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Introduction

The Committee on Campus Community was established in February 2004. At that time, you charged us with examining the role that a sense of community plays on our campus and to recommend ways in which the University can strengthen the sense of community among all members of the campus. The impetus for appointment of the committee came from a sense that too many members of our campus community—faculty, students, and staff—felt alienated. Instead of identifying with and feeling a part of a larger group, they perceived the environment as unwelcoming and remain detached from the larger community. Animated by a belief that community is crucial, but is something that requires nurturing, we have worked diligently to respond to your charge. This report is the product of our deliberations.
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The Concept of Community

The committee fully appreciates, perhaps now more than ever before, just how elusive a concept community is. The search for community is a quintessentially human endeavor. We all strive to find others for whom we feel an affinity and a level of comfort, whether the bond is based on common views, ideals, likes, dislikes, goals, backgrounds, or some other common denominator. Community is an important means both of self-definition and self-expression. In a large and diverse University like ours, students, faculty and staff share a natural inclination to find a sense of community in smaller groups. This is inevitable, and it is good. But we must also recognize the concomitant tension between fostering community through small groups and fostering a sense of community at the University level. Therefore, we must strive both to ensure that identification with a small group occurs in an atmosphere that promotes respect for the differences among us and to take steps that create and remind us of the ties that bond us to the University as a whole.

We recognize that efforts at promoting a sense of community are further complicated by the fact that the University community comprises several quite distinct constituencies. Students, faculty, staff and alumni experience the University in significantly different ways. Obstacles to developing a sense of community within each of these groups vary from group to group. Indeed, it is safe to say that even within each group, various subgroups experience the University in significantly different ways. The interactions of graduate students may be quite different from undergraduates; tenured faculty from untenured from nontenure-track faculty; professional staff from nonprofessional staff.
Consequently, we are confident that there is no one-size-fits-all definition of community. At the most general level, however, we found guidance in the following statement suggested by one committee member. “Community to me is a comfort that comes with knowing that you are welcome and valued in an environment. It is a pride in being associated with something that is larger than ourselves and making an active and appreciated contribution.”

In the limited time available to the committee, we tried to identify the strengths and weaknesses that respectively have contributed to and hindered the creation of a sense of community across all the University’s constituencies. We then sought to devise steps to address the problems we identified. Some of the recommendations we make are steps that can be taken at low cost and in the short term. Others are more long-term and costly in nature. In many instances, we have been able to do little more than identify a problem and suggest that further study be undertaken.

The Committee’s Method

The committee decided to divide its task into three basic aspects of campus life—Programs, Facilities, and Relationship—and created subcommittees corresponding to these three areas. The commentary and recommendations that follow are organized along the lines of our subcommittee structure, although we recognize that substantial overlap exists among these three areas. An additional section addresses structural issues considered by the committee as a whole. In light of the ongoing work of the Commission of 125 and other committees, this committee did not deliberate about and this report does not address curricular issues. Nevertheless, the committee wishes to go on record as endorsing President Faulkner’s response to the report of the Task Force on Racial
Respect and Fairness, particularly as it relates to the inclusion of a cross-cultural course requirement.

Our committee sought input from the campus as a whole. We created a presence on the University web pages and were given a place among campus Spotlights in early April. Through this mechanism, we invited members of the University community to respond to a simple, open-ended questionnaire. We were also able to conduct some focus groups, particularly among students. We were fortunate in being able to draw upon the observations of student government leaders Brian Haley and Sly Majid, who, together with Tom Dison, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs and Director of Recreational Sports, visited a number of other large state universities on a fact-finding mission. We also consulted some of the materials that others, such as the Student Government, Office of the Vice-President for Student Affairs, Texas Exes, and drafters of the Campus Master Plan Report, had already compiled.

Before turning to specifics, the committee acknowledges that an impressive range of initiatives has already been undertaken throughout campus to promote a sense of community. The committee discovered numerous efforts by students, faculty and administration to tackle this problem. Moove-In, the Forty Acres Fest, Gone to Texas, staff recognition awards, initiatives at the departmental and school level, myriad student organizations, the Campus Master Plan, Freshman Interest Groups, and opportunities for volunteerism are just a few of many, many ways in which the University already strives to foster a sense of community. Our observations in the following pages are not intended
to diminish the significance of these efforts. To the contrary: in many instances the committee has identified successful programs and suggested ways to build upon and improve them.

