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Letter to the President

Dr. Michael A. McRobbie  
President  
Indiana University  

Dear Dr. McRobbie:

On behalf of the students of Indiana University Bloomington, I would like to thank you for your willingness to listen to the many voices of the student body through your Vision of the Ideal Student Environment (VOICE) Project. You have shown unprecedented attention to the constituency very much at the heart of Indiana University Bloomington, and for that we are grateful.

The Steering Committee of the VOICE Project has worked over the last year to gather and distill the many student voices of this university. The following report is the result of these efforts. It must be noted that this is not by any means meant to be a comprehensive report. The scope of this project is massive, and touching on every detail of the total student environment would be impossibly difficult. Rather, this report should be seen as an outline of the major themes and concerns that developed in our attempt to define the “ideal” college environment. Further, the thoughts and recommendations included herein do not form the final statement of the VOICE Project. Additional discussion will be needed on a number of points, as the committees of the VOICE Project were not always adequately equipped to address the more complex issues affecting Indiana University Bloomington.

I would like to preface the report by giving some indication of the challenge the Project had in gathering “voices” to inform the report. When first approached by members of the VOICE Project, students generally responded quite favorably as to their experience at Indiana University Bloomington. This finding generally parallels the findings of major, national university satisfaction surveys, including Bloomington-based National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and University of California, Los Angeles-based Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) surveys. That said, when forced to think more critically about their experience here at IU, students did, with a great deal of provoking, consistently identify areas of the environment they felt could be improved. Students’ stubbornness to criticize IU was a challenge we perceived to be a result of a base level of student satisfaction, not “ideal” satisfaction. Indeed, areas of opportunity abound.

Again, thank you for this unprecedented opportunity. I look forward to hearing how this report helps to inform your vision of the ideal college living and learning environment for the 21st century.

Sincerely,

Alexander Shortle  
Chairperson
Executive Summary

The Vision of the Ideal College Experience (VOICE) Project was established by President Michael McRobbie as a means of gathering student sentiment to assist him in crafting a “vision of the ideal college living and learning environment for the 21st century.”

“I want to find out what students think about the present campus environment and how they would make it better,” McRobbie stated. “We have many bright students at Indiana University with constructive thoughts about their college experience. I am eager to see what they can produce.” The following report is the result of this charge.

Methodology

The project consisted of a Steering Committee (the “Committee”) and five subcommittees, chaired by Committee members, each focusing on a different part of the college experience: the Intellectual Environment, the Social Environment, the Campus Living Environment, the Off-Campus Environment, and Support Services for Students. Cumulatively, 125 students participated in discussions through the Committee and five subcommittees. Additionally, Committee members led two Focus Group Lunches during which over 180 students were asked a series of open-ended questions regarding their experiences at Indiana University.

The Committee worked with the Center for Survey Research to develop and administer a comprehensive student survey (“Survey”) during January and February of 2008 to 5,200 students; those sampled included students from each class, including graduates. The data were analyzed using SPSS and the results are included in this report.

Further outreach was done informally through meetings with key student leaders and organizations including Union Board, Residence Halls Association, Indiana University Student Association, Graduate and Professional Student Organization, and the Dean of Students Advisory Board. Final vetting is to go through Dean’s Advisory Board leadership and the Committee.

Development of Themes

The first few Committee meetings primarily consisted of trying to “wrap our heads” around the project. Initially, the charge seemed a bit impossible in scope – and to some degree still seems to be. In attempting to define the “ideal college environment,” the Committee decided to first start with defining the ideal student – more precisely, the ideal student on his or her graduation day. The Committee contended that if it could describe the ideal graduate, it could begin discussing the college environment necessary to develop students into that “ideal.”
The following is a list of ten characteristics the Committee decided the “ideal” Indiana University student embodies on his or her graduation day:

- **Broad Educational Background** – The traditional IU education is one with broad exposure to the liberal arts, sciences, and the humanities. Due to the rapidly changing nature of the world today, this sort of education, rich in reading, writing, mathematics, synthesis, and analysis is more relevant than ever.

- **Adept in Communication** – Must be prepared to take a view and defend that view through written and oral communication and using technology and multimedia. Public presentation of material is more prevalent than ever, and students must have the experience necessary to be comfortable in this and all modes of communication.

- **Displays Initiative** – The ability to identify problems and seek solutions beyond that which is expected or required is essential for graduates to remain relevant in a globally competitive world.

- **Oriented to Working in Diverse Groups** – It is utterly essential for students to have adequate experience working as part of a team. Experience in both academic and co-curricular activities as a leader and follower is the ideal. Further, an understanding and appreciation of the role full-diversity plays in group dynamics is expected no matter the chosen post-graduate path.

- **Exhibits International Perspective** – Exposure to various cultures and languages through both international and overseas study is crucial to developing an understanding of the modern world. Indiana University is uniquely positioned to produce students unparalleled in this regard.

- **Values Service** – A developed sense of necessity/obligation to serve as a member of a modern democracy. Graduates of public universities must understand through experience the value of civic engagement – both community service and political/governance involvement – so that they may affect positive change within and without their chosen field.

- **Knowledgeable of Next Step** – Already secured or fully understand how to secure employment, graduate school acceptance, or other post-graduate endeavors. Has full knowledge and use of university resources and alumni network for continued occupational/professional growth after leaving Bloomington.

- **Sense of Obligation to IU** – A deep connection to Indiana University resulting in future service and gifts. Graduates would have become invested in IU through active engagement outside of the classroom in co-curricular activities, faculty research, and similar “defining” activities.
• **Engaged in Health/Wellness** – Understands the importance of health and wellness, and participates in activities in line with Governor Mitch Daniels’ INShape Indiana initiative.

• **Explored Values/Ethics** – Throughout his or her college career, graduate challenged pre-college value structure, explored diverse set of beliefs and understandings, and worked to develop life philosophy in line with ethical standards and personal beliefs.

The Committee does not pretend to have fully realized the ideal college student on his or her day of graduation through the ten characteristics listed above. Rather, these characteristics helped focus the discussion and ultimately informed the recommendations included in this report.

### Eight General Themes

Through the activities discussed in methodology above, the Committee accumulated a great number of recommendations and general thoughts on what an ideal college environment would look like. During this process, it rapidly became apparent to the Committee that breaking the report down by the five subcommittee “environments” would not sufficiently frame the recommendations – the ideas were simply too interconnected.

The Committee views the whole of the college experience in three “spheres”: Academic, Co-Curricular (extracurricular to the antiquated), and Social. The ideal college environment as defined by the Committee is one in which these three spheres are merged into one sphere – where education is ubiquitous, happening 24/7, no matter the place or context.

Using this understanding of “ideal,” the Committee explored the recommendations developed in the subcommittees and arrived at the following eight general themes the group felt both adequately summarized underlying student concerns and demonstrated the fusion of the three spheres:

• **Organize IU** – The ideal college environment – a merging of the academic, co-curricular, and social spheres – is an extremely interconnected environment that necessitates an obvious organizational structure and efficient administrative functions. Emerging during Committee discussions was the sense that the university’s structure, as perceived by students, was not conducive to ensuring a fluid, engaged university experience. The apparent “silo-effect” on schools and departments has created a number of independent colleges, compromising the sense of shared IU experience and detracting from the overall university experience. Further, there is a general sense of disinformation at IU, whereby students feel unsure as to the resources available or to the events taking place on campus and in the community. A better-organized Indiana University, more easily understood and navigated by students, is essential to realizing the following seven themes.

• **Engagement** – Central to this entire report is the idea that student engagement in all facets of the university is “ideal.” Framed in a manner quite palatable to university administrators, the Indiana University Foundation found that students actively engaged outside the classroom are much more likely to give back to the university post-
graduation. Intuitively, this is a result of engaged students feeling more satisfied with their college experience – a notion that is in line with Committee findings. Simply put, because of its size and volume of inimitable resources, Indiana University is uniquely capable of providing a universally satisfying student experience through engaging students outside traditional educational settings, providing opportunities to challenge and apply knowledge acquired in the classroom. The seven other themes of this report are all essential components for encouraging and supporting student engagement at Indiana University.

• First-Year Experience – Generally, students arrive at Indiana University intending to involve themselves fully in what the university has to offer, and thus fulfilling the above theme of engagement. However, when students arrive on campus they are so overwhelmed with classes, developing friendships, deciphering university information, and the general independence of college that they often become “numb” to the engagement opportunities presented to them. The Committee noticed that the students most engaged during their college careers are those who became actively engaged early – often as a result of a mentor presence who could help the student wade through the inundation of information and navigate the general labyrinth of college life during their first year. The question then became: how does Indiana University ensure that all students have a mentor presence during their first year to help navigate? The First-Year Experience section includes recommendations that attempt to answer this question.

• Advising – Due to the size and complexity of IU and all that it has to offer, students need resources available to help them navigate the entirety of their college experience – not solely the academic sphere. Providing a supportive first year experience is half the battle; ensuring continued support during the remainder of their college career is ideal. Advisors are uniquely placed to provide this support, as they are knowledgeable of both students’ interests and the resources and opportunities available at IU. The Advising section includes recommendations on the current advising structure and recommendations for advising that does not yet exist.

• Student Input – The tradition of Indiana University is one of an active student voice in the governance of the institution. More than providing a unique perspective on issues affecting the campus, active student involvement creates students fully “invested” in the future of their institution – more engaged and thus more satisfied. There has been noticeable erosion of this tradition as of late: exclusion of students on the Presidential Search and Screen, initial exclusion of students on the Athletic Director Search and Screen, and exclusion of students as campus governance moves more towards ad hoc committees and task forces. Admittedly, the VOICE Project is an ideal illustration of the tradition of student input and thus somewhat contradicts this argument, but what is to become of the student voice once the VOICE Project’s time has passed? The Student Input section presents thoughts and recommendations on the continuation of the very-IU tradition of an active student voice in the governance of the institution.

• Technology – Successfully merging the three spheres of the student experience necessitates an environment conducive to active interaction, collaboration, and
communication across all university groups. After all, both the relevance and benefits of a residential campus today are predicated on active interaction between all parties. While technology certainly can facilitate broader and timelier communication, it also presents a number of issues for residential campuses intent on providing active interaction on campus. Indeed, considering the nature and content of the Internet today, students rarely need to leave the 18x18 box in front of them: their keyboard and computer screen. One need only look at the evolution of the dorm room lounge to understand the insularity produced through the modern realities of technology; once rooms holding the lone floor television where students would come to watch prime-time television and interact (thereby building community), they are now either empty or dorm rooms themselves. The Technology section includes student satisfaction data on the current use of technology and recommendations on optimizing this essential aspect of the modern college environment.

- **Facilities** – As mentioned above, merging the three spheres of the student experience necessitates an environment conducive to active interaction and collaboration across all university groups. Indiana University is perfectly set, with its compact, beautiful campus, to provide students with ideal physical locations for developing this form of engagement. Currently, Indiana University does not have adequate spaces on campus for facilitating broad, informal interaction between all constituencies. The Facilities section includes thoughts and recommendations on current and future physical spaces at Indiana University.

- **Safety** – The Committee believed this to be an essential section of the report in light of recent events on college campuses nationwide. Indeed, to adequately take advantage of all the opportunities available at Indiana University, students must perceive the campus and surrounding area as a safe environment. Any hesitancy or unease can be detrimental to the overall student experience. The issue of alcohol on campus also served as a motivation for this section. Like perceived safety, alcohol, when approached irresponsibly, can be detrimental to the college experience, preventing it from ever becoming the “ideal” outlined in this report. The Committee contends this issue has not received the honest, open discussion it so desperately needs. The Safety section includes a discussion of perceived safety on campus and a call for an open discussion on the appropriate role of alcohol at IU.

**Recommendations by Theme**

**Organize IU**

- The university work to better unify the disparate communities of campus, providing a more easily understood and navigable environment while instilling a sense of “shared experience” for all IU students. Ensuring a “Brand IU” binds students more fully to the mission and expectations of the university. (17)
The university better centralize student services to encourage student visitation and utilization of the services offered. The IMU was discussed as a possible location for centralizing many of these services as long as student resource space is not removed. (18)

The university develop a more consistent web presence across schools, offices, and departments to ensure students are getting accurate information in an efficient manner. Further, the university needs to ensure search functionality on IU websites is as advanced as possible. Students today are much more attuned to “Googling” than they are to antiquated pull-down menus. (19)

The university update the rather antiquated online course schedule site, introducing a searchable format (by name, distribution designation, faculty, school, major) with:
- Full course descriptions
- Links to faculty pages with CV, research, and co-curricular involvement
- Links to grade distributions (currently distributions are available but few students know where to find them) (19)

The university mandate faculty release the list of required course materials at least 10 days before the start of each semester to allow students enough time to use all the resources at their disposal (Internet, used bookstores) to search for the best possible prices on books. (20)

The university explore the possibility of moving to a paperless, online course evaluation model and explore placing course evaluation results or a portion thereof online to aid student course selection. (21)

The university assess the current Events Calendar available on the IUB homepage and find ways to make it more approachable and user friendly for students. Providing more specific “interest calendars” with lists of relevant events for particular students and assignable email alerts are two features students have recommended. (22)

The university do an analysis on the adequacy of advisors for advising across curricula and schools. School specific advising serves the interest of the school – not the university, and therefore not the “broadly developed” students the Committee has identified as the “ideal.” (23)

The university work to simplify the application process for overseas study through digitizing applications/confirmations (signatures) and centralizing university funding for overseas study. (24)

Engagement

The university must ensure that faculty members are engaging students inside and outside of the classroom. Faculty should be more demanding in office hour participation as evidenced by the frequency of informal faculty/student interaction. Further, faculty must
be encouraged to participate in co-curricular activities as a part of their responsibilities to the university. (29)

- Due to the overwhelmingly positive response of students, the Committee recommends the university explore options for expanding both the LAMP model (integrated academic/co-curricular program) into other academic program areas and the living-learning community model (LLCs, etc.) across the Bloomington campus. (30)

- The university offer greater opportunities for student involvement in faculty research. Further, the university create a research opportunities website and office to facilitate research experiences for students. The website should include the capability for students to browse faculty, departments and subjects, indicate funding, list requirements, and provide project descriptions. (31)

- At least one service learning course be available in the required curriculum of each major. This ensures that all students have the opportunity to experience a service-learning course, serving to better engage the students and increase the level of community connectedness on campus. (32)

- The Office of Service Learning play a part in the organization/planning of all service learning courses. More than simply providing a standardization of product, this will better facilitate the dissemination of information regarding service learning courses. (33)

- The university assess the resources currently allocated to Student Activities. Provisions must be made to ensure this is a visible, well-resourced office capable of serving the important role of facilitating student involvement. (35)

- The Student Activities Office develop a more robust Internet presence that would allow student groups to do more efficient outreach/promotion, better coordinate efforts, and more easily access the funding sources made available through the Indiana University Student Association Student Organization Funding Board. This would greatly benefit the co-curricular environment of the campus. Additional university support (financial) is understood to be necessary for implementation of this recommendation. (36)

- The appointment of a taskforce on Civic Engagement to assess current efforts and recommend a strategy for increasing student involvement in civic engagement through improving campus efforts in service learning, volunteerism, political activism and other civic engagement activities. (37)

