1,218 Beds
  - $48,508/Bed

- **Apartment Style**
  - 5,013 Beds
  - $36,132/Bed
Factors Affecting Campus Housing

- Level of demand on campus
- Household income of typical student on campus
- Growth in enrollment of campus
- Amount (if any) of existing beds with no outstanding debt
- Marketability of existing inventory of beds
- Off-campus market competition
Our Changing Residential Community

UTA Housing Construction Dates

- RESIDENCE HALLS
- UTA APARTMENTS
- PRIVATE HOUSING
UTA Student Housing Beds Available

Year

Total Beds Available

UTA Apartments  UTA Residence Halls  UTA Houses  Private Apartments

Age of Campus Residents

Percent of Total

Age
Classification of Campus Residents

Changing Amenities
- Private Rooms
- Ethernet
- Cable TV
- Phone
- Washer & Dryer
- Future - Garages?
Changes Impacting Housing Assignments

- Virtual Tours replacing Physical Tours
- On-Line Application and Assignment
- Computerized Roommate Matching

Changes Impacting Campus Support Services

Increased Support Required from:

- Campus Police
- Judicial Affairs
- Health Center
- Counseling
Changes Impacting Community Support Services

Increased Need for:
- Local Grocery Store
- Retail Development
- Public Transportation

Changes Impacting Academic Environment
Maverick Scholars
Residential
Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs)

Imagine the Possibilities!

Student Success Programs

Kalpana Chawla Hall:
UTA’s Living-Learning Center

Learning Community I
FIG C
Learning Community II
FIG A
Learning Community III
FIG B
Types of Living-Learning Communities at UTA

General Learning Communities
- Major and special interest themes
- Assigned room space based on learning community preferences
- Hall programming builds group sense of community
- Facilitated study groups

Freshman Interest Groups
- Placed in small groups with students of similar major/interest
- Live within a learning community with a Peer Counselor
- Co-enroll in at least three courses
- College adjustment course
- Faculty mentor
- Social and academic programming in the hall

Why Learning Communities?
- Develop the “whole” student
  - Academic needs
    - engaged learning, support
  - Personal needs
    - “traditional” experience, community, adjustment
  - Social Needs
    - friends with similar interests
Residential FIGs Fall 2004 Summary

- FIG student Fall-Spr Retention: 94%
- Non-FIG student Fall-Spr Retention: 88%
- FIG student Mean GPA: 2.97
- Freshman Mean GPA 2004: 2.64

- Tracking student learning outcomes, retention, course performance, graduation rates of FIG students