Programs

1. *New programs that cut across student/faculty/staff lines.* The demographic groups comprising the University community are fairly well-defined: students, faculty, staff and alumni. Consequently, most of the programs, organizations, and events tend to be broken down along these lines. A substantial number, however, cut across these lines and help to foster a sense of identification with the University rather than some subgroup. These include campus-wide events such as Explore UT, athletics and cultural events, and Longhorn Halloween. The committee believes much more can be done to help cut across student/faculty/staff lines. We recommend the following:

- **Creation of a University Book Club.** This could be modeled on book club programs adopted by various cities, including Austin. The University would select a book that everyone in the University community would be invited to read. Faculty, students and staff could then meet to discuss the book in workshops and discussion groups conducted throughout campus. If practicable, the author of the book could be invited to campus to speak or conduct a workshop about the book.

- **More events that invite alumni and faculty to come and speak to students,** using the Plan II “Good Life” series as a model.

- **Coffee Talk or other Roundtable discussions hosted by the President and other University officials to which students, faculty and staff are invited.**

the open-ended nature of the questions and the small number of responses, the responses were scattered and of little value.
2. **Collaborative programs.** We identified many successful programs that bring together different groups or involve collaboration among different offices. These include Freshman seminars (students and faculty), Freshman Interest Groups, including Resident FIG's and FIG's Beyond Borders (students, faculty, staff), Campus Fusion (various student groups), Engineering Advising Office (College of Engineering and Housing and Food Service), and UT Explore (students, faculty, staff, alumni). We recommend that efforts be made to enhance these programs and replicate or adapt them in other settings as appropriate. Where appropriate, presently existing programs that are geared toward one group can be opened to other groups. Gone to Texas, for instance, might be a "welcome" to any new faculty and staff members who began working at the University after the last Gone to Texas.

3. **Communication.** The need for better communication was perhaps the single issue that was universally recognized as critical to fostering a better sense of community throughout the University. Complaints were repeatedly voiced about the lack of effective communication among students, as well as between students, faculty, staff and administration.

One example vividly demonstrates how ineffective communication can work to diminish some of the University's best efforts. The University offers a staggering array of student organizations. According to the Office of the Dean of Students, we have more than 900 registered student organizations. A student wishing to learn about these may find an alphabetical listing at [http://utdirect.utexas.edu/dsorg/](http://utdirect.utexas.edu/dsorg/). But sorting through a list of 900 organizations is a daunting task. While the listed web page permits a keyword search, the first suggested search term ("professional") generated a list of more than 160
organizations, including the Salsa Club, Texas Silver Wings, Civil Discourse, and the National Spanish Honor Society. A more targeted search term like "law" produced more precise results, but still included among the listed organizations the Iranian Students Academic and Cultural Organization. As student organizations are a major method by which students hope to find others with common intellectual, social, professional or other interests, the University should find ways to make known the existence of these organizations in as comprehensible and accessible a manner as possible. The vast number of student organizations should be an asset, not an impediment, to building a sense of community. Therefore, we recommend:

- Improve student organization website to make it more user friendly.

Another frequently-cited complaint concerned the coordination and communication of campus events. The committee noted the existence of the UT Direct calendar, but many committee members expressed the view that it was not as user-friendly or effective as it could be. Moreover, the Committee recommends the placement around campus of physical calendars or kiosks that list campus events. Physical listings have two distinct advantages over web-based listings. First, the physical listings are present for anyone passing by casually to see: they do not require an affirmative act of seeking out the information. Second, receiving the information through physical listings is a communally-experienced act, in contrast to searching for the information on the web, which is an individually-based act. We recommend:

- Publicize the existence of UT Direct campus-event calendar and make it more user-friendly and effective.

- Install around campus physical calendars or kiosks that list campus events.
• Have the Daily Texan post its weekly calendar online.

4. Room reservation procedures. Closely related to complaints about effective calendaring of events was the perceived need for a more efficient room reservations procedure for student events. We recommend:

• Centralize and simplify the room reservations process for student groups.

5. Make facilities more accessible to student groups. Budgetary stresses have created pressure to charge student organizations for the use of University facilities for student events. This includes both indoor and outdoor spaces. The Committee recognizes that safety concerns may require the presence of additional security personnel and that outdoor events create wear and tear on the grass and may require the provision of toilet facilities. While these impose additional costs, the Committee believes that, to the extent possible, these should be viewed as part of the University's cost of doing business. The University should be in the business of encouraging events that promote a sense of community on the campus and should strive to limit the amount it charges student groups that seek to stage such events. We recommend:

• Indoor and outdoor facilities should be made more accessible to student groups. The University should try to minimize efforts to charge student organizations for the use of University facilities and attendant costs.

6. Volunteer activities. The Committee believes that volunteer activities can be an invaluable method of community building. The sense of common purpose brought to such endeavors instills a strong sense of community among the participants, and the
tangible results of their efforts help forge better ties between UT and the larger community.

- The University should sponsor more University–wide community service projects, encouraging participation of not only students, but faculty and staff as well.