- A more intuitive online calendar and a comprehensive university events ticketing system to better facilitate student awareness and attendance of events. (40)

- Parking at the IMU be free for students arriving after 7PM. This facilitates greater use of the Union by students and student groups at night without overcrowding the parking lot during business (class) hours. (43)
The creation of an off-campus resource website to assist students with the general tasks of living off campus. Relevant topics include tenant rights, Student Legal Services information, relevant city ordinances, trash and recycling policies, utilities information, and area “things to do” information (not a comprehensive list). (43)

Intramural and club sports continue to be supported at an institutional level – i.e. facilities and fields placed as a university priority. These activities are an ideal way for students to interact outside of the classroom, and they contribute substantially to the overall satisfaction of student life on campus. (44)

First-Year Experience

The university put a taskforce together to discuss the possibility of creating a comprehensive first-year transition program (“IU 101”) for all students that occurs throughout the first two semesters of an undergraduates IU career. The intent of the program is to introduce IU and all that it has to offer in smaller, more easily understood doses, providing a guiding, “mentor” presence for all first-year students. (51)

The university explore expanding interest-based living arrangements (LLCs, etc.) on campus. (52)

The university institute a compatibility survey to place students in residence hall rooms where they are more likely to both get along with their roommate and succeed during the very difficult first year of college. A number of universities use compatibility surveys to assist in the placement of students including the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Richmond. (52)

The university limit the policing role of RAs and work to place them in a more appropriate advising/mentoring role for their student populations. Attention also needs to be paid to the orientation and training given to RAs. RAs should be the most appropriate and capable mentors for students, but the data suggests they are rarely serving this role. (53)

A complete review of freshman academic advising. Improvements in this will be complimented by the creation of the first-year transition program that will cover major selection, overseas study planning, and other advising coverage areas identified as being weak. (54)

The university provide a more robust, unifying graduate orientation that compliments the efforts of individual schools. (55)

Advising

The university ensure first-year students are exposed to overseas study advisors to eliminate information gaps regarding studying abroad. These information gaps were often sited as reasons for not studying abroad (student would learn of requirements or scheduling issues too late in their matriculation). (59)
The university evaluate current efforts in career services and work to ensure all students are given the resources and endowed with the skills necessary to secure post-graduate employment if so desired – no matter the student’s school or major. Inequities between schools were often noted. (60)

**Student Input**

- The university provide greater flexibility in the setting of student fees through decoupling the increases of tuition and fees. Further, the university explore alternative funding sources for CFR-supported organizations that require one-time, “non-operating” expenditures (Recreational Sports facility improvements). (65)

- Student Affairs work with IUSA and GPSO to develop an orientation process for all student appointments to university committees to ensure greater engagement and integration with these highly developed committees. Yearly student turnover without an adequate orientation process is detrimental to ensuring the student voice is heard on standing and ad-hoc university committees. (65)

- The university ensure that there is adequate student representation on all ad hoc university committees. (65)

- Every school, department, and organization (service area) on campus have a functioning student advisory board to ensure that student concerns are heard on the foundational level, well below the level of the administration. (66)

**Technology**

- Combine the IU management software and the Webmail system with one another in order to simplify accessing student information. (70)

- A high number of students recognize Ballantine Hall, the IMU and the Library as locations that could use more computers or an additional computer lab. Additional suggestions included creating and expanding computer labs in all of the residence halls, implementing more express printing stations as opposed to computer labs, and providing the ability to print remotely to any computer-controlled printing station on campus. (76)

**Facilities**

- The university explore expanding reasonably priced, healthy food options at all foodservice locations on campus. (79)

- Expanded food and drink offerings in the Wells Library food court, more fluid movement between the lobby and the court, and renovating the dining area to provide a more inviting environment through the addition of windows, outdoor seating and more suitable lighting. (80)
The university explore options for renovating the coffee kiosk in the Wells Library in an effort to provide greater service and a more appropriate spot for engagement – use the Starbucks in the Indiana Memorial Union as an example of successful implementation. (80)

Extending foodservice hours in the Wells Library. (80)

Acceptance of residence hall Meal Points at all foodservice locations in the Wells Library. (80)

Renovation of food kiosks in SPEA/Business, Music, Education, and Jordan Hall into permanent foodservice locations. (80)

Expanded seating for food kiosks in SPEA/Business, Music, Education, and Jordan Hall in the model of the IMU Starbucks. (81)

Extended hours for food kiosks in SPEA/Business, Music, Education, and Jordan Hall. (81)

Opening the Arboretum to all student group activity including tabling, campaigning, and programming. (81)

Exploring options for increasing the usability of the Arboretum space by students, faculty, and staff. (81)

The IMU reassess how it serves the students of Indiana University, and realign its strategies to encourage student use, participation and community building (this will be further explained in the points below). (82)

The IMU begin discussing a more appropriate use of the bookstore space to provide for a more open, useable union. (83)

The IMU remove The Back Alley and introduce a space more conducive to bringing students/faculty/staff together in a casual setting for both academic and non-academic work. Possible uses include providing student group resource space, relocation of the Student Activities Office, and academic/non-academic computer clusters. (83)

The university open a 21+ establishment in the Solarium or other suitable space of the IMU for students, faculty and staff. (83)

The IMU provide late night food and beverage service in a comfortable environment. (84)

The IMU accept all forms of ID payment for foodservice including RPS Meal Points. (84)
The IMU provide free parking in the north and east Union lots for all students arriving after 7pm. (84)

The university discuss fully the Recreational Sports Master Plan at an institutional level, and begin planning for necessary facility improvements/additions as laid out in the Master Plan. Further, the university ensure current services are not cut (intramural fields) and all additional services are more appropriately designed for use by students/faculty/staff during the workday (centralizing facilities as much as possible). (86)

The university assess the current funding process for one-time expenses (non-operating), like the Recreational Sports Master Plan, to ensure necessary projects are not prevented by restrictions placed on the Committee for Fee Review’s fee recommendations. (86)

The university work with the current Indiana University Student Association administration to explore the need and options for expanded Health Center hours. This is an issue currently being addressed by IUSA. (87)

The university evaluate options for centralizing the majority of Student Affairs offices. The Indiana Memorial Union would be an “ideal” location for many of these offices so long as student organization office space is maintained. Further, the university move the Office of the Division of Student Affairs to a location that more adequately represents the import and role of this office. (87)

The university identify a location more visible and accessible for the Office of Overseas Study. (88)

Safety

The university appoint a taskforce on alcohol consumption, to address, openly and honestly, current university policies regarding the consumption of alcohol on campus. (91)

The university eliminate (for a trial period) the neighborhood selection process for incoming freshman. This would ensure student exposure to a more diverse group of individuals and help to remedy many of the quite accurately stereotyped environments of certain residence halls on campus (i.e., concentration of “party oriented” individuals in the northwest neighborhood). This recommendation does not include interest-group living arrangements or living requests based on necessary proximity to specific school (tuba player living in Read). (92)
Methodology

Note: This is the only section of the report completed by a university staff member.

Committees

The Steering Committee and the five subcommittees were announced in September. Those subcommittees included: Campus Living Environment, Intellectual Environment, Off Campus Environment, Social Environment and Support Services for Students. Membership was sought in a variety of ways including personal e-mails from Dean McKaig to all Deans, and Directors of Units across the campus seeking nominations for the committees, as well as adds in the IDS and solicitation from all registered student organizations and student organization advisors. Nominations came from across campus and all nominees were contacted and allowed to select their committee of choice. Kick-off meeting on October 1, 2007 included 65 students who confirmed selected committees as well as Steering Committee members who chaired the subcommittees. 51 more students joined committees for a total of 116. 91 other students expressed interest or were nominated but responded they could not participate at that time. Each committee began to meet and most selected additional co-chairs for the committees. Committees utilized Oncourse for meeting announcements and communication, etc. (Individual committees were set up like a class and then added all the members to the “VOICE class”)

Throughout the semester a small number of students continued to be added to the groups as I received nominations or interest. Student chairs also invited members to join. It was advertised as open to any student who wished to come and VOICE an opinion.

Focus Group Lunches

The Dean of Students always hosts two lunches first semester and in the fall of 2007, he gave these over to VOICE. He introduced the focus of the lunches and Alex Shortle explained what was happening with VOICE. For each of the two lunches approximately 300 students were invited by the Dean’s Office. This is a random sample of all enrolled undergraduates who are currently on the Bloomington campus, not traveling abroad. List comes from Registrar’s list of students and each receives a letter of invitation from the Dean. Over 180 students attended the two lunches. Tables were hosted by members of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees who had a series of open-ended questions, as well as some very pointed questions. Questions came from the steering committee and subcommittees. Each host wrote a report of their responses for Alex Shortle. These responses were discussed at steering and subcommittee meetings. (I attended these lunches and observed very lively discussions going on. Normally these tables are hosted by staff and administrators, but staff and administrators were not involved in these lunches first semester, only students.)
**Other Outreach**

Members of VOICE committees also attended a number of other student organization meetings, including Student Government, Union Board, Dance Marathon, RHA, and the Division of Student Affair’s Student Advisory Board, among others, to talk about what VOICE was doing and seek input, ideas, and even members.

**VOICE University Survey**

Alex Shortle worked with John Kennedy and John Wunsch from the Center for Survey Research for the development of the Survey, as well as the administration of the Survey. They drew the Sample in conjunction with the Registrar. The random Sample was 1000 students from each class, and 1000 graduate students. There were 200 additional international undergraduate students and African Americana and Hispanic students added to the random sample in an effort to get a large enough number of responses from that group. (As a note: Because the Center for Survey Research was drawing six undergraduate samples for different surveys being administered in the beginning of second semester, John Kennedy asked for and got approval from the different groups that he draw the six samples randomly without any overlap so we would not solicit survey responses from the same students. It is my understanding that all agreed, so response data from the NSSE survey and the Board of Aeons surveys came from different undergraduates. (I had suggested some comparison with the results of these surveys to either reinforce what was found, or to see where there might be different results. It isn’t often such a large group of students are surveyed at the same time where there were some overlapping questions.) The steering committee came up with questions and those were formulated by working with CSR. CSR had some members of VOICE respond to the survey as well as a paid group of students to help with the development of their survey instrument. They administered the survey in January and February by inviting students to participate by e-mail. It was an online survey. They compiled the data and sent it to Alex Shortle as an SPSS document in March.

**Analysis of Quantitative Data**

Using SPSS I was able to run more than frequency responses to all questions. At the request of Mr. Shortle, I ran a number of crosstabs, as they would relate to specific questions that would address the seven preliminary themes for the report they had identified. There were many variables that could be cross-tabulated. Did on/off women respond differently than on/off campus men? What were differences by school, by year in school, by various living areas, by Greek Affiliation, by involved students, by any of the demographic categories?

It was important to look at the respondents to see how representative they were to the IU population and to see where there was over/under representation. As seems typical to many surveys, women were overrepresented, so any question where there was a big difference in the responses between men and women needed to be reexamined if the question was being used. Freshman respondents were a little underrepresented, but there were some questions demanding freshman only responses, so that was helpful. Graduate students were over represented in the responses, so questions needed to be broken down by class for many questions. As might well be expected there was often quite a difference in the responses by undergraduates from those of graduate students. The respondent school break down was quite representative except for the SPEA percentage being over represented but the N was small. The big question was with
COAS/UD, which lead to the idea that students were really in UD but responded that they were in COAS. In general it seems the respondents were consistent with the population except for those mentioned and the data was good as long as the responses of women and graduate students were accounted for in specific questions. The figures from the last two years of NSSE suggest that women over represent their respondents at almost the same rate at VOICE. The VOICE did a little better with multicultural responses, so maybe the oversampling did help a little.
Eight Themes to Ideal College Environment
The ideal college environment – a merging of the academic, co-curricular, and social spheres – is an extremely interconnected environment that necessitates an obvious organizational structure and efficient administrative functions. Emerging during Committee discussions was the sense that the university’s structure, as perceived by students, was not conducive to ensuring a fluid, engaged university experience. The apparent “silo-effect” on schools and departments has created a number of independent colleges, compromising the sense of shared IU experience and detracting from the overall university experience. Further, there is a general sense of disinformation at IU, whereby students feel unsure as to the resources available or to the events taking place on campus and in the community. A better-organized Indiana University, more easily understood and navigated by students, is essential to realizing the other seven themes detailed in this report.

Silo-ing of Campus

There is a sense among the students that the Bloomington campus is becoming increasingly segregated into individual divisions and schools. There are obvious reasons for the individual schools within the university to be proud of their reputations and for them to further develop their “brand.” The Jacobs School of Music, Kelley School of Business and the Journalism School are top programs (certainly not a comprehensive list) that deserve to be recognized and were often sited during the VOICE Project as contributing factors for attending IUB. However, the Committee believes, as introduced in the Executive Summary, that ideal students leave IU with a breadth of knowledge and experience requiring more than the experience of just one division or school. Rather, exposure must span the university, whereby students are exposed to breadth in curricula, faculty and students. Note that this is not simply a classroom criticism, rather a concern that spans all aspects of the university – all three “spheres.”

Lengthy discussions were had within the VOICE Steering Committee on the topic of decentralization. A Committee member noted that, “systemic decentralization in the university pushes the responsibility to be successful to the student.” This comment should not be taken as a relinquishment by students of the responsibility for individually-driven growth, but rather as a statement on the perception of disorganization and decentralization that makes navigating IU a challenge and prevents full realization of the ideal college experience.

An explanation that may make this point of organization a bit more clear was brought by a Committee member who noted that students can receive an “Honors Degree with Honors” from Indiana University. The member further stated:

“Getting an honors degree is not an option for all students when their department does not offer enough honors courses, because in order to participate in the Honors College they would have to take a number of additional courses outside of their major. Thus the
choice is constrained by time and finances instead of motivation and academic success. Having two tracks also becomes confusing both in deciding and explaining a diploma which is an Honors degree with honors.”

The VOICE Committee does not intend to make a recommendation regarding honors programs on this campus, although the lack of parity between schools is clearly an issue, but rather utilize this point to emphasize the “significant perception issue” that contributes to the confusion of students in navigating the university.

Another point the Committee found relevant to this discussion of decentralization was the need for students to have the perception of “shared experience” at IU, whereby all students, regardless of their chosen track, can be unified through relatable experiences. To some degree, the realization of the points made in the Executive Summary of this report would ensure “shared experience” for all IU students.

The Committee recommends:

- The university work to better unify the disparate communities of campus, providing a more easily understood and navigable environment while instilling a sense of “shared experience” for all IU students. Ensuring a “Brand IU” binds students more fully to the mission and expectations of the university.

---

**Student Services**

**Physical Student Services**

Students are noticeably unaware of where Student Services are on Campus:

“I am still having trouble in negotiating the IU landscape of offices, bureaucracy, funding, and such.”