Facilities

Physical spaces provide the context within which community development occurs. They shape our community both by providing the boundaries that create the core campus and by offering areas that are welcoming, safe, stimulating, and accessible to the University community and visitors. The interactions and connections that occur in these locations create the foundations upon which the community develops. The physical spaces that comprise our campus have the ability to establish a sense of belonging, to create a warm inviting environment, to promote the diversity that exists on campus, to encourage integration among students, faculty, staff and visitors, to inspire individuals to the ideals of the academic community, and to aid in the establishment and transformation of the vibrant university community. The committee emphatically endorses the Campus Master Plan’s focus on the relationship between physical spaces and community, and concurs in its view that “[e]fforts to regain a sense of community would be lost if one were to consider the people of a university as separate from the place. A university community is fundamentally about the interwoven character of a people and place, not one or the other, in an intricate social, cultural and institutional fabric.”

The committee identified numerous ways that a sense of community could be enhanced by better use of or improvements to existing facilities and by construction of new facilities. Before turning to specifics, a few observations are in order. One
unfortunate, but inescapable fact is that most of our students live off-campus. Despite an enrollment hovering around 50,000, the University’s current on-campus housing capacity stands at 6,700. This represents a 26% increase in capacity since 1996, and the committee applauds President Faulkner for his initiative in this regard. Nevertheless, the University cannot come close to accommodating every student who would like to live on campus. Making matters worse, escalating housing prices over the past two decades have driven many students to seek housing far from campus. To put it bluntly, for a large number of our students, the University has become a commuter school.

This hinders attempts to build community in numerous ways. Freshmen who live off-campus are likely to have more difficulty integrating themselves into campus life. Unless adequate facilities are available to accommodate them during the day, students who live off-campus are likely to view the campus merely as a place to come to class and leave. Exacerbating this problem is the persistent shortage of parking. With no place to park, off-campus students are deterred from returning to campus and taking advantage of the rich array of campus events. The impending plan to develop the West Campus area has the potential to alleviate this problem to an extent. The addition of housing units adjacent to campus would allow more students to come and go as if they were living on campus. But it also presents a danger. We fear that West Campus housing is likely to be expensive. Consequently, the danger of an economic divide exists. The West Campus area may be transformed into an area that accommodates our relatively affluent students, while those less well off will be consigned to more remote housing locations like Riverside Drive and Far West Boulevard neighborhoods.
These concerns are student-oriented. But facilities issues also affect faculty and staff. It comes as no surprise that parking is a major issue for everyone on campus. Like students, faculty and staff are deterred by the lack of parking from taking full advantage of the many campus programs and events. Many hesitate even to leave campus for a group lunch because they fear they will not be able to park upon their return. Moreover, the lack of common spaces and inviting areas to dine communally around campus impedes faculty and staff from socializing and developing relationships outside the ordinary routine of their jobs.

1. Better utilization of existing facilities. Better utilization of space could begin with a review of existing facilities on campus and how those spaces are utilized. The application of this recommendation would require flexibility and cooperation among campus entities with the potential outcome of increased usage of existing spaces. Flexibility would need to be considered relative to the types of activities that can occur within a specific facility, as well as the times those facilities would be available for use. With flexibility in mind, smaller venues such as classrooms and lecture halls could be used for student organization meetings and events as well as study space. Larger venues such as the LBJ Auditorium and Gregory Gymnasium could be made available for conferences, forums, and concerts. A review of the hours of availability of such venues may reveal that they could be made available for alternate uses during off-peak hours.

The use of existing facilities in new and innovative ways may require a new level of cooperation among all departments on campus. Through the cooperative efforts of various agencies, a synergy could occur with new relationships formed and more flexibility in programming. Cooperation could come in the form of flyers, posters,
speaker circuits at student organization meetings, and the printing in a newsletter. By increasing flexibility and cooperation, there would be less chance for “silos” to form on campus. Often the creation of “silos” is a result of the University community assuming that certain spaces are off limits. The University could ask all departments to assist in breaking down this mentality and allowing for the creative use of existing space. Therefore, the committee makes the following recommendations:

- Conduct a review of existing facilities on campus and how those spaces are utilized with an eye toward encouraging flexible use of the space.

- Encourage increased cooperation among all departments on campus regarding the use of their physical facilities.

2. **Improvements to existing facilities and new construction.** The committee lacked sufficient time to review comprehensively the needs of the campus or to develop precise recommendations about new or improved facilities. Our recommendations are based on our sense of the types of steps that would most directly have an impact on the quality of community life at the University. We acknowledge at the outset that some of these recommendations involve substantial expense and are long-term in nature; others are less costly and could be accomplished more quickly. We did not attempt to rank order the recommendations that follow.

a. **Student Activity Center.** The University lags far behind other large state universities in the number of square feet per student devoted to student unions. See Addendum 1, page 1. The median for the 28 listed schools was 8.9 square feet per student. At 3.0 square feet per student, UT would have to nearly triple the size of its student union space to reach the median. Indeed, as the addendum indicates, enrollment increases have caused UT’s square footage per student to drop from 8.1 to 3.0 since 1960.
Especially in light of the number of students who live off-campus, the University needs more student activity space. Students need places where they can congregate comfortably between classes and that act as a magnet to draw them back to campus after hours. A new Student Activity Center could include Union-type facilities (food service, meeting rooms, lounge space), student activity space (volunteer center, gender and sexuality center, student organization offices, student government offices), and recreation spaces (aerobics rooms, cardio equipment rooms). It could also be used to replace Batts Theater, which is scheduled to be torn down next year and converted into classrooms. Presently Batts is used almost every weekend by student groups. Performance activities are tremendous community builders, and the lost theater space should be replaced.

b. Other areas to congregate and eat. As a general matter, the committee strongly supports the Campus Master Plan’s emphasis on the development of open/green spaces and its view that such spaces can contribute significantly to enhancing campus community. We endorse the Master Plan’s recommendation to maximize the development of programmable open/green spaces throughout campus, and recommend specific focus on the short-term development of the Speedway Mall, East Mall, and West Mall areas.

The committee believes a concerted effort should be made to identify areas throughout campus, both indoor and outdoor, that can be configured or otherwise transformed into spaces that invite students to congregate. This may include the strategic placement of benches and tables in certain green spaces; creating outdoor spaces with wireless capacity; reconfiguring or refurnishing existing spaces within buildings to attract
students to linger and interact; creating more attractive dining areas, both indoor and outdoor, throughout campus.

In addition, we recommend that efforts be made to develop a multitude of attractive dining areas around campus. O’s Campus Café in the A.C.E.S. Building demonstrates the enormous pull of such a venue. Similar facilities around campus would help draw faculty, students and staff together for the types of informal exchanges that are so central to building a sense that we are all part of a larger community. Additional congenial outdoor dining areas would make economically feasible a greater number and more diverse array of well–designed and appropriately–sited take–out stands.

c. On–campus housing. As discussed above, the University provides on–campus housing for only a small minority of its students. The figures in Addendum 1, page 3, demonstrate that, at about 13%, the University lags behind comparable state universities. The committee fully endorses President Faulkner’s goal of increasing on–campus housing capacity from 6,700 to 10,000, and even beyond that in the long term. In the introduction to this section, we allude to how this would help foster a sense of campus community. Beyond those comments, we would add that creating new housing facilities would enable the University to both expand successful programs such as the residential FIG’s and to experiment with new programs. We would encourage the architects of any new facilities to consider the inclusion and maximization of attractive communal spaces for both study and leisure. We attach to this report as Addendum 2 the DHFS Residence Hall Master Plan.
d. Parking. We recommend the continuing development of parking structures to accommodate members of the university community returning to campus for evening, late night, and weekend activities.

e. Student Services Building II. We recommend construction of a second student services building. Such a facility could accommodate student service units currently housed in the Student Health Center (international office, student radio) and expand space for those currently housed in the Student Services Building. Additionally, it could provide much-needed auditorium space, classrooms/conference space, and food service.

f. Summary of recommendations.

- Planning and construction of a new Student Activity Center.

- Follow through on Campus Master Plan’s emphasis on the development of open/green spaces.

- Identify areas throughout campus, both indoor and outdoor, that can be configured or otherwise transformed into spaces that invite students to congregate, including placement of benches and tables in certain green spaces; creating outdoor spaces with wireless capacity; and reconfiguring or refurnishing existing spaces.

- Creation of attractive dining areas, both indoor and outdoor, around campus.

- Increase on-campus housing capacity from 6,700 to stated goal of 10,000, and beyond.

- Encourage the architects of any new facilities to consider the inclusion and maximization of attractive communal spaces for both study and leisure.

- Continue to develop additional parking structures to enable members of the University community to return to campus for evening and weekend activities.

- Construction of a second student services building.
Relationships

Relationships is perhaps the most amorphous of the areas considered by the committee. But in many ways it is the most important, for ultimately community is the sum of a multiplicity and web of relationships. Divining ways to encourage the building of relationships between and among students, faculty, and staff is no easy task. We have identified some problem areas, and we make some suggestions. This area, however, is the one most in need of further consideration and development.