Allocation of physical space contributes to this perception – the Division of Student Affairs being a prime example. Currently, Student Affairs has thirteen units that are located in eight separate buildings on campus. These offices are:

- Dean of Students and Vice Provost for Student Affairs, Bloomington
  - Franklin Hall 200
- Career Development Center
  - 625 North Jordan Avenue
- Health Center
  - 600 North Jordan Avenue
- Student Ethics and Anti-Harassment Programs
  - 705 East 7th Street
- Student Legal Services
  - 703 East 7th Street
- Student Advocates
  - Owen Hall 204
While certainly some of these offices are best placed at their current locations, it seems odd the division as a whole is so decentralized. A graduate of IU undergrad and current Law School student commented:

“One thing that is nice about the Law School, as compared to when I went to IU as an undergrad, is that everything is contained in this building – financial aid, career services, and our recorder. In undergrad any administrative task was always a nightmare – having to run around campus to all the different buildings, usually having to go back and forth.”

Indeed, students often commented on the pain of running from office to office trying to get things done. The problem with this kind of environment is that the challenge of finding and visiting the offices minimizes their perceived importance and minimizes the chance a student will visit. For example, because the Office of Overseas Study is so difficult to find (discussed in Facilities section of report) students are, as many stated in a subcommittee discussion, less likely to visit and therefore less likely to study abroad. The Committee recommends:

- The university move to better centralize student services to encourage student visitation and utilization of the services offered. The IMU was discussed as a possible location for centralizing many of these services as long as student resource space is not removed (included in Facilities section of report).

**University’s Online Presence**

A general student sentiment often expressed was the lack of continuity in the university’s web presence. It seems that every school, office, and department operates a completely different website, dissimilar in almost every regard. The lack of consistency between sites makes finding information efficiently and ensuring accuracy/timeliness difficult:

“Very difficult to locate websites online.”

“Too many different sites, not easy to get it all together…examples are the myriad of scholarships, internships, grants, things that exist in nearly all schools and departments, but no easy way to find them.”
Many students today rely entirely on the Internet for information specific to the various areas of the college experience (Course Schedule, Bursar, Student Activities, etc). Many of these students commented that they are not getting timely, accurate information through IU websites due to inconsistencies and general information gaps. Specific to finding information, students suggested a number of remedies, the most popular (and Committee supported) being the implementation of more powerful search functionality.

Regarding general online student services (other recommendations will follow), the Committee recommends:

- The university develop a more consistent web presence across schools, offices, and departments to ensure students are getting accurate information in an efficient manner. Further, the university needs to ensure search functionality on IU websites is as advanced as possible. Students today are much more attuned to “Googling” than they are to antiquated pull-down menus.

Registration

Registration is known to be a surprisingly difficult process, even prohibitively so for first-year students. Note: the importance of educating students on the registration process is covered in the First-Year Experience section of this report.

Survey data shows that not all students visit their advisor in a typical semester (an issue covered in the First-Year Experience and Advising sections of this report). One of the many roles of an advisor is to assist in each semester’s course selection. If students are not visiting their advisor, they are evidently getting course selection advice (among other things) from some of other source – chiefly, the Internet. The data and anecdotal evidence suggest this has become pervasive. As such, the university must supply adequate resources online to allow educated selection and scheduling of courses by those students who are not going to their advisor for this. Inefficient structure and insufficient available information was noted by the Intellectual Environment subcommittee:

“[Students] find Onestart for registration lacking in consistent and useful descriptions of classes. Maybe one in five are good and you know what the class is, others don’t tell the student anything. Trying to find classes that fit a particular requirement or would be good substitutes is a tedious process.”

This noted, the Committee recommends:

- The university update the rather antiquated online course schedule site, providing a searchable format (by name, distribution designation (A&H, etc), faculty, school, major) with:
  - Full course descriptions
  - Links to faculty pages with CV, research, and co-curricular involvement
  - Link to grade distribution (currently distributions are available but few students know where to find them)
Books

Students repeatedly comment on the price of books. This is an issue that has risen in prominence over the years and is now one of the core issues of the current Indiana University Student Association (Student Government). With the nature of the Internet today, students have more resources than ever for purchasing books:

- amazon.com
- campusbooks.com
- textbooks.com
- ebay.com

Through the use of these sites, ambitious students can often find necessary textbooks at a sharp discount. However, currently the vast majority of faculty members do not make their required list of books available prior to the start of the semester. Due to delivery times of online purchases, students who wish to use the Internet to get the best possible price on textbooks do not receive those textbooks until well after classes have commenced. This fact often prevents the use of the Internet by price-conscious students for required texts. The Committee recommends:

- The university mandate faculty release the list of required course materials at least 10 days before the start of each semester to allow students enough time to use all the resources at their disposal (Internet, used bookstores) to search for the best possible price on books.

Course Evaluations

At the end of each course at IU, faculty distribute a course evaluation for students to take. During the last fifteen minutes of the last class of the semester, students fill out these evaluations, place them in an envelope, and never hear from them again. Presumably, the faculty member whose course it is reviews the survey data and adapts accordingly. That said, many students commented on how useful it would be to view this survey data when selecting courses.

Another point, with 31,000 undergraduate students taking an average of five courses a semester (the Committee understands these estimates are not totally accurate), IU Bloomington is currently wasting 145,000 Scantron sheets a semester. Purdue University recently and quite publicly moved to an electronic course evaluation, providing a number of benefits:

- Estimated savings of about 985,500 pieces of paper each semester.
- “Results are returned to faculty just hours after the deadline for submitting campus grades…rapid turnaround allows sufficient time for instructors to modify and improve their courses based on the feedback received well before the next semester begins.”

---

1 “Purdue to introduce new system for instructor and course evaluations,” Purdue Today, <http://news.uns.purdue.edu/insidepurdue/2008/081119_evaluations.html> 
3 “Purdue to introduce new system for instructor and course evaluations.”
• Allows for “open-ended questions that elicit more focused and richer responses from our students.”

In light of current initiatives to establish a more sustainable campus and in the spirit of defining the ideal college environment, the Committee recommends:

- The university explore the possibility of moving to a paperless, online course evaluation model and explore placing course evaluation results or a portion thereof online to aid student course selection.

**Information Dissemination**

As one will find mentioned repeatedly in this report, students often comment that they are unaware of what is going on and what is available on campus. Note: the First-Year Experience section of this report provides a bit more color on bringing students up to speed with the Bloomington campus and what possibilities/resources exist.

**Student Services:**

“I think there needs to be more promotion about cultural events and student services.”

“I have all my classes in the School of Education, and I also work in the Education Library. I hear a lot about things going on around the education field but very little about campus as a whole. As a junior I don’t use as many student services that much. I don’t think I was very well informed of them as a freshman or sophomore.”

“Health Center needs to advertise services.”

**Student Events:**

“I always feel like I hear about events that already happened through the IDS, and always say, ‘That would have been fun to go to if I knew about it before it happened!’ Somehow I don’t get the message and information on UPCOMING events.”

“I know that when I was in the residential halls, I was much more informed about events. But since moving off campus I have absolutely no idea what is going on. It would be nice if there was a way to be informed.”

“It is hard to hear about the events when I live off campus.”

**Events Calendar:**

“It would be good to try to put up all the campus events onto the events calendar.”

---
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“I wish there was one consistent cultural events board where you can sort by category or events that you want to look at. The only things I know about are the stuff that comes in my mailbox and those are not all the things I am interested in but I don’t want the excess emails all the time. I want to be able to choose.”

“I don’t know if this is already offered, but a centralized calendar with all public campus events would be helpful. Perhaps these could be color-coded or divided up by type of event (musical, cultural, educational, career/business development, athletics, etc). To advertise that this website/feature exists, you could use flyers or email alerts (extremely sparingly), etc.”

Clearly from these comments and those included in the remainder of this report, students often feel unaware or uninformed about IU and its many activities. For most students, the Internet serves as the chief information point – laptops, iPhones, Blackberries – students today are never without this resource. As such, and not to belabor the point, Indiana University needs to have a robust, intuitive Internet presence that can be easily navigated by students from their first to last days on campus.

Specific to the comments above, students repeatedly comment on their little knowledge of what is going on. The current “Events Calendar” accessible from the IUB homepage is seldom used by students (many do not know it exists), seems to have spotty information (though it is much better than previous iterations), and is noted as difficult to use. Simply loading the calendar can take a prohibitive amount of time for students used to immediate gratification. In terms of content, the calendar currently has tabs for:

- Academic & Official Dates
- Alumni Events
- Arts & Entertainment Events
- Intercollegiate Athletic Events
- Careers & Non-Credit Courses
- Information Technology Events
- Lectures, Meetings & Conferences
- Museum & Gallery Events
- Recreational Sports, Health & Wellness
- Student Activities
- All Events on This Campus
- Events on Other Campuses

These tabs cover a great breadth of campus events though certainly not all. That said, with the amount of information loaded to the calendar, students can quickly become overwhelmed – as evidenced by the comments above. The Committee recommends:

- The university assess the current Events Calendar available on the IUB homepage and find ways to make it more approachable and user friendly for students. Providing more

---

5 “Events at Indiana University Bloomington,” Indiana University, <http://events.iu.edu/iub.html>
specific “interest calendars” with lists of relevant events for particular students and assignable email alerts are two features students have recommended.

Advising Across Departments

Advising is obviously covered in the Advising section of this report, but it is discussed here framed in a slightly different manner. Many students pursue multiple majors and concentrations, requiring advisors with broader knowledge on all schools’ majors. In the ideal university environment, students would have one advisor able to satisfactorily advise the student no matter his or her year or major. While the Committee understands this to be extremely difficult, it still believes students should have advisors capable of advising across schools and concentrations. After all, it is in the best interest of the university to have students seeking multiple majors/concentrations. Advisors capable and encouraged to advise across schools would certainly promote this. During the process of data collection, students often commented that this is not reality:

“I have to run all over campus to do so since I am a double major, and much of the information I receive is conflicting. IU needs to streamline this process and make sure that the advisors are more organized and knowledgeable.”

“[I] had a lot of difficulty getting the information that I needed. I am completing a certificate program in SPEA and a minor in COAS – and I have been unable to find anyone who can advise me effectively due to the fact that I am working in three different schools. So, overall, advising has been my biggest disappointment at IU.”

“My academic advisor that was assigned to me when I first arrived here was not helpful. I had to get an advisor for further help. I feel they help with my questions concerning classes for my major but I can’t talk to them ‘person to person’ about what I would like to do and see if we can find a major for that.”

The Committee recommends:

- The university do an analysis on the adequacy of advisors for advising across curricula and schools. School specific advising serves the interest of the school – not the university, and therefore not the “broadly developed” students the Committee has identified as the “ideal.”

Overseas Study

Overseas Study is an often-sited example of the perceived challenges of getting something done, administratively, at IU (Overseas Study is covered more fully in Engagement section). The
process of applying for overseas study begins in the “hardest to get to” office at the university: the Office of Overseas Study on the 3rd floor of Franklin Hall. Once there, students are required to fill out a number of forms then parade around campus gathering signatures from schools and departments. While this is going on, the student is locking down financing, but since many scholarships do not transfer to non-IU programs this can become a challenging process for those students pursuing more “exotic” locals – the locations the university is most actively promoting. Many students provided anecdotes during the VOICE Project on the challenges to scheduling and applying for overseas study. The Committee, with the scope of this report, does not pretend to fully understand the intricacies of applying and finding funding for overseas study. That said, the Committee did note students consistently commenting on the challenges of the application/funding process. In light of this, the Committee recommends:

- The university work to simplify the application process for overseas study through digitizing applications/confirmations (signatures) and centralizing university funding for overseas study.
Central to this entire report is the idea that student engagement in all facets of the university is “ideal.” Framed in a manner quite palatable to university administrators, the Indiana University Foundation found that students actively engaged outside the classroom are much more likely to give back to the university post-graduation. Intuitively, this is a result of engaged students feeling more satisfied with their college experience – a notion that is in line with Committee findings. Simply put, because of its size and volume of inimitable resources, Indiana University is uniquely capable of providing a universally satisfying student experience through engaging students outside traditional educational settings, providing opportunities to challenge and apply knowledge acquired in the classroom. The seven other themes of this report are all essential components for encouraging and supporting student engagement at Indiana University.

### Student Connectedness Data

#### How Much Students Feel a Part of the IU Community

- **A lot**: 47%
- **Some**: 28%
- **Not much**: 20%
- **Not at all**: 5%
How Connected Students Feel to Peers at IU

- Very connected: 36%
- Somewhat connected: 45%
- Not too connected: 15%
- Not at all connected: 4%

How Connected Feel to Peers at IU (by class standing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Standing</th>
<th>Very Connected</th>
<th>Somewhat Connected</th>
<th>Not too Connected</th>
<th>Not at all Connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interaction with Faculty

Note above that approximately 85% of undergraduate and graduate students surveyed stated that meeting with faculty or administrators informally improved academic experience “A lot” or “Some.” This question was intentionally broad, meant to include all those points of interaction that happen outside of the classroom setting, whether it be in office hours or in the coffee shop. The anecdotal evidence suggests a similar sentiment:

“Meeting with Dr. Terrill on a regular basis assisted immensely with understanding the course concepts. Additionally he was a great resource just to talk to about cares and concerns of being a student. We still keep in touch, I am now a junior, and he often writes recommendation letters for me”

“While searching for a new major, I enjoyed an introductory class so much that I decided to settle on that. The professor of the class has helped me along the way, keeping me updated about conferences, information, job fair opportunities, and groups to get involved with for my new major. I am now a junior and she has given me two work opportunities as well as written recommendations for me.”

“My chemistry professor has been asking my opinions of his class and has invited me to his office to talk. I find that this makes this class infinitely more appealing as my opinions and view seem important. Already I have been drawn into the class more; it has made me not miss class as he is a teacher I like and respect.”
The data above details the rates of informal interaction occurring at Indiana University. As one can see, 52% of all undergraduate students meet with faculty or administrators two or fewer times a semester. That is, at most, once every eight weeks. Further, it was noted repeatedly during the focus group lunches that students “feel connected to other students, but not to professors, faculty” and “feel VERY disconnected from professors.” Students also noted a lack of support for co-curricular activity by faculty members:

“The faculty at the university could show more support for organizations the students participate in through the university.”

“Faculty members rarely advertise extracurricular activities that relate to course topics, making courses seem somewhat disconnected from the university culture. The exception to the rule would be the business school, where faculty often promote clubs and events
that relate to the coursework. Perhaps part of their success – half of learning happens outside the classroom.”

Graduate informal interaction with faculty seems to happen at much greater levels than for undergraduates. According to the survey, only 36.7% of graduate students met with faculty or administrators two or fewer times a semester, and a whole 21.8% met ten or more times. Graduate education naturally supports greater faculty/student interaction, but as noted by one graduate student, IU seems to do better than most:

“As a graduate student I selected IU because I felt it had a more open/collaborative environment vs. other schools I was considering, but I didn’t fully realize how great this contrast was until a year or so into the program at IU.”

The Committee recommends:

➢ The university must ensure that faculty members are engaging students inside and outside of the classroom. Faculty should be more demanding in office hour participation as evidenced by frequency of informal faculty/student interaction. Further, faculty must be encouraged to participate in co-curricular activities as a part of their responsibilities to the university. In the Facilities section of this report, the Committee details a number of recommendations regarding the addition of space(s) on campus more conducive to student/faculty/staff interaction. The Starbucks in the Indiana Memorial Union is the “ideal” example of this for the purposes of this report.

**Liberal Arts and Management Program (LAMP), Living Learning Communities, Freshman Interest Groups and other Academic/Co-Curricular Programs**

Students who are involved in thematic communities, whether academic or residential, overwhelmingly agree they are beneficial. Here are a number of responses from the survey, certainly more than are necessary (included to emphasize overwhelming student responses), when asked for “any other experiences at IU that have impacted you academically:”

“I am lucky to be a part of a relatively small program. I know all of the students in all of my classes and we have become somewhat of a family. I know that I can come to my peers for help, and I also know that when working in a group my voice is not over shadowed by others and I am also not doing all of the work. I have gotten to know my professors semester after semester, and even know some of their family members. All of these little things have impacted my academic career.”

“Collins Living Learning Center, where I have lived every semester except during my overseas studies. The community provides many opportunities to meet with others to study and receive or provide help, and the atmosphere (I find) very conducive for study and self-improvement.”

“I am a LAMP student. This program has benefitted me most of all of my involvements, classes, and opportunities at IU. I love this program. The LAMP advisor has been the
most helpful of my advisors because of her knowledge of how to be efficient and oriented to my needs when helping me plan my schedule. The classes, of which I have only taken a few, have been some of my favorite coursework. Because of the strides the LAMP faculty have taken to create an effective and enjoyable program I feel I have been prepared for any career I become involved in after my time at IU.”

“The LAMP program has been a very positive part of my academic experience at IU.”

“I have gotten involved in several organizations and taken part in many extra-curriculars which has shaped my overall experience and gotten my name out in the university and career field I am interested in. But most of all, exposing myself to other intelligent, driven students within the Mitte Business Honors Program has impacted me the most.”

In case the reader is unfamiliar with LAMP, it is an interdisciplinary certificate program through the College allowing students to integrate a College major with training in business management. While a worthwhile program as defined by this mission, it is the “close-knit community of motivated students” that makes this a prime example of the major theme of this report: merging the three spheres of the college experience. Through the program, like-minded students interact inside and outside the classroom with peers and faculty across curricula. They are engaged not just at the academic level, but also at the advisory, co-curricular and socials levels. Similarly, the Collins Living Learning Center, Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs) and Academic/Thematic Communities help to bridge the chasm between the three spheres of the college experience. Please note that this is most certainly not a comprehensive list of the communities established by the university to bridge these gaps. The point the Committee is making is that these communities are very well received by the students and are supported by the themes of this report. Note: FIGs, LLCs, Academic/Thematic Communities will be covered in the First-Year Experience section.

Due to the overwhelmingly positive response of students and relatively low involvement in academic/thematic communities/programs relative to peers, the Committee recommends the university explore options for expanding both the LAMP model (integrated academic/co-curricular program) into other academic program areas and the living-learning community model (LLCs, etc.) across the Bloomington campus.

Faculty Research

Student involvement in faculty research is an ideal merging of the three spheres of the college experience. It provides student/faculty interaction essential to defining the ideal college environment and allows students the opportunity to apply what they have learned in the classroom while exploring potential career paths. Indeed, student involvement in faculty research provides experiences in a number of the expectations outlined in the Executive Summary.

---

6 “About Us,” LAMP. <http://www.indiana.edu/~lamp/about.html>
IU, as “one of the largest and most diverse public research institutions in the United States,” places a great deal of emphasis on the research mission of the university. With ongoing pressure from the State of Indiana, that focus has never been greater. That said, the university’s mission is also “challenging and inspired undergraduate, graduate, professional, and life-long education” and to provide “meaningful experiences outside the classroom.” Student involvement in faculty research is an ideal expression of this mission and has been consistently considered a memorable and beneficial academic experience:

“Being able to participate in research groups has given me the opportunity to practice research skills in authentic contexts and begin to develop a professional network.”

“As a graduate student in HPER I have enjoyed the chance to participate in research with several professors. This has enhanced my knowledge and skills and prepared me for entering a doctoral program.”

Anecdotally, students find research beneficial, but incredibly difficult to come by:

“Resources and opportunities for student research and internships exist, but often in an uncoordinated way. Finding and securing undergraduate research opportunities is largely left to students themselves. There are no organized contact points for students to go if they desire a research experience. Students must cultivate a relationship with a faculty member and then find whom if any of the faculty they have a relationship with has opportunities. With the increasing prevalence of cross-collaboration in research, developing infrastructure that spans departmental and school boundaries could be an important aspect of an information system.”

“Disconnect between students and faculty looking”

In the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2006 report it indicates that only 19% of IUB seniors responded that they had “worked on a research project with a faculty member outside of class,” compared to 26% of students from the peer group selected by NSSE. The Committee strongly believes that taking into account the evidence included above, IUB is not utilizing the faculty research capabilities of this campus to provide an “ideal” student environment.

The Committee recommends:

- The university offer greater opportunities for student involvement in faculty research. Further, the university create a research opportunities website and office to facilitate research experiences for students. The website should include the capability for students to browse faculty, departments and subjects, indicate funding, list requirements, and provide project descriptions.

---
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Service Learning

During the focus group lunches mentioned in Methodology, students were asked for their “most positive experience” during their time at IU. Service learning was often cited as a standout, memorable experience that served as a tipping point for students to get further involved in service:

“In taking a service-learning class, I realized that I was really interested in community service and advocacy.”

“Service-Learning courses were an utter mystery to me until this academic year. Now I’m an ACE (Advocates for Community Engagement) working through COSL (Community Outreach and Partnerships in Service-Learning) and becoming more aware of the issues the University and the town are facing. Knowing what I know now, I believe that service-learning at the University should be more heavily endorsed by IU. I have really enjoyed my college experience. I have learned a lot and believe I am ready to contribute to society. I hope to make a big impact, and I believe my experience at Indiana University is going to contribute to it.”

Service learning courses offer students a great deal of experience in the expectations outlined in the Executive Summary. Specifically, service learning “[develops] sense of necessity/obligation to serve as a member of a modern democracy” and ensures students “understand through experience the value of civic engagement – both community service and political/governance involvement – so that they may affect positive change in their various fields.”

There are 37 different courses that have a service learning component for the Fall Semester of 2008. Students often commented on the need for more community-connected academic work:

“I highly suggest more courses encourage community involvement or at least an assignment to be completed off campus.”

“The university is working very little to be able to accept more community/volunteer/internships as opportunities for college credit. It is somewhat ridiculous. After all, we are in college, for a life experience, but they, ‘IU,’ doesn’t want to give us credit for it.”

The Committee recommends:

➤ At least one Service Learning course be available in the required curriculum of each major. This ensures that all students have the opportunity to experience a service-learning course, serving to better engage the students and increase the level of community connectedness on campus.

Currently, it is not required that service learning courses be run through the Office of Service Learning. It has been suggested that the faculty/organization relationship component of service learning courses be administered through the Office of Service Learning:
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“When faculty do not utilize the office of service-learning the results can be mixed because the institutional memory and expertise that comes with the Office of Service Learning cannot be leveraged.”

“Making the Office of Service-Learning a part of all service-learning courses would guarantee a standard of experience for both students and the organization – and would provide for better continuity.”

The Committee contends that the Office of Service Learning should play a part in the organization/planning of all service learning courses. More than simply providing a standardization of product, this will better facilitate the dissemination of information regarding service learning courses. As touched on throughout this report, there is an information gap here – many of the students we talked to were unaware that service learning courses were available. Providing a center depository of information on service learning will help combat this information asymmetry.

### Division of Student Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Graduate Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement in campus/community organizations (by class standing)</td>
<td>[53% Yes, 47% No]</td>
<td>[58% Yes, 42% No]</td>
<td>[57% Yes, 43% No]</td>
<td>[65% Yes, 35% No]</td>
<td>[44% Yes, 56% No]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mission of the Division of Student Affairs is to:

“[Support] the academic mission of the University through student advocacy, services, and programs that promote the general welfare of students and foster a campus climate conducive to learning and responsible citizenship. The primary goals of the Division are intended to provide opportunities for personal development, foster respect for diversity, encourage physical and emotional wellness among students, protect student rights and promote ethical behavior.”

There is a discussion within the university administration claiming that the brighter, better prepared student the university is now seeking will result in a student body more capable of navigating the university and more apt to engage in co-curricular activities and with faculty. In a letter to Provost Karen Hanson, Vice Provost for Student Affairs Richard McKaig wrote regarding this:

“There is every reason to believe that better students, who often bring with them more assertive parents, will press even greater expectations and demands upon our beleaguered staff (Division of Student Affairs). The faculty who interact with those students also may find that new challenges come with more capable learners, and our operations must be positioned to respond effectively to emerging faculty needs, too.”

As discussed in the opening of this report, it is the understanding of the Committee that the goal of Indiana University with respect to student living and learning should be to bring the three spheres of the student experience together – academics, co-curricular, and social. In no place of the university is this goal more understood than in the Division for Student Affairs. This report comes at an opportune time, for the nature of the student experience is changing. The pervasiveness of technology, movement of students off campus, and core motivations of the general student has forced student affairs offices to rethink their approach. Vice Provost Richard McKaig noted the challenges for the Division of Student Affairs in addressing these new realities:

“We cannot reflect or create in ways necessary to substantially improve the learning environment for our students, or encourage more productive relationships between
students and faculty, because of the limits of our time and energy—our human resources—are consumed by individual problems.”

The VOICE Committee does not have the data or knowledge necessary to make specific recommendations on the organization of or resources made available for the Division of Student Affairs. Rather, this section is included to exhibit the central role the Division plays in the various themes developed in this report, and to document the observations made by students and the Committee as to the institutional support (or more precisely, lack of) for the Division of Student Affairs as perceived by students.

First and foremost, the physical space of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs office needs to be addressed. Located in an interior office on the second floor of Franklin Hall, the office could not be less prominent. Far from the daily movement of students, the office once housed the Associate Dean of Students (who has since left for the Dean of Students post at Penn State) in a retrofitted closet. The Committee wonders if this is a metaphor for the importance this institution currently places on the Division of Student Affairs. Note: specific space recommendations for the Division of Student Affairs are outlined in the Facilities section of this report.

A second observation made was the inadequacy of physical space and resources available in the Student Activities Office. Located on the third floor of the student tower in the Indiana Memorial Union, the SAO does not have the resources or infrastructure necessary to serve the 40,000 students of Indiana University. Part of the mission of the SAO is to “[provide] a comprehensive support system for student organizations, leadership development and civic engagement for the Bloomington campus.” We repeatedly heard from student groups, including a number of groups currently advising on Dick McKaig’s Student Advisory Board, that the SAO does not have the resources available to fulfill this mission – a mission that is fully supported by the themes of this report. According to research done by the IU Student Activities Office and confirmed by other Big Ten student affairs offices, IU currently has the second lowest student activities office employee hours per student ratio in the Big Ten (second worst to Michigan State). It is interesting to note that a great deal of research has been done showing that more engaged students are more satisfied, resulting in better retention levels – research done at Indiana University no less. The Committee recommends:

- The university assess the resources currently allocated to Student Activities. Provisions must be made to ensure this is a visible, well-resourced office capable of serving the incredibly important role students believe necessary in the “ideal college environment.”

Note: the non-ideal location of the office will be covered under the Facilities section of this report.

A third observation, more an extension of the second, is that the Internet presence of the Student Activities Office is inadequate. Currently, there are over 600 student groups on campus, each, presumably, scheduling meetings and programming events throughout the year. As detailed throughout this report, students constantly remarked that they are unaware of what is available on campus. That said, the Committee recommends:

The Student Activities Office develop a more robust Internet presence that would allow student groups to do more efficient outreach/promotion, better coordinate efforts, and more easily access the funding sources made available through the Indiana University Student Association Student Organization Funding Board. This would greatly benefit the co-curricular environment of the campus. Additional university support (financial) is understood to be necessary for implementation of this recommendation.

Note: general IU Internet presence has additional coverage in the Organize IU section of this report.

Civic Engagement

As stated in the Executive Summary and Service Learning section above, the ideal college environment is one that develops students’ “sense of necessity/obligation to serve as a member of a modern democracy” and ensures that students “understand through experience the value of civic engagement – both community service and political/governance involvement – so that they may affect positive change in their various fields.”\(^\text{13}\) Currently, there is little institutional support for civic engagement on campus and in the local community. It is interesting to note that in 2000, IUPUI Executive Vice-Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties William Plater appointed a Civic Engagement Task Force at IUPUI to discuss this topic. In the Introduction to Civic Engagement section of IUPUI’s Institutional Portfolio website, it states:

> There is growing recognition that institutions of higher education are called to be good citizens in their surrounding communities. The role of citizen engenders both rights and responsibilities. As one of the nation’s leading urban universities, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) takes seriously its responsibility to relate its academic work to communities in ways that are mutually beneficial. Collaborative work in and with communities, including scholarly work, is consistent with the goal that IUPUI be a model urban university, provide leadership to others in all facets of integrating service with teaching and research, and engage educators, staff, and students in activities that benefit their communities as well as themselves. As articulated in the campus Mission, Values, and Goals, "IUPUI values the opportunities afforded by its location in Indiana's capital city and is committed to serving the needs of its community", and "IUPUI serves as a catalyst for collaboration in teaching, research, and service among its faculty, students, and staff."\(^\text{14}\)

In order to fulfill this vision, IUPUI has allocated campus resources and created campus infrastructure to support civic engagement.

While the Committee understands the unique urban location of IUPUI and the centrality of civic engagement to the mission of the campus, it seems some carryover to Bloomington would serve to benefit the university.

\(^{13}\) Executive Summary of VOICE Report, “Values Service” expectation.

Over the last few years, there has been a great deal of discussion amongst faculty and students on the possibility of establishing a “Center for Civic Engagement.” The strongest student proponent of this initiative of recent was Katie Klaussen, a recipient of the 2006 Well’s Award and a Marshall Scholarship – a student that deserved more university attention on this initiative than she actually received. The idea was for the center to house volunteer support services, student political organizations, the Office of Service Learning, and other related programs/offices. The founding of such a center is supported by much of the anecdotal and quantitative data collected by the Committee.

There are currently a number of departments and centers on the Bloomington campus dedicated to civic engagement. However, it is Committee’s contention that there is no organized effort to ensure all students get adequate experience in civic engagement activities – an effort essential in defining the “ideal college environment.” That said, the Committee cannot make any explicit recommendations due to the incredibly broad and challenging nature of the topic, but does suggest:

- The appointment of a taskforce on Civic Engagement to assess current efforts and recommend a strategy for increasing student involvement in civic engagement through improving campus efforts in service learning, volunteerism, political activism and other civic engagement activities.

Cultural and Educational Programming

Cultural literacy is one of the great gifts Indiana University offers its students. The school, set amongst the rolling hills of rural southern Indiana, has, shockingly, some of the most well regarded fine and performing arts programs in the world. Students can enjoy world-class opera across the street from their residence hall and lecturers from Nobel Laureates down the block from their favorite bar. Overwhelmingly, students find these experiences to be rewarding both to their personal and academic lives:

“All of the performance aspects of a COAS degree have greatly impacted my academic experience. Poetry readings, theater presentations, art exhibits – these experiential learning opportunities enhanced by understanding of these academic disciplines.”