We identified some strengths as well as several distinct problems. Among our strengths is vast array of events of all types at the University, many of which we have already mentioned. These are critical in building relationships. Of particular note are events like Moove-In, Explore UT, and Longhorn Halloween, which are consciously directed at community building. The University’s leadership in initiating and continuing these programs provides tangible evidence that University leadership recognizes the importance of fostering a sense of community. The committee also notes that in some instances professional staff and faculty appear to be well integrated. In addition, the University has established a number of programs to recognize staff (e.g., awards for lengthy service) and organizations dedicated to staff development (e.g., the Student Affairs Staff Development Committee).

On the debit side, there is a perceived lack of interaction between students and faculty in certain areas of the University. For obvious reasons, this problem exists more in the larger schools and departments and in the less-specialized programs. And while some staff are well-integrated with the faculty, other staff are largely invisible to or ignored by faculty and students. Another obstacle to relationship building is the silo
mentality that tends naturally to flow from the necessary division of the University into subunits. In addition, the lack of effective communication, discussed in the Programs section, tends to erode the promise of some of the best-intentioned programs. Finally, some believe that certain institutional barriers, such as the fear of sexual harassment complaints, deter some faculty from interacting with students and staff. Even those who raise this issue recognize that sexual harassment still occurs and is highly destructive to efforts to create a sense of community. The committee supports the University's ongoing efforts to better educate faculty, staff and students about what is proper and improper behavior.

The committee recommends:

- University leadership must continue to support and emphasize the importance of building relationships.
- Funds should be made available for professors to create activities outside the classroom in which they can interact with students.
- A student-driven initiative to express appreciation of and recognize staff should be implemented.
- Efforts should be made to replicate or expand programs and work dedicated to staff development.
- Students, faculty and staff should all make greater efforts to take advantage of one the University's great resources—its alumni.
- A “spirit of collaboration” should be instilled across the University, aimed at encouraging cooperation across portfolios. One example would be the establishment of cross-college advising offices that work with other campus entities, including the residence halls, to establish a presence on campus and increase their accessibility to the undeclared population.
Structural Issues

The committee devoted a fair amount of time to a discussion of possible structural changes that could be implemented to foster a sense of campus community. The committee believes that, ultimately, community must develop from the bottom up; it cannot be imposed from the top down. But that does not absolve the University leadership from a critical role in creating the proper atmosphere in which innovation can flourish. It is important that University leadership set the right tone. It must convey the message that community is important and is something that requires constant attention.

The committee considered, but rejected, the idea that the President should declare 2004–2005 to be the “year of community.” The committee also considered, but rejected the creation of a new position in either the President’s or Provost’s Office with campus community as its portfolio or expressly assigning these responsibilities to an already existing position. We did not feel that we had considered the issue in sufficient depth to warrant recommending such a step.

Finally, the committee is split as to whether to recommend that it be reactivated next year. A slight majority of committee members believe the committee could perform a valuable service by continuing to discuss these issues, provide recommendations to the campus community as a whole, and to assist in implementing the substantive recommendations contained in this report. Other committee members, however, feel that the committee has accomplished much of what it can do, and that the valuable work of fostering community and putting our ideas into action now lies with others.
Summary of Recommendations

Programs

- Creation of a University Book Club. This could be modeled on book club programs adopted by various cities, including Austin. The University would select a book that everyone in the University community would be invited to read. Faculty, students and staff could then meet to discuss the book in groups conducted throughout campus. If practicable, the author of the book could be invited to campus to speak or conduct a workshop about the book.

- More events that invite alumni and faculty to come and speak to students, using the Plan II “Good Life” series as a model.

- Coffee Talk or other Roundtable discussions hosted by the President and other University officials to which students, faculty and staff are invited.

- Efforts should be made to enhance existing programs that bring together different groups or involve collaboration among different offices programs and replicate or adapt them in other settings as appropriate. Where appropriate, presently existing programs that are be geared toward one group can be opened to other groups.

- Improve student organization website to make it more user friendly.

- Publicize the existence of UT Direct campus–event calendar and make it more user–friendly and effective.

- Install around campus physical calendars or kiosks that list campus events.

- Have the Daily Texan post its weekly calendar online.

- Centralize and simplify the room reservations process for student groups.

- Indoor and outdoor facilities should be made more accessible to student groups. The University should try to minimize efforts to charge student organizations for the use of University facilities and attendant costs.
The University should sponsor more University-wide community service projects, encouraging participation of not only students, but faculty and staff as well.

Facilities

- Conduct a review of existing facilities on campus and how those spaces are utilized with an eye toward encouraging flexible use of the space.

- Encourage increased cooperation among all departments on campus regarding the use of their physical facilities.

- Planning and construction of a new Student Activity Center.

- Follow through on Campus Master Plan’s emphasis on the development of open/green spaces.

- Identify areas throughout campus, both indoor and outdoor, that can be configured or otherwise transformed into spaces that invite students to congregate, including placement of benches and tables in certain green spaces; creating outdoor spaces with wireless capacity; and reconfiguring or refurnishing existing spaces.