“Attending lectures by professors in their area of expertise, and cross-departmental lectures sponsored by clubs were very helpful to my academic experience.”

“I love the programs here at IU! We have such an amazing music school and I love all of the student activities choices.”

“There are so many [programs] it’s hard to keep track of them all! But the ones I’ve found and have attended have been excellent.”
**Frequency of attendance to events and exhibits**
(freshman only, during fall semester)

- None: 13%
- 1-2 Times: 24%
- 3-4 Times: 23%
- 5-6 Times: 33%
- 7-8 Times: 6%
- 9 or more times: 1%

**Frequency of attendance to events and exhibits**
(all students)

- None: 11%
- 1-2 Times: 15%
- 3-4 Times: 20%
- 5-6 Times: 39%
- 7-8 Times: 4%
- 9 or more times: 11%

**Satisfaction with Events/Exhibits**
(all students)

- Very satisfied: 69%
- Somewhat satisfied: 28%
- Not too satisfied: 2%
- Not at all satisfied: 1%
The data clearly suggests students are satisfied with the programming they attend on campus. However, the rate at which students attend events seems rather low for a campus that prides itself on its cultural and educational programming opportunities. The Committee believes these programming opportunities to be invaluable to personal development and should be encouraged throughout a student’s matriculation at IU. The excuse raised repeatedly by students for their lack of attendance at events was awareness.
Students generally do not seem fully aware of the programming available and how to go about securing tickets. The Committee recommends:

- A more intuitive online calendar and a comprehensive university events ticketing system to better facilitate student awareness and attendance of events. Note: events calendar is discussed more fully in the Organize IU section of this report.
Studying abroad is universally regarded as one of the most meaningful experiences of students’ college careers:
“Studying abroad was the best experience of my IU career and my life. It was the final step that made me convinced that work/volunteering abroad is what I want to do with my life. I am planning on joining the Peace Corps after graduating from IU. Being in another country on my own shaped me (into the kind of person I have always wanted to be) the most.”

“Study abroad was the most meaningful academic experience [of college], especially in the sense that I was thrown into an entirely different academic/university setting. The experience definitely increased my flexibility and planning/organization skill.”

“I am a graduate student and regret not studying abroad as an undergraduate. I feel that learning a foreign language would have been a great benefit to me in my career. That is why I am thrilled to have the opportunity to travel to Europe during spring break through a graduate class I am taking.”

Studying overseas fulfills a number of the expectations outlined in the Executive Summary including cultural/international literacy and breadth of knowledge. The Committee believes overseas study is an ideal engagement experience that the university should continue to aggressively promote.

While students overwhelmingly praise overseas study, most concur that four areas need to be addressed. First, the Office of Overseas Study is located on the third floor of Franklin Hall in one of the worst physical spaces on campus. Nearly impossible to find, the office seems a forgotten corner rather than a central focus of the university. Specific facilities recommendations are included in the Facilities section of this report. Second, study abroad opportunities are reported as being available inconsistently across schools in a rather unorganized, decentralized manner. While the Committee sees this as largely a perception issue, there is clearly a communication/information issue that needs to be addressed. Similar to many of the information gaps noted in this report, the Office of Overseas Study has an antiquated website that needs to be updated with increased search functionality. Third, funding for overseas study, especially for students on scholarship, seems to be a concern of many students. Students often noted the financial burden of overseas study as a deterrent to studying abroad. Those students on scholarship have additional difficulties, as they are often limited to IU programs due to limited scholarship transferability. This is a serious roadblock to the university’s efforts to send more students to unconventional study abroad locations. Fourth, students often cited procrastination in college course planning as a deterrent to overseas study. Many did not feel the urgency freshman year to plan for a semester or year abroad, and when finally realizing their window for action was closing felt it too late to act. The First-Year Experience section covers the importance of advising students on overseas study early in their college careers. Further information and specific recommendations on overseas study are covered in the Organize IU section.
Off-Campus Students

Survey data suggests students on and off campus feel comparably connected to Indiana University. However, the qualitative data from the survey and from Committee discussions suggests students off campus are not quite as informed as those on campus:

“Off-campus residents need more info given to them.”

“I know that when I was in the residential halls, I was much more informed about events. But since moving off campus I have absolutely no idea what is going on. It would be nice if there was a way to be informed.”

“I live off campus, so it is difficult for me to know what is going on.”

“It is hard to hear about events when I live off campus.”

A number of students commented on the need for an off-campus student center or resource center where off-campus students could meet, collaborate, and interact outside of a classroom setting. When the Indiana Memorial Union is suggested as that place, students often site the lack of adequate (cheap) parking as a key deterrent to coming to the union for off campus students – many on-campus students living in periphery housing site the same deterrent. To combat this, the Committee recommends:

- Parking at the IMU be free for students arriving after 7PM. This facilitates greater use of the Union by students and student groups at night without overcrowding the parking lot during business (class) hours. This and other parking operations are explored further in the Facilities section of the report.

Another issue brought by students living off-campus is the seeming lack of support for student life issues for those living outside of campus housing.

Most obvious is the complete lack of assistance in finding a residence outside of university housing. While the Committee certainly understands this position, assisting off-campus students to ensure the stresses of off-campus life are kept at bay is in the best interest of the university. As such, the Committee recommends:

- The creation of an off-campus resource website to assist students with the general tasks of living off campus. Relevant topics include tenant rights, Student Legal Services
information, relevant city ordinances, trash and recycling policies, utilities information, and area “things to do” information (not a comprehensive list).

Recreational Sports

Health and wellness is an increasingly important issue for students today and is included as an expectation in the Executive Summary. The Student Recreational Sports Center (SRSC) and Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER) facilities as centers for engagement will be addressed in the Facilities section of this report. The areas of interest for this section of the report are the programming areas, specifically intramurals and club sports. During the second focus group lunch session facilitated by the Committee, students were asked for extracurricular experiences that stood out from the rest. More than any other experience, intramurals was named as the “standout” activity.

The intramural sport participation numbers at Indiana University are staggering. According to IU Recreational Sports, every year “22,000 students participate in 5,450 intramural sports contests.” Further, in a 2007 Student Survey conducted by IU Recreational Sports, “approximately 80% of respondents indicated they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of intramural sports.” It is clear to the Committee that these activities are sought and appreciated. That said, the Committee recommends:

- Intramurals and club sports continue to be supported at an institutional level – facilities and fields placed as a priority. These activities are an ideal way for students to interact outside of the classroom, and contribute substantially to the overall satisfaction of student life on campus.

Greek Life

In this report, Greek Life refers to all social and professional Greek organizations. Honorary societies are not included in this analysis.

There are currently over 5,000 students involved in 65 fraternity and sorority organizations at IUB. Using enrollment numbers from the 2008-2009 IU Fact Book, that means over 16% of IUB undergraduate students are members of Greek chapters.

Greek chapters, for the purposes of this report, can be viewed as the ideal Living and Learning Communities (LLCs) – successfully merging the three spheres of the college experience: academic, social and co-curricular. On average, their satisfaction levels, levels of connectedness and levels of engagement are substantially higher than their peers.

---

How Connected Students Feel to Peers at IU
(by student residence)

- On-Campus: 34% Very Connected, 49% Somewhat Connected, 14% Not Too Connected, 3% Not at all Connected
- In a Fraternity/Sorority House: 62% Very Connected, 36% Somewhat Connected, 2% Not Too Connected, 2% Not at all Connected
- Off-Campus: 35% Very Connected, 44% Somewhat Connected, 16% Not Too Connected, 5% Not at all Connected

Perceived value of the Greek community to IU Academic and Intellectual Environment

- Members of Greek Letter Organization: 65% Very Valuable, 24% Somewhat Valuable, 8% Not too Valuable, 2% Not at all Valuable
- Not Members of Greek Letter Organization: 51% Very Valuable, 30% Somewhat Valuable, 12% Not too Valuable, 7% Not at all Valuable

Perceived value of the Greek community to IU Social Environment

- Members of Greek Letter Organization: 84% Very Valuable, 14% Somewhat Valuable, 1% Not too Valuable, 1% Not at all Valuable
- Not Members of Greek Letter Organization: 24% Very Valuable, 32% Somewhat Valuable, 19% Not too Valuable, 25% Not at all Valuable
Perceived value of the Greek community to IU for Philanthropy and Service

- Members of Greek Letter Organization:
  - Very Valuable: 84%
  - Somewhat Valuable: 13%
  - Not too Valuable: 2%
  - Not at all Valuable: 1%

- Non-Members of Greek Letter Organization:
  - Very Valuable: 24%
  - Somewhat Valuable: 39%
  - Not too Valuable: 16%
  - Not at all Valuable: 20%

Perceived value of the Greek community to leadership development at IU

- Members of Greek Letter Organization:
  - Very Valuable: 85%
  - Somewhat Valuable: 13%
  - Not too Valuable: 16%
  - Not at all Valuable: 22%

- Non-Members of Greek Letter Organization:
  - Very Valuable: 36%
  - Somewhat Valuable: 27%
  - Not too Valuable: 22%
  - Not at all Valuable: 1%
As the data shows, Greeks feel much more connected to their peers than non-Greeks. The qualitative data suggests a similar scenario:

“Students living in Greek houses tend to like IU better because they live with a more cohesive group of people than randomly assigned dorms. Also, with IU being so big, being in a Greek house makes it feel smaller which is a good thing and you feel like you belong and are an individual rather than one of 40,000.”

There are presumably a number of reasons Greeks experience these reported levels of satisfaction. One reason has been documented extensively in research completed at Indiana University: students with higher levels of engagement are more likely to be satisfied with their college experience. The anecdotal evidence on LLCs and other interest-group living arrangements suggests a similar scenario:

“Although the Greek community demonstrably helps students adjust to IU as undergraduates, I have heard multiple students complain of having just done it because everyone else was doing it. There should be alternative community living situations, such as co-ops or communities organized within residence halls, to help students adjust and bond with one another.”

Students see these living arrangement models as a way of focusing their experience at such a large university, making it more manageable and personal:

“[Greek life] makes the campus seem a lot smaller yet filled with so many activities and so many people to meet.”

“It is great, it makes the college experience so fun and the campus very small.”
Another benefit of the IU Greek community is its emphasis on experience in a number of the expectations outlined in the Executive Summary. One area of emphasis is civic engagement, specifically community service and philanthropic endeavors, a theme that is increasingly how the Greek community likes to identify and promote itself:

“I think that the Greek community plays a huge part in the involvement of Indiana University into philanthropic life.”

A second area of emphasis for Greeks is in gaining experience in leadership and governance:

“My chapter has provided me with numerous leadership opportunities both in the organization and around campus… My experience at IU would not be nearly as beneficial and meaningful if I had not joined a house.”

“[Greek life] was an amazing experience and provided excellent opportunities for leadership and personal development.”

Clearly the benefits of the Greek community are substantial – benefits that are paralleled by other interest-group living arrangements (LLCs, etc) (See living community recommendation on page 52), and indeed, other co-curricular activities. With this said, problems persist and negative comments are common. Indeed, claims of limited diversity (full-diversity issue exists across the Greek community), alcohol centrality, and academic ambivalence hold some weight considering the principles espoused by these organizations. The perception of the Greek community is not always accurate, but these comments do a reasonable job of identifying the challenges and growing threats that exist for the community:

Exclusivity:

“It’s a very closed-off community.”

“There is a huge rift between Greek life and non-Greek life on campus, and I believe that this is a problem.”

Minimal diversity and integration:

“I would like to see the Greek community to become more diversified… I would like to see Greek members actively recruiting more minorities and people not as affluent as most of the chapters appear to be.”

“I feel there is a definite separation between the white and black Greek organizations… In support of campus diversity and unity I think there needs to be ways that the two entities collaborate more.”

Alcohol centrality:

“Fraternities are a joke. The "good" they do for IU is far outweighed by the harm. They are nothing more than places for guys to get drunk and girls to get taken advantage of. They are protected by a different standard of rules than the rest of IU students. Every single fraternity has alcohol and the school knows it. If the school really cared about the rules it has it would not turn a blind eye like it does.”
Alcohol is addressed in the Safety section of this report, but is included here to make a point. Institutional support for the Greek community is implicit, as many former Greeks currently hold positions of power within the university. However, this support is mostly a hands-off “pat on the back” rather than actual student affairs support based on reality, and in this lies the fundamental issue currently challenging the Greek community. The university and student affairs apparatus need to take an honest look at the Greek community that currently exists at IU. They need to engage the Greek governing bodies in an honest dialogue about the health of the community and what the goals are going forward. The current model, which turns a blind eye to some of the uglier aspects of the Greek community (chiefly alcohol and hazing), is not tenable in the 21st century. The first step is addressing the alcohol environment on campus – covered in the Safety section of this report.
First Year Experience

Generally, students arrive at Indiana University intending to involve themselves fully in what the university has to offer, and thus fulfilling the above theme of engagement. However, when students arrive on campus they are so overwhelmed with classes, developing friendships, deciphering university information, and the general independence of college that they often become “numb” to the engagement opportunities presented to them. The Committee noticed that the students most engaged during their college careers are those who became actively engaged early – often as a result of a mentor presence who could help the student wade through the inundation of information and navigate the general labyrinth of college life during their first year. The question then became: how does Indiana University ensure that all students have a mentor presence during their first year to help navigate? The First-Year Experience section includes recommendations that attempt to answer this question.

Orientation

The obvious place to start acclimating students and facilitating the engagement so important to the “ideal” college experience is during Summer Orientation. However, there are a number of issues with orientation that prevent this. First, students come to orientation with two central motivations: schedule classes and develop friendships. The general student is not looking for outlets for creativity or how to plan for overseas study during this first experience with IU. Two, the shear quantity of information that is attempted to be transmitted to students is mind-numbing – students become numb to what seems unimportant at the time and ultimately retain little of the information presented during orientation. The qualitative data confirms these ideas generated by the Committee:

“Freshman orientation was fun to meet new people and get excited about attending IU. However, I did not get too much out of it academically. Socially, I had a good time but I rarely, if ever, have a hard time socializing. The advising process was awful and I did not really get off to a good start for school. I did alright, but it could have been much better and really did not.”

“Orientation was extremely boring and not all that informative. It could be improved if there is more time spent going over information on majors and academics instead of people telling IU rules and playing lame games.”

IU students need a more robust, applicable orientation to the university that occurs on campus, during the school year – allowing students to apply what they learn in real-time.
First-Year “IU 101”

It has become quite evident to the Committee that current programs for acclimating students to Indiana University are insufficient, resulting in ill-informed students not adequately prepared to take advantage of all the opportunities available at Indiana University. With this in mind, the Committee recommends:

- The university put a taskforce together to discuss the possibility of creating a comprehensive first-year transition program ("IU 101") for all students that occurs throughout students’ first two semesters. The intent of the program is to introduce IU and all that it has to offer in smaller, more easily understood doses, providing a guiding, “mentor” presence for all first-year students.

As the Committee envisions it, the orientation would be a minor-credit earning program taught by faculty/staff members and supported by leading junior and senior-level students covering the following areas:

- Advising and Registration
- Student Services
- Student Life (social)
- Health and Wellness
- Overseas Study
- Co-curricular Activities
- History and Traditions of IU
- Bloomington and Surrounding Areas
- Cultural Opportunities at IU and in Bloomington

Residence Hall Life

The Committee heard repeatedly throughout this process how favorably students felt interest-based living arrangements (Collins Living Learning Center is the primary example of this) had affected their college experience:

“Every university should have a living-learning center, a chance to live with people who care about education and call the other 499 people that they live with family. The faculty and resources here have allowed me to continuously learn, both outside and inside the classroom, and I am forever grateful for the amazing men and women who had the idea to start the concept of a small, residential college where students and faculty can share so many daily experiences with one another.”

“My time at the Collins Living-Learning Center, choosing classes taught at the LLC, creating academic programming, and having the opportunity to work with the faculty and staff involved in Collins has been one of the most motivating and interesting experiences for me at IU. The LLC has given me a new perspective on the academic world and allowed me a sneak peek into the process of forming college curriculum.”
Interest based living arrangements on campus, in particular the Collins Living Learning Center, succeed more than any other residential arrangement at bringing the three spheres of college together. The involvement of faculty and staff encourages the engagement outside of the classroom that is so important to student development. Further, they provide opportunities for mentorship not available in typical residence halls or other living arrangements. The Committee recommends:

- The university explore expanding interest-based living arrangements (LLCs, etc.) on campus.

Roommate compatibility is another issue facing new students that can often be remedied through interest-based living arrangements – students sharing interests are intuitively more likely to get along. However, for those students not in interest based living arrangements, the potluck process often does not work out in their favor. According to the students involved in the VOICE Project, room change requests are more frequent than most would presume – obviously placing undo stress on our already over-capacity residence halls. Ensuring (or at least predicting) compatibility for new students would help to limit room change requests and provide for a more pleasant environment for new students utilizing the potluck system. The Committee recommends:

- The university institute a compatibility survey to place students in residence hall rooms where they are more likely to both get along with their roommate and succeed during the very difficult first year of college. A number of universities use compatibility surveys to assist in the placement of students including the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Richmond, among others. Example of survey is included in Appendix A.

There is certainly merit in the argument that students should not be paired too comfortably in their first year of college, as this is a time for new experiences and growth. The Committee agrees that students should be encouraged to challenge themselves, and this first roommate experience is an ideal time to begin perfecting the art of “getting along.” However, the first roommate experience should not be detrimental to the students’ academic or social acclimation to IU, and as such, any survey implemented should be more focused on habits and routine, rather than attempting to set up a perfect “pair.” The survey examples included reflect this belief.

The neighborhood selection process that currently exists at Indiana University for incoming freshman presents a number of issues – these will be discussed at length in the Safety section of this report.

**Resident Assistants**

Resident Assistants (RAs) are in an ideal place to aid new students during their turbulent first year of college. The university does attempt to place them in an advisory, “mentor” role, but from the evidence gathered during the VOICE Project, it seems students do not see their RAs as mentors but rather as police. This policing role prevents or discourages many strong RA candidates:
“I was a Resident Assistant last year. I loved my job, and took it very seriously. But the requirements were so difficult, especially rounds for the weekend days that my academic grades declined drastically. Although I completely enjoyed the experience, I can never do it again because of the late hour rounds on weekends (last set of rounds are at 2am).”

Further, once RAs are placed in a “policing” role, the possibility of them mentoring and advising students is all but eliminated. Certainly there are stories of strong advisory relationships that exist on campus between RAs and students, but the quantitative and qualitative data suggests that for the general student population, RAs are seen as simply a nuisance to be dealt with. That said, the Committee recommends:

- The university limit the policing role of RAs and work to place them in a more appropriate advising/mentoring role for their student populations. Attention also needs to be paid to the orientation and training given to RAs. RAs should be the most appropriate and capable mentors for students, but the data suggests they are rarely serving this role.

### University Division Advising

Students overwhelmingly state that University Division advising, from orientation through school selection is devastatingly inadequate:

“I entered Indiana University with an academic adviser within the University Division. I'm upset to say that this adviser didn't help me in the slightest. She claimed that she wasn't knowledgeable on the areas that I was interested in such as Music, Theater, and Art. In fact, I found that I was forced to advise myself for the entire first semester and part of the second. I eventually realized on my own that perhaps the other undergraduate advisers would be helpful in guiding my selection of classes and possibly a major. Clearly, she was ill equipped to help many students, including myself, within the University Division. The UD advisers have the toughest job and must be WELL equipped and ready to guide students such as myself to pick useful classes and to choose a major. It caused me a lot of stress and made my first semester almost impossible to get through, having felt very alone and unaided at Indiana University.”

“The undergraduate advisors we get as freshmen are horrible. I could have graduated early had I not listened to them. It is a poor showing for the university and shows a disinterest in student progress. It seemed like you were after my money and not what was best for me.”

“I also feel some of the University Division counselors are under-informed and under-motivated to help. My assigned counselor was not helpful so I went to a different one to help me plan my first semester of my sophomore year and my career path.”

“The advisors I met for freshman orientation and had freshman year were awful and did not do any advising. They helped me make a schedule, but it was not a good one for me. In no way were they helpful in helping me to identify ways to optimize my schedule, get ahead, and get access into many of the great things IU has to offer.”
It is quite evident from the comments above and the discussions had throughout the VOICE Project that students feel underserved by University Division advising. This is one of the first experiences students have in student services at Indiana University, it is a shame it is perceived so negatively. The Committee recommends:

- A complete review of freshman academic advising. Improvements in this will be complimented by the creation of the first-year transition program that will cover major selection, overseas study planning, and other advising coverage areas identified as being weak.

**Graduate “IU 101”**

Similar to undergraduates, graduate students generally feel underserved by university and departmental orientation programming. The ideal orientation experience is a bit different than undergraduate orientation, as the graduate experience is distinct from that of undergraduates. Students new to Indiana need an orientation that includes greater logistical information on living in Bloomington and the surrounding area:

“The orientation provided me with the details about getting paid, the handbook of requirements, but not with just fitting in to Bloomington, finding resources I would need, using the bus system, etc.”

“I didn't know where to go in Bloomington where grad students would be the majority or what kinds of fun things there were to do that aren't necessarily associated with the University.”

Additionally, many students indicated the need for more thorough information on required courses, integration of academic and social life, and the role and responsibilities of graduate students:

“Initially I was told my degree would take three years. Luckily, I spoke to another student about the degree requirements because I would have spent a year and a half taking unnecessary classes.”

“It was a great opportunity to talk to 2nd year students and discover the career paths for each academic concentration.”

“It would have been nice to meet current students in the program.”

“My department orientation did not offer information on outside departmental resources and fellowship opportunities and it was difficult not having this information.”

“Further orientation of library, research skills such as endnote, etc, which doctorate students have, may be very useful. Optional orientation for such research skills in the beginning of the year may come in handy. Health center, writing tutorial, or other cultural, scientific, or artistic facilities could be introduced (other than HPER and SRSC) during the orientation.”
The Committee recommends:

- The university provide a more robust, unifying graduate orientation that compliments the efforts of individual schools.

Recommended program coverage:

- Graduate Resources
- Student Services
- Education Orientation and Training (AIs, TAs etc)

“Orientation for teaching was satisfactory for new teachers; orientation for area of study NIL.”

“I wish more time had been spent preparing me for what the semester would entail other than teaching.”

“My department’s orientation provided adequate introduction to the student-role that grad students are expected to fill (in seminars, guest lecturers, &c). However, it completely ignored the teacher-role. The department provided no educational training.”

- Graduate Funding Resources and Strategies
- Graduate Life (social)
- Health and Wellness
- Living in Bloomington
- Co-curricular Activities
- History of IU Bloomington and Surrounding Area
- Cultural Opportunities at IU and in Bloomington
Advising

Due to the size and complexity of IU and all that it has to offer, students need resources available to help them navigate the entirety of their college experience – not solely the academic sphere. Providing a supportive first year experience is half the battle; ensuring continued support during the remainder of their college career is ideal. Advisors are uniquely placed to provide this support, as they are knowledgeable of both students’ interests and the resources and opportunities available at IU. The Advising section includes recommendations on the current advising structure and recommendations for advising that does not yet exist.

Academic Advising

Unlike the negative perception students generally have of freshman academic advising (UDiv), both the quantitative and qualitative post-first year advising satisfaction data is mixed:

“Before arriving at IU, I met with Debbie Hrismalos, the nursing academic advisor. Due to her help at this time, I chose to attend IU for nursing. Now that I’m in the nursing school, she has continued to help me decide classes and even search for summer jobs.”

“Academic advising is horrific. I was told conflicting information on more than one occasion. There is absolutely no personal relationship attempt by anyone in the advising community. The advising at IU has hindered my academic potential, specifically when it comes to study abroad opportunities, schedule management, and course selection.”

“Since being at IU (2 years), I have had 3 different advisors with 3 different opinions about my future. It has made things more difficult and complicated for me. The lack of structure really did not help me academically.”

As mentioned in the Organize IU section of this report, advising across disciplines was repeatedly sited as being weak:

“My academic advisor that was assigned to me when I first arrived here was not helpful. I had to get an advisor at the education building to help me and then a Spanish advisor for further help. I feel they help with my questions concerning classes for my major but I can’t talk to them ‘person to person’ about what I would like to do and see if we can find a major for that.”

Advisors, if endowed with accurate, robust information, have the potential to provide the resources available in an ideal college environment. Inaccurate or insufficient information at the front-end (first-year) can be detrimental to a student’s development:
“My freshman year academic advisor (University Division) was absolutely terrible and put my academic career in jeopardy. She gave horrible irrelevant advice and would never return emails or take down my desired major.”

This point has been covered extensively in the First-Year Experience section and need not be belabored. An area that also has been covered but not framed in this manner is that of faculty involvement.

Approximately fifty-five percent of undergraduates meet outside the classroom with faculty or administrators two or less times in a typical semester. Faculty members are presumably the most capable advisors on campus. If students are meeting with faculty only a couple times a semester, across all their courses and co-curricular activities, students cannot be getting the full benefit of faculty advising. The Committee believes faculty involvement in advising, both formal and
informal, to be paramount to achieving the “ideal college environment” and urges greater emphasis be placed on faculty involvement in advising. Comments the Committee received were mixed on current faculty efforts to engage students in this manner:

“Some professors are so inclusive and welcoming to students (such as my advisor is very inclusive), then there are some that are stand-offish. I don’t know if this is a matter of tenured faculty not “needing” new advisees to advance their rank, or whether it’s a question of the ‘old guard’ versus the new generation. I wish all professors would help their students more since that’s a pivotal part of the academic experience for both undergrads and grads. IU’s professors should always be inclusive.”

“I have found some professors love students who come in outside of class and want to build a relationship, and others especially in the business school can be very cold and have ulterior motives for teaching which they demonstrate clearly through the sale of their books for the course.”

**Study Abroad Advising**

Students overwhelming find overseas study to be a beneficial, enjoyable experience, and the Committee sees some overseas exposure to be essential to the ideal college experience. This point cannot be stressed enough. Students consistently commented that overseas study was the most memorable, formative experience during their time at IU.
Conversely, students often responded quite negatively to questions regarding the resources and advising available for overseas study. It is believed that much of this discontent stems from the physical and virtual presence of the Office of Overseas Study, which is covered in the Organize IU section of this report.

With respect to advising, there seems to be a great deal of information asymmetry between academic advisors and advisors in the Office of Overseas Study. Academic advisors are, according to comments gathered through the VOICE subcommittees, ill equipped to fully advise on overseas study matters. Many students commented on the frustration of realizing their sophomore year they may not be able to study abroad because of the misinformation or lack-of information they received during advising sessions their freshman year. The Committee recommends:

- The university ensure first-year students are exposed to overseas study advisors to eliminate information gaps regarding studying abroad. These information gaps were often cited as reasons for not studying abroad (student would learn of requirements or scheduling issues too late in their matriculation).

**Career Advising**

The Committee identified “Knowledge of Next Step” as a characteristic of the ideal IU graduate. Essentially, students must understand where they are going and how to go about getting there. This knowledge comes from a number of areas – notably, advising – but, in the case of students seeking employment, this knowledge comes from a career services office.

Students consistently commented during the VOICE Project on the tremendous resources available through the Undergraduate Career Services Office of the Kelley School of Business:

“Many of the most valuable experiences are those made available by the career services office to meet with and learn from practitioners and/or alumni to gain the kind of insights or perspectives not possible from textbooks or classrooms alone.”

Alternatively, students of the College of Arts and Sciences often voiced their frustration over the seeming inequity of the resources available to students of The College relative to those of the Kelley School:

“I was disappointed to learn how little the College of Arts and Sciences was able to aide in my job search during my senior year. The students at the business school are given help though their college to get interviews and jobs lined up, yet in the college of arts and sciences they will provide a list of where the students from previous years went to work. Otherwise, we are on our own. I think that an official position that aids in students who are graduating, find jobs and get businesses to come to Indiana would be greatly appreciated by the students and their families.”

The Committee believes that all students should be given the opportunities students of the Kelley School are given in their search for post-graduate employment. It was repeatedly stated that this is currently not the case. The Committee recommends:
The university evaluate current efforts in career services and work to ensure all students are given the resources and endowed with the skills necessary to secure post-graduate employment if so desired – no matter the student’s school or major. Inequities between schools were often noted.
The tradition of Indiana University is one of an active student voice in the governance of the institution. More than providing a unique perspective on issues affecting the campus, active student involvement creates students fully “invested” in the future of the institution. There has been noticeable erosion of this tradition as of late: exclusion of students on Presidential Search and Screen, initial exclusion of students on Athletic Director Search and Screen, and exclusion of students as campus governance moves more towards ad hoc committees and task forces. The VOICE Project is an ideal illustration of this tradition, but what is to become of the student voice once its time has passed? The Student Input section presents thoughts and recommendations on the continuation of the very-IU tradition of an active student voice in the governance of the institution.

Erosion of Student Voice

In the spring of 2004, the IU Athletics Department petitioned to the student–chaired Committee for Fee Review (“CFR”) for the inclusion of a $15 per semester “athletics fee.” The committee did not approve the fee citing the addition of “new methods of generating revenue” as a source of funding to adequately cover needs. Although the fee structure as approved by the CFR was passed by both the Dean of Students and Chancellor of the Bloomington campus, a $15 per semester “athletics fee” was added at the presidential level before being submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval. This was an unprecedented move that proved contentious for two years before the fee was finally removed.