- Creation of attractive dining areas, both indoor and outdoor, around campus.

- Increase on-campus housing capacity from 6,700 to stated goal of 10,000, and beyond.

- Encourage the architects of any new facilities to consider the inclusion and maximization of attractive communal spaces for both study and leisure.

- Continue to develop additional parking structures to enable members of the University community to return to campus for evening and weekend activities.

- Construction of a second student services building.
Relationships

- University leadership must continue to support and emphasize the importance of building relationships.

- Funds should be made available for professors to create activities outside the classroom in which they can interact with students.

- A student-driven initiative to express appreciation of and recognize staff should be implemented.

- Efforts should be made to replicate or expand programs and work dedicated to staff development.

- Students, faculty and staff should all make greater efforts to take advantage of one the University's great resources—its alumni.

- A “spirit of collaboration” should be instilled across the University, aimed at encouraging cooperation across portfolios. One example would be the establishment of cross-college advising offices that work with other campus entities, including the residence halls, to establish a presence on campus and increase their accessibility to the undeclared population.
The University of Texas at Austin  
Office of Institutional Research  
Headcount by Major, Classification, Ethnicity and Gender

Graduate Programs (excluding School of Law)  
12th Class Day Enrollment Report  
Fall 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 2</th>
<th>2 or More</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% &lt; 2</th>
<th>% 2 or More</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Programs (excluding School of Law)  
12th Class Day Enrollment Report  
Fall 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&lt; 2</th>
<th>2 or More</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% &lt; 2</th>
<th>% 2 or More</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs added to Fall 2003
1. Landscape Architecture  
2. Electrical Engineering  
3. Electrical & Computer Engineering (Biomedical Engineering)  
4. Electrical & Computer Engineering (Computer Engineering)  
5. Electrical & Computer Engineering (Electromagnetic & Acoustic)  
7. Electrical & Computer Engineering (Manufacturing Systems Engineer)  
8. Electrical & Computer Engineering (Plasma, Quantum Electronics & Optics)  
9. Electrical & Computer Engineering (Solid-State Electronics)  
10. Electrical & Computer Engineering (Communications, Networks, & Systems)  
11. Theatre (MFA-Acting)  
12. Theatre (MFA-Directing)  
13. Russian, East European & Eurasian Studies/Communication
# Comparison of Unions by Size

**October 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Gross Square Feet</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Sq. Ft/Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State</td>
<td>382,973</td>
<td>22,992</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young</td>
<td>497,000</td>
<td>32,122</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State</td>
<td>263,000</td>
<td>22,762</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>35,747</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>250,682</td>
<td>22,102</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT Arlington</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>20,424</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association of College Unions-International Recommended Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>22,988</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>262,869</td>
<td>27,954</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>26,458</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>23,813</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>345,717</td>
<td>37,494</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>27,898</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>27,569</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Texas State</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>410,099</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M*</td>
<td>368,935</td>
<td>45,083</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Austin in 1960</strong></td>
<td><strong>157,472</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,527</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>279,071</td>
<td>38,263</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>41,462</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>38,903</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>46,515</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>222,740</td>
<td>48,477</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UT Austin in 2002</strong></td>
<td><strong>157,472</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,268</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Hotel
Recreational Sports
Indoor Facility Space Survey
April 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Student Population*</th>
<th>Indoor Facility Space (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Sq. Ft/Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>22,988</td>
<td>368,000</td>
<td>16.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>25,424</td>
<td>378,849</td>
<td>14.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>33,298</td>
<td>411,800</td>
<td>12.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>41,507</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>37,199</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>52,264</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>42,788</td>
<td>396,463</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>37,559</td>
<td>344,589</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>43,501</td>
<td>381,000</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>47,576</td>
<td>413,360</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>38,248</td>
<td>315,900</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>39,031</td>
<td>315,900</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>38,564</td>
<td>289,318</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>38,903</td>
<td>283,257</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>39,136</td>
<td>276,500</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan St.</td>
<td>44,542</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>36,698</td>
<td>191,000</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>42,877</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 2001-02 Figures
## Housing Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th># Beds</th>
<th>Percent Housed on Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>18,411</td>
<td>7,998</td>
<td>43.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>42,700</td>
<td>17,462</td>
<td>40.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>31,761</td>
<td>9,998</td>
<td>31.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>38,903</td>
<td>11,625</td>
<td>29.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill</td>
<td>26,028</td>
<td>7,763</td>
<td>29.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>38,103</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>37,209</td>
<td>10,249</td>
<td>27.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>9,436</td>
<td>26.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>39,872</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
<td>33,145</td>
<td>6,427</td>
<td>19.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>40,626</td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington - Seattle</td>
<td>37,412</td>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>16.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Texas</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.14%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2004 ACUHO-I Membership Directory

Enrollment = undergraduate and graduate enrollment
Residence Hall Master Plan
The University of Texas at Austin
Division of Housing and Food Service
May 2004

This document is available on the web at: www.utexas.edu/student/housing in the Mission section.
Potential Residence Hall Sites

The University of Texas at Austin
General Information

The Division of Housing and Food Service (DHFS) Residence Hall Master Plan presents ideas to achieve the University of Texas at Austin goal to house more students on campus. Some of the sites suggested are not designated housing sites in the Campus Master Plan. Information regarding the benefits of living on campus is also included in this document.