In the fall of 2006, a Presidential Search Committee was established to identify potential candidates to replace outgoing president Dr. Adam Herbert. The search committee was as follows:

- Sue H. Talbot – IU trustee
- Bruce Bergland – Chancellor, IU Northwest
- Clarence W. Boone, Sr. – IU Trustee
- Marion E. Broome – Distinguished Professor, University Dean, School of Nursing, Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis
- David E. Clemmer – Robert and Marjorie Chair, Department of Chemistry, College of Arts and Sciences, IU Bloomington
- Daniel F. Evans, Jr. – President and Chief Executive Officer of Clarian Health Partners
- Jerrol Z. Miles – IU Southeast Board of Advisors member
- Theodore K. Miller – Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs
- Thomas E. Reilly, Jr. – IU Trustee

• Lauren Robel – Val Nolan Professor of Law, Dean, School of Law-Bloomington
• The Honorable V. Sue Shields – Magistrate Judge, United States District Court, Southern District of Indiana University
• Desmond C. Wong – President & CEO, Sino Strategies Group, LLC, Chicago
• Michael Renfrow – Student Body President, IU South Bend

Notice that out of fourteen committee members, only one was a student—a graduate student at IU South Bend. The campus that is considered “the flagship residential, doctoral-extensive campus of Indiana University” according to the mission statement of Indiana University Bloomington as approved by the IU Board of Trustees, did not have a single student, undergraduate or graduate, on the search committee.

These are but two examples of major university decisions that were made either without or in direct contradiction to student input. A great deal of publicity was made of these two instances, with Indiana Daily Student coverage universally negative, and four consecutive Indiana University Student Association presidents denouncing the actions taken by the university. Although anecdotal, there is a great deal of evidence suggesting that these incidents are not isolated; rather simply the latest examples of the gradual erosion of student input in university-wide and campus-wide decision-making.

According to the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, Indiana University students have the right to “contribute to the making of institutional policy generally affecting their social or academic affairs.” While this should be enough to ensure the inclusion of the student “voice,” there are other points that support the necessary inclusion of students:

• Students are the major, paying customers of the university.
• Students view issues with a drastically different perspective than faculty, staff or administrators.
• It is in the students’ best interest to ensure Indiana University is as highly ranked as possible, as the value of their diploma today and into the future depends on it.
• Governance is a competency all students should experience/acquire during their matriculation (Included as an expectation outlined in the Executive Summary).
• Students are the eyes and ears of the campus—from the dormitories to Kirkwood, and can offer insights that could not be obtained without considerable expense on the part of the university.

There are five major areas that the VOICE Project found most relevant in regards to student input:

• Student Government
• Committee for Fee Review
• University Committees
• Student Advisory Boards

---

18 “Presidential Search and Screen,” <http://www.indiana.edu/~nextpres/committee.shtml>
19 Mission Statement, Office of the Provost.
20 “Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct,” Indiana University,
  <http://dsa.indiana.edu/Code/index1.html>
**Student Government**

The Indiana University Student Association (“IUSA”) and the Graduate and Professional Student Organization (“GPSO”) are the two recognized student government bodies of Indiana University Bloomington. Some fragility exists in this two-body system as the GPSO, while recognized by then-outgoing President Myles Brand, has never been ratified in a campus-wide referendum as per the Constitution of the Indiana University Student Association. This rather untenable situation needs to be sorted out by the two governmental bodies if efficiencies in student representation are ever to be achieved. Further, greater cooperation between the two bodies, an obvious byproduct of more explicit representation roles, is needed, as it would provide for more effective representation.

At the moment, the university is perceived to be quite supportive of both student government bodies, though not always supportive of their various issues and initiatives – not surprising or irregular. So, while the above paragraph has recommendations for the governmental bodies, the Committee has not generated any specific recommendations for the university with respect to the student government bodies other than their necessary inclusion in university decision making (recommendation included below).

**Committee for Fee Review**

The Committee for Fee Review (“CFR”) is the student fee-recommendation body co-chaired by the presidents of IUSA and GPSO. Thirteen campus organizations petition the committee, including:

- IU Health Center
- University Information Technology Services
- IU Campus Busses
- IU Auditorium (Auditorium Cultural Subsidy)
- Day Care Support
- Graduate and Professional Student Organization (GPSO)
- Indiana University Student Association (IUSA)
  - Main Account, Student Organization Funding, Readership Program
- IU Student Television (IUSTV)
- IU Outdoor Adventures
- Division of Recreational Sports
- Student Legal Services
- Union Board
- IU Student Radio (WIUX)

---

21 “Indiana University Student Association Constitution,” Indiana University Student Association, <http://www.indiana.edu/~iusa>
The fundamental idea behind the CFR is students taxing themselves for services they desire. When students desire additional services, fees are attached after the full vetting of the committee, and a final fee structure is recommended to the Dean of Students. Once approved, the fees move to the Provost and Executive Vice President and finally to the President of Indiana University. At the biannual budget meeting of the IU Trustees, the President presents the fee structure for approval.

For long a truly independent body, the CFR enjoyed little to no restrictions on the setting of fees. Fees typically paralleled the general increases in tuition save irregular increases, like the Assembly Hall and the Student Recreational Sports Center student fees.\(^{23}\) This freedom to tax as students see fit, is a freedom the CFR no longer enjoys.

As of recent, student fees are combined with tuition when presented to the Indiana General Assembly for appropriation purposes. Currently, there is a 4\% cap on tuition and fees—a cap that, because tuition and fees are combined, pits student fees against general tuition revenue—student services against initiatives the administration and faculty feel most important (i.e. faculty recruitment and retention).\(^ {24}\) It does not take much understanding of the politics of higher education to suspect students’ fee recommendations will not pass muster if attempting to increase total fee structure beyond 4\% when the fees are competing with tuition.

Due to the limitations on fee increases noted above, there are a number of student services that are dramatically under-serving the student body:

- **IU Health Center** – cannot extend hours due to funding limitations
  - “It is inconvenient that the IU Health Center only has hours from 8am-4pm”
  - “The Health Center needs to have longer hours - there are students who get hurt on Friday afternoon and don't go in until Monday, which is unsafe. Their hotline is not even 24 hours, so there is not really full care for students on campus except for the emergency room. They close at 4:30 p.m. now, and I really think that they should be available to students outside of class time.”

- **Student Recreational Sports Centers**
  - “Students have been concerned that RS facilities were inadequate and insufficient to support student interests. For example, there is strong consensus that strength & conditioning space is too limited overall and in bad shape at HPER; the outdoor field space is limited and in poor condition and the complex at North Fee Lane”

- **Transportation**
  - Students commented repeatedly on the frustration of being passed by full busses on a variety of routes. Further, fuel spikes over the past year have forced service cutbacks.

There is a need for increasing student fees beyond what has been allowed the in last couple iterations of the CFR process. Unless the university is willing to decouple student fees and tuition, the CFR will be unable to provide the funding necessary to adequately support these student services. The Committee recommends:

\(^{23}\) Minutes of the board of Trustees of Indiana University, 09 December 1989.

\(^{24}\) Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Indiana University, 06 May 2005.
The university provide greater flexibility in the setting of student fees through decoupling the increases of tuition and fees. Further, the university explore alternative funding sources for CFR-supported organizations that require one-time, “non-operating” expenditures (Recreational Sports facility improvements).

University Committees

Combined, IUSA and GPSO appoint hundreds of students annually to university committees, including the Bloomington Faculty Council, University Faculty Council, Capital Priorities Committee and others. The yearly turnover of these positions presents a number of challenges for student representation: steep, annual learning curves, finding students willing to serve, and ensuring those students fulfill their duty. To fill the appointments, the university simply asks the IUSA President and GPSO Moderator for names of individuals who have expressed interest. At this point the process of bringing the appointed student up to speed and ensuring attendance is largely in the hands of the respective committee’s chairperson. Often, students reach this point, the orientation never occurs (nothing is formalized), and the student disengages and disassociates with said committee. As this section has demonstrated, it is in the university’s and students’ best interest to have students actively involved/engaged on university committees. Due to the situation just mentioned, this does not happen consistently, across all university committees due to the difficulties inherent in student appointments. While certainly a great deal of the onus should be placed on the students (Student Government), the university also needs to ensure that Student Government has the resources and knowledge to adequately orient and monitor these appointments. That said, the Committee recommends:

- Student Affairs work with IUSA and GPSO to develop an orientation process for all student appointments to university committees to ensure greater engagement and integration with these highly developed committees. Yearly student turnover without an adequate orientation process is detrimental to ensuring the student voice is heard on standing and ad-hoc university committees.

Further, the university is moving towards a more ad hoc committee structure, consisting of one time task forces, charged with tackling issues once covered by standing committees. The Committee recommends:

- The university ensure that there is adequate student representation on all ad hoc university committees.

Student Advisory Boards

Throughout the VOICE Project, when attempting to gather “big picture,” “blue-sky” ideas from students, the Committee often heard simple, understandable suggestions targeting the day-to-day lives of students – areas that are often overlooked by university officials. Suggestions such as where to place trash cans and where to provide more adequate lighting at night. For a while, the Steering Committee found these ideas and suggestions distractions from the charge of the
VOICE Project. The group felt the project was being sidetracked by the minutiae, it was feared that no grand ideas would come from continually falling into the trap of “which shower needs a new showerhead.” Quickly it was realized that the repetition of such concerns is a clear indication of the disconnect between customer and supplier, where the students have ideas/concerns but no way to voice them. In truth, if every student on the Bloomington campus had a means of voicing concerns and was aware of it, this project would have a much more limited scope – would probably be unnecessary. From what was heard in discussions throughout this process, this is clearly not the case. That said, the Committee recommends:

- Every school, department, and organization (service area) on campus have a functioning student advisory board to ensure that student concerns are heard on the foundational level, well below the level of the administration.
Successfully merging the three spheres of the student experience necessitates an environment conducive to active interaction, collaboration, and communication across all university groups. After all, the relevance and benefits of a residential campus today is predicated on active interaction between all parties. While technology certainly can facilitate broader and timelier communication, it also presents a number of issues for residential campuses intent on providing active interaction on campus. Indeed, considering the nature and content of the Internet today, students rarely need to leave the 18x18 box in front of them: their keyboard and computer screen. One need only look at the evolution of the dorm room lounge to understand the insularity produced through the modern realities of technology; once rooms holding the lone floor television where students would come to watch prime-time television and interact (thereby building community), they are now either empty or dorm rooms themselves. The Technology section includes student satisfaction data on the current use of technology and recommendations on optimizing this essential aspect of the modern college experience.

**Enterprise Management Software**

Students were asked a variety of questions regarding their use and satisfaction with different facets of the enterprise management software at IU.

**Oncourse**

Students were asked questions regarding the number of courses taken during the Fall 2007 semester and the number of courses that incorporated Oncourse. Of the courses represented by the sample, almost 8% did not use Oncourse at all, with nearly 40% of students stating that all of their courses utilized Oncourse.
Although many students found Oncourse to be useful to help organize and keep up with course requirements, some cited navigation and site confusion as problem areas that needed to be resolved:

“The new Oncourse is difficult to navigate”

“The Oncourse setup is made in a way that makes it difficult to access things easily.”

“I think OneStart should be a little easier to work with. There are an abundance of links that aren't organized all that well.”

**OneStart**

As with Oncourse, students found OneStart to be useful, but too complex. Respondents included both students and staff who found the technology to be difficult to use and navigate on both ends.
About half of students surveyed never or rarely used Onestart for any reason beyond Bursar access or registration.

“Onestart is too much. Things aren't in logical places and it rarely is clear on what something means. It's even more confusing being both a student and a staff member.”

“One start is very confusing when searching for information/subjects. It's difficult to navigate through.”
“Onestart is hard to find what you are looking for”

“Onestart is a convoluted mess. Even if I was aware of a feature I wanted to use on it - it is almost impossible to find. One start needs to be stripped down of its features to provide something more basic and thus more useful.”

“OneStart is incredibly confusing and very very poorly organized. It's impossible to find what you're looking for while using it, and it's so frustrating I strive to avoid it completely.”

“The Office of Financial Aid and the Bursar REALLY need to find ways to integrate the information that they give to students on their respective websites and Onestart. The Bursar needs to come up with a much more easily understood billing format…A series of "clickable" prompts that give definitions might help for all technical terms.’

The Committee recommends:

➢ Combine the IU management software and with the webmail system with one another in order to simplify accessing student information.

“I think it would be really nice if OneStart, Oncourse, and Webmail were all combined into one application so that you wouldn't have to access them all separately.”

“All of Indiana University's computer programs, such as their webpage designs and the programs they use such as Onestart and Oncourse…should be replaced with ONE easier to use all in one program…There are many programs out there that would require one person to log in under one name and access the information they need in an all in one page.”

“OneStart and Oncourse should be combined into one interface.”

Technological Engagement by Faculty

Students were asked about the use of technology by faculty in their courses. Survey questions surrounded satisfaction with the amount of technology used and specific usage of Oncourse.

Overall, 90% of students surveyed are satisfied with the amount of technology used in their courses, with 40% being very satisfied.
A variety of themes also emerged from open-ended questions and focus groups.

**Technology Usage**

Students found technology to be underused by faculty in the classroom, and current technological approaches used by some to be outdated:

“It's somewhat disheartening when professors can't use the technology available to them. After all, how hard is it to put an extra copy of a syllabus online? Then again, if you lose the syllabus, you probably don't deserve another one.”

“Many professors are still insisting on using bulb light overheads instead of using computer related items. Also desks are inadequate for laptop use. Sometimes the wireless network would not connect to the laptops.”

“Some professors don't use technology at all. I think they need to get up on the times and get into gear. Technology is a great tool, yet some still are all over the place with their lecturing which is really hard to follow. This semester out of all my classes, I don't use technology and this is the course I am doing the worst in. Also, professors need to adapt to students using technology in classrooms. Every class I have has a strict rule against cell phones and laptop computers. I'm not advocating texting while in class but at the same time this generation was brought up to multi-task. They are only doing what they know. And personally, my cell phone allows me to take my class notes on it in Word. This is the new age, get with the times.”

“Teachers often have trouble keeping up with the changing technology; Time is wasted in class trying to play videos, etc...”
**Technology Training**

Faculty’s readiness and preparedness to use technology in the classroom was a concern to several students:

“A lot of teachers would probably benefit from some kind of training or tutorial in how to use the technology in the classrooms, especially if they plan on using it regularly.”

“I often times feel that my instructors are inadequately prepared to use technology during class. Perhaps instructors would benefit from a conference or class of some sort to help them learn how to better incorporate technology.”

**Oncourse Usage**

Students felt that Oncourse was not being used adequately or consistently. There were also many requests for faculty to employ the specific features of Oncourse, such as the gradebook and syllabus, which are underutilized.

![Extent to which different features of Oncourse are used](chart)

“Very few teachers use all tools on Oncourse.”

“I feel that many of the faculty do not utilize the very expensive software/hardware for which we are paying. I feel it should be mandatory that all teachers use Oncourse for grades, assignments, and announcements. It is confusing when they do not use it or if they use their own website.”
“Each department has their own websites running for the class stuff instead of Oncourse, which makes Oncourse useless (It's probably had to do with people avoiding new materials).”

“No consistency amongst teachers in terms of using Oncourse.”

“The technology is very easy to understand and figure out, but many teachers do not use the same websites, like Oncourse, which easily gets confusing, because you end up having to check 3 or 4 websites for homework assignments.”

“I wish all the professors used Oncourse in a similar way. They are inconsistent with the things they post, and it gets too confusing. I really hate Oncourse sometimes.”

“I wish that all teachers would use Oncourse. It's especially helpful for referencing the syllabus, making readings available, and having discussions with other students over assignments.”