- Currently on-campus capacity is 6,700. This is a 26% increase from 5,300 in 1996.

- The University’s immediate goal is to house 10,000 students on campus, 20% of the student population. The goal is to house every freshman who wants to live on campus, approximately 75% of the freshmen class (6,000) and to provide housing for all upper class students who would like to remain (4,000). Currently 4,700 freshmen and 1,900 upper class students live on campus. The long range goal is to house 15,000 students on campus.

- Estimated construction cost is $65,000 - $90,000 per bed (2003-2004). Debt on each residential structure must be paid with the income generated from room and board. To remain competitive in the Austin housing market, financial analysis indicates a down payment of approximately 25% - 40%.

- Each building will generate a net assignable that will serve as the down payment for the next new hall.

- Estimated project time from programming, through design, construction and commissioning is 34 – 38 months.

Any questions concerning the Residence Hall Master Plan may be directed to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Porter</td>
<td>512-475-7288</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rporter@austin.utexas.edu">rporter@austin.utexas.edu</a></td>
<td>PO Box 7666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Garrard</td>
<td>512-475-8885</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garrardd@austin.utexas.edu">garrardd@austin.utexas.edu</a></td>
<td>Austin, Texas 78713-7666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Mackey</td>
<td>512-475-7536</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmackey@austin.utexas.edu">lmackey@austin.utexas.edu</a></td>
<td>Fax: 512-471-9101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd Hoelting</td>
<td>512-471-8631</td>
<td><a href="mailto:floydh@austin.utexas.edu">floydh@austin.utexas.edu</a></td>
<td>Division of Housing and Food Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whitis Residential Community Site Analysis

500 – 1500 beds

Additional housing on the north side of campus would serve colleges in this vicinity and better balance the number of students living in the southeast corner of campus. The majority of student services are located on the north side of campus which makes this site convenient for students.

The goal of this site is to provide a living-learning community in the north quadrant of campus. This community will focus heavily on the freshman transition year. It will house Freshman Interest Groups and provide for group study and informal interaction with staff and faculty. More than 50% of the rooms will be single. All baths will be semi-private or connecting, serving no more than two students. There are three options for this site.

1. Build 500 beds on the Scarbrough site. This site is currently in the design phase and is scheduled to open Fall 2006.
2. Remove or modify old co-ops and build 400 new beds on the co-op site.
3. Build 600 beds at West Dean Keeton and Guadalupe to establish a residential community of 1500 beds using the entire block. The corner site on West Dean Keeton has been designated for a College of Communication building. If plans change, DHFS would be interested in creating a retail and residential learning community.

Advantages
- Existing Food Service locations.
- Existing management structure.
- Proximity to existing residence halls.
- Proximity to Student Services Building.
- Proximity to Student Union.
- Proximity to North Campus Classrooms.
- Serve as a gateway to the University.
- Included in the Campus Master Plan.

Disadvantages
- Construction Noise
- Water and utility lines must be installed at site.
- Tunnel from Dean Keeton Street must be created.
- If the old co-ops are removed it would reduce gain in bed count by 200.
Simkins Residence Hall Site Analysis

600 beds (400 new beds)

The site of the current Simkins Hall is on the banks of Waller Creek and adjacent to one of the last remaining green spaces on campus. The current structure requires major renovation, and the site is not fully utilized. A larger hall to replace the current 190 beds is possible and would make better use of limited land resources on campus.

Remote from our other major living areas, a hall in this location would serve the housing needs of students in the College of Engineering and Fine Arts and the School of Law. Rooms will be doubles and singles with private or connecting baths.

**Advantages**
- Proximity to School of Law and College of Engineering.
- Existing housing site – no Campus Master Plan conflicts.
- Integration of Waller Creek
- Ease of construction.

**Disadvantages**
- Would probably require removal of Simkins which would reduce gain in bed counts by 190.
- Proximity to creek - flood plain issues. Cost implications.
- Proximity to Chilling Station (chilling station construction will bring it to Simkins back door)
- Hike to dining facilities or must build new dining facilities.
- The bank on Waller Creek in front of Simkins Hall has a terrible erosion problem.
Stadium Parking Site Analysis

1,500 - 2,500 beds

Building at this large and more remote site will fulfill housing needs of the more mature student. Living units will be an apartment/suite type of living arrangement with some cooking ability.

Advantages
- Fairly level site.
- Convenient to athletic venues.
- Included in the Campus Master Plan.
- Parking availability.
- Extremely large site – 1500-2500 beds
- Many options for design.
- Isolated from main campus.
- Little construction noise impact.
- Ease of construction.

Disadvantages
- Proximity to IH35 (noise).
- Isolated from main campus.
- Displacement of a significant amount of parking.
- Distance to campus activities.
- Distance to current dining facilities.
- Location might be affected by IH 35 expansion.
North End Zone Site Analysis

400 – 500 beds

Building at this site will also fulfill housing needs of the more mature student. Living units will be an apartment/suite type of living arrangement with some cooking ability. Partnering with athletics will help save on infrastructure expenses.

Advantages
- Convenient to east campus colleges and classrooms.
- Convenient to athletic venues.
- Many options for design.
- Somewhat isolated from main campus.
- Little construction noise impact.
- Additional food service venue possible.
- Proximity to IH35.
- Proximity to parking.

Disadvantages
- Somewhat isolated from main campus.
- Views from rooms will only be to the north.
- Noise and crowds on five or six game days.
School of Nursing Site Analysis

250 - 400 beds

South of the School of Nursing is a perfect housing site for upper class, graduate and married students. Studio/efficiency apartments will be one bedroom, one bath, living and kitchen. The School of Nursing has expressed a need for convenient and affordable housing for nursing students.

The goal of this housing would be to provide a studio apartment style living for upper class and graduate students. The site is on a walking path to the Trinity parking garage and across the street from the Erwin Center. One side lies on the upper bank of Waller Creek.

Advantages
- Adjacent to School of Nursing.
- Compact site that would lend itself to upperclass and graduate housing.
- Beautiful site.
- Integration of Waller Creek.
- Will serve southwest corner of campus.

Disadvantages
- Proximity to Brackenridge Hospital (noise).
- Site not included in the Campus Master Plan.
- Security issues need to be considered (vagrants along Waller Creek).
- Building around and maintaining Centennial Park.
UA9 Site Analysis

400 - 500 beds

This site is not currently designated as residence hall space; however it would be a convenient location. This site would bring more housing to the north end of campus.

Advantages
- Existing management structure.
- Proximity to existing halls.
- Proximity to dining facilities.
- Proximity to Student Services Building.
- Site access.
- Suitable for classroom space on bottom floor.

Disadvantages
- Not included in the Campus Master Plan.
- Little outdoor common areas space for residents.
- Construction noise.
Top 10 Reasons to Live on Campus
Compiled by the University of Texas at Austin Residence Hall Association leaders.

1. Convenience. Close to the library, computer labs, classes, and every type of restaurant you can think of!

2. When students live on campus, they are a part of the campus community. They know what’s happening on campus and off.

3. Meet lots of people. The friendships built in the residence halls can last a lifetime.

4. Students who live on campus have a well rounded college experience. They meet different kinds of people, from different backgrounds, which help to broaden both their educational and social horizons and to appreciate differences.

5. Home away from home. Three hot meals a day and you don’t have to shop for food, cook or wash dishes! Saving an average of 17 hours a week. (University of Utah study)

6. Research has shown that living on campus has a positive effect on academic persistence.

7. Opportunities to become involved in hall government and hall campus activities. Each Residence Hall provides numerous programs and activities to enhance one’s education and socialization.

8. The closer you are to class, the later you can sleep!

9. The closer you live to class the more likely you are to not skip class and study group sessions.

10. Students who live on campus tend to be more satisfied with and loyal to their university!
Importance of Living on Campus

Findings at a significant level from the following research projects support the importance of living on campus.


1. Less likely to drop out.

2. More likely to graduate in 4 years.

3. More likely to do graduate work.

4. Likely to have a higher GPA in undergraduate and graduate school.

5. Improved self-confidence and ability to speak in public.


7. More interpersonal contacts with faculty and other students.

8. Artistic interest will increase.


10. Greater participation in outside class activities.

11. Experience greatest change - philosophy, values, political and career goals.

12. Students who live on campus for one year -- 43% more likely to finish college than those who never live on campus.
GPA Comparisons — On-Campus vs. Off-Campus
The University of Texas at Austin
On-campus GPA for Freshman through Senior, Fall 1997 through Spring 2003. For all classifications, living on campus yields higher GPA. Off-campus GPA for Graduate students however (not shown) is higher than GPA for graduate on-campus residents.

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Division of Housing and Food Service
Residence Hall Master Plan