“I wish that professors were required to use Oncourse because it puts all of my work, grades, and schedules into one location that is very easy to keep track of. I absolutely HATE it when professors won't use Oncourse.”

“Professors REALLY REALLY should be required to keep up with online grades. I have found that many students, including myself, find it hard to navigate through classes without knowing where they stand. Knowing my grades throughout the semester is really important to me and to many others I've talked to and would definitely help students keep on top of things.”

**Campus Wide Resources**

Students were asked about availability and efficiency of campus wide technology resources, such as computers, printers, and wireless Internet.
In addition, students were asked for their opinions on the allocation of finite resources towards campus wide technology resources. Slightly more than 60 and 50 percent of students, respectively, ranked computers and wireless Internet as a first or second priority in allocation of finite resources.

### How well technology meets students' needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Very Adequately</th>
<th>Somewhat Adequately</th>
<th>Somewhat Poorly</th>
<th>Very Poorly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wireless internet access</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Technology</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rank of Allocation of Finite Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Internet Access</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Technology</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Computers

Of the student who responded to the open ended prompts in the survey, 13.9% highlight computers and computer labs a major source of their technological dissatisfaction at the Bloomington campus. Approximately 89% of student respondents felt computers on campus met their needs to a certain extent.

Accessibility of computers and labs was seen positively, however, the availability of computers was a major source of dissatisfaction for students. Some students also mentioned difficulty in locating computer labs as a problem source as well:

“It is nice to have a computer available pretty much anywhere you go on campus.”
“It is very necessary because not everyone can afford a computer/laptop and so I find it very convenient to have them around.”

“I wish there were more computer labs on campus because it often seems as though all the labs on campus are full at peak hours. It would be wonderful to see additional labs, printers and wireless Internet because these would help to improve productivity and access. Perhaps we could install more computer and print stations as a means to remedy the problem.”

“The amount of computers and printers available is definitely adequate, but it is often extremely hard to find the computer labs in various buildings. Often I do not know where the computer lab is unless I happen to pass it one day. It would be great if there could be a sign somewhere that indicates where computer labs are so that they are easy to find. Signs by entrances, or even an asterisk next to a classroom on the maps that indicate fire routes would be helpful.”

**Wireless Internet Access**

Overall, wireless Internet access meets the current needs of students; with over 70% of respondents stating that current availability at least somewhat adequately meets their needs. Approximately half of student respondents agree that wireless Internet access on campus should be the first or second priority of finite resources.

However, in the qualitative dataset, availability and reliability of wireless Internet access were common points of dissatisfaction among student respondents:

“I am very happy with the technology around here, except for the wireless access in Willkie. It's very tough to keep a signal.”

“I believe wireless in dorm rooms would be a very positive characteristics to add to dorm/school marketing.”

“The wireless in the Wells Library is terrible. Also, wireless is poor in several big lecture classrooms such as BU219, BU223, BH013, etc.”

“…My only wish is that wireless Internet would work everywhere...Some places it refuses to work on laptops.”

“Wireless internet should be available beyond floor lounges.”

**Printers**

A great majority of students (82%) felt that printers currently at least “somewhat adequately” met their needs, with 37% of respondents prioritizing printers as a top one or two allocation of finite resources.
Availability, reliability, and printer quota were main complaints among student respondents. As with computer availability, Ballantine, the Indiana University Memorial Union, and the residence halls were all mentioned as locations which need more attention and capacity:

“The computer labs all over campus seem full to bursting, especially at the Main Library, Woodburn, Ballantine, and the Union.”

“…there need to be more printers and more computers to print things with. Every day in Ballantine and in Woodburn (two high traffic buildings) there is a line 10-20 people long, and when I need to print up something for class, it's quite frustrating, especially when I look at people's computer screens and they are surfing on Facebook.”

“Need to have more express printing stations across campus, especially in the hallways, not just in the labs.”

“Printing stations opposed to computer labs.”

“Make more printers available in dorms and academic buildings.”

“Adjusting the print quota measurement to counting the number of pieces of paper used in lieu of typed pages would greatly affect the printing capabilities and costs for all IU students choosing the double-sided printing option.”

A high number of students recognize Ballantine Hall, the IMU and the Library as locations that could use more computers or an additional computer lab. Additional suggestions included creating and expanding computer labs in all of the residence halls, implementing more express printing stations as opposed to computer labs, and providing the ability to print remotely to any computer-controlled printing station on campus.
As mentioned above, merging the three spheres of the student experience necessitates an environment conducive to active interaction and collaboration across all university groups. Indiana University is perfectly set, with its compact, beautiful campus, to provide students with ideal physical locations for developing this form of engagement. Currently, Indiana University does not have adequate spaces on campus for facilitating broad, informal interaction between all constituencies. The Facilities section includes thoughts and recommendations on current and future physical spaces at Indiana University.

The one theme repeated more than any other during discussions with students and student groups was that Indiana University is an absolutely beautiful campus. This was cited as a contributing factor in coming to IU throughout the focus group lunches. The campus is alive today with construction and renovations, all of which is done with a full commitment to enhancing the aesthetic appeal of the campus. It should not be forgotten however, that facilities on a residential campus need not simply fill a need for more lab or classroom space, but should facilitate the joining of the three spheres of the college experience: academics, co-curricular and social. Physical spaces must allow for full student engagement with peers, faculty, and staff and provide for public engagement as well.

“Centers” of Campus

During the process of collecting information for this report, a discussion was had on the location of the modern “center” of campus. The traditional geographic center of campus was the Indiana Memorial Union, but with the substantial growth north and east this is no longer true. Today, the geographic center, with a rather crude traffic estimate thrown in, rests somewhere between Ballantine and Woodburn Halls. Through this center crosses what seems to be a veritable “highway of students” spanning from Ballantine Hall on the south end to 10th Street and Fee Lane on the north end. The discussion, however, was not on the geographic center, although this is an important point to remember, but rather on the center for engagement – where meetings take place and debates are had. The Indiana Memorial Union was at one time the easy choice for this “center” (along with the geographic center) of campus and therefore an ideal focal point for a discussion on student/faculty/staff engagement, or more broadly, a discussion on “community.” Today however, this can no longer be considered the “center,” but rather one of many “centers,” all contributing to the sense of community that exists at IU. The centers identified during this discussion were:

- Wells Library – Explosive growth in use since the introduction of the Information Commons.
• Indiana Memorial Union – Still a traditional center, especially for students actively involved in co-curricular activities.
• Schools (buildings) – In particular, Business, Music, and Education.
• HPER/SRSC – Evolving spaces with heavy engagement component.

The question now is how does Indiana University utilize these spaces on campus (four above bullets, traffic “highway”, areas between Ballantine and Woodburn Halls) to facilitate student/faculty/staff interaction and building of community?

For the purposes of this report, facilitating interaction and building community will be a function of informal meeting places – locations outside of the classroom where students, faculty, and staff can meet. Currently, these sorts of locations on campus are surprisingly limited. The IMU has a number of locations suitable for informal meetings. Faculty and staff offices can be suitable, but many students seem to consider these “too formal” for casual discourse. The Committee believes that the university needs more informal locations on campus for students to interact with other students, faculty, and staff. The criterion for these locations is simple: comfortable and pleasant, available throughout the day, reasonable proximity to “centers,” and some availability of food and drinks. A description and analysis of current locations and proposed locations forms much of the remainder of this section.

Food on Campus

Currently food is available (outside of vending machines) on campus at:

• Residence Halls
• Indiana Memorial Union
• Wells Library
• Kiosks: SPEA, Music, Education Building, Jordan Hall

While the number of locations for food is not alarmingly inadequate, the availability of the food at these locations (primarily residence halls) contributes to pushing students off campus during the school day – negatively contributing to engagement on campus. Residence hall dining facilities can take a considerable amount of time to get to during the day, and once students have gotten to their residence hall dining facility, the chance of them returning to campus for anything other than a class is understandably low. The locations that offer full-meal service in the academic core of campus (Wells Library and the IMU) do not accept residence hall Meal Points; further ensuring those living in residence halls leave campus when not in the classroom. The kiosks located in SPEA, Music, the Education Building and Jordan Hall do accept residence hall Meal Points, but have very limited offerings and are not open throughout the day. All of this contributes to moving students off-campus during the day, detracting from the engagement element of the ideal college environment.

Recommendations for Specific Food Locations
Below are descriptions of the issues facing the individual food locations on campus, and recommendations on ensuring the locations are serving the dual role of providing food and serving as places for engagement and interaction.

**Residence Hall Foodservice**

From the discussions the Committee had throughout the VOICE project, it seems residence hall foodservice is adequate to serve the needs of these locations. Certainly there were students with some discontent, but in terms of availability and location, students seemed pleased. However, there is frustration that students on meal plans (which all students in residence halls must have) are essentially forced to eat all meals in the residence hall dining facilities because of limited options on campus and no acceptance of meal points in the IMU and Wells Library. The movement back in forth from the academic core of campus so students can eat lunch (breakfast and dinner do not seem to fit this argument) is inefficient, taking time better spent in academic or co-curricular pursuits.

One other criticism voiced by students of residence hall dining options is the lack of reasonably priced healthy food options:

- “RPS food is too expensive. I eat pizza because it is far cheaper that the healthy food offerings.”
- “Sustainable, organic and healthy food options are very limited on campus.”
- “The university pushes a healthy diet at every turn and serves very few healthy things, and those health items cost about three times what the unhealthy things do, which creates a huge hurdle for anyone who isn’t dedicated to the idea of healthy eating. If you truly believe the university is dedicated to healthful eating try and make it obvious in ways besides a couple of signs.”

Students are increasingly concerned about health and wellness issues, and are demanding food options more in line with those concerns. Residential Programs and Services is currently exploring the issue. The Committee supports this initiative and recommends:

- The university explore expanding reasonably priced, healthy food options at all foodservice locations on campus.

**Indiana Memorial Union**

Updates to foodservice in the IMU are discussed in the IMU section below.

**Wells Library**

The Wells Library was identified as a campus “center” throughout the discussions leading up to this report. Through the introduction of the Information Commons, the facility has begun to truly combine the three spheres of campus life. Students now meet for academics, for co-curricular activities, between classes, and simply to say “hi”, all within the confines of this building. While the general perception of the building is overwhelmingly positive, food service was sited as being offensively inadequate for the number of students using the Wells Library today.
The downstairs food court of the Wells Library has very limited options, a horrible location, and an abysmal setting with no windows and inadequate lighting. This space could serve as an ideal location for facilitating engagement on campus, but fails to do so in its current state. With this in mind, the Committee recommends:

- Expanded food and drink offerings in the Wells Library food court, more fluid movement between the lobby and the court, and renovating the dining area to provide a more inviting environment through the addition of windows, outdoor seating and more suitable lighting.

The other foodservice location in the library, the coffee kiosk in the lobby, is actually a retrofitted closet. This site is entirely incapable of adequately servicing the present need in the lobby of the library. Throughout the day, lines exist with a dozen or more students waiting patiently to get a cup of coffee or a bagel. The Starbucks in the IMU, introduced roughly two years ago, has been an overwhelming success and serves as the ideal model for the coffee kiosk in the library. The Committee recommends:

- The university explore options for renovating the coffee kiosk in the Wells Library in an effort to provide greater service and a more appropriate spot for engagement, using the Starbucks in the Indiana Memorial Union as an example.

Two final issues for foodservice in the Wells Library are hours and meal points. First, students use the library throughout the day and night, but the foodservice locations close much too early for students to use them when working late into the evening. The Committee recommends the university explore extended hours for the foodservice locations in the Wells Library. Second, currently the library foodservice locations do not accept residence hall Meal Points. This prevents students living in the residence halls from utilizing these food options – an unnecessary hindrance for students. The Committee recommends:

- Extending foodservice hours in the Wells Library.
- Acceptance of residence hall Meal Points at all foodservice locations in the Wells Library.

**Kiosks: SPEA/Business, Music, Education, Jordan**

The kiosks on campus were put in to service the needs of those locations away from traditional dining facilities on campus. While these locations do help the need for food, they do little service for the campus in providing informal meeting locations. The majority of these kiosks were placed in a corridor or lobby, allowing for little or no seating. These spaces need to be expanded, very much in the model of the IMU Starbucks, though with greater food offerings, providing locations where students can meet with peers, faculty, and staff and further the engagement mission of the university. It is understood that the SPEA/Business kiosk will be expanded with the renovation of the undergraduate business building; this is an ideal approach and will contribute positively to the life of those schools. That said, the Committee recommends:

- Renovation of food kiosks in SPEA/Business, Music, Education, and Jordan Hall into permanent foodservice locations.
- Expanded seating for food kiosks in SPEA/Business, Music, Education, and Jordan Hall in the model of the IMU Starbucks.
- Extended hours for food kiosks in SPEA/Business, Music, Education, and Jordan Hall.

Arboretum

A large percentage of the student body walks through the Arboretum on a daily basis, making it one of the most heavily trafficked areas of campus. The area was established as a green space to replace the relocated Memorial Stadium, and serves this role quite well. However, on the Indiana University website it describes the Arboretum as “an ideal place for relaxation and study.” While it may be an ideal space for relaxation and study, it is rarely used for such activities. Outside of the first couple weeks of warm weather in late spring, the area is really just an additional couple minutes of walking. Students have commented on the Arboretum as “feeling like a museum” that does not contribute to the student experience outside of providing a good view. In truth, it is not an area very conducive to student engagement, whether that is academic or co-curricular. There are no comfortable areas for sitting (without a blanket), spotty wireless Internet coverage, and no student group activity because of university restrictions. The Arboretum could be an ideal location for student engagement, community building, and activism, but currently provides none of this. Thought must be put into how the university is going to utilize this space to better engage the student body. Ideas that surfaced during discussions included the addition of a patio/café on the periphery, comfortable seating areas, and a larger, more useful gazebo. The Committee recommends:

- Opening the Arboretum to all student group activity including tabling, campaigning, and programming.
- Exploring options for increasing the usability of Arboretum space by students, faculty, and staff.

Indiana Memorial Union (IMU)

“For all IU students and alumni, the IMU symbolizes a sense of community, an extension of learning outside the classroom and a reminder of the overall Indiana University student experience.” This is a comment from the Off-Campus Living subcommittee of the VOICE Project. This representation of the IMU seems to parallel the image the university seeks of its core student center, and is a representation confirmed by many students:

“I don’t participate in many of the cultural events on campus. However, I LOVE the Indiana Memorial Union.”

“I love the IMU! The only thing I could even think to improve would be to add another computer lounge and to allow the use of meal points there. Other than that, it’s perfect.”

The VOICE survey data suggests students are generally satisfied with the IMU. Anecdotally, they like the aesthetic beauty and the tradition, but cite these as possible impediments for it to truly be “the student union.” Many of the areas within the IMU are undeniably antiquated, out of line with student life today:

“IMU can seem too formal at times, so make it less formal.”

Students often repeat this sentiment, feeling it is not a true student union, but rather a commercial establishment more intent on serving alumni and guests than the student population. Further, the formality of many of the spaces has not contributed to the engagement the IMU intends to promote. Any weekday afternoon walk through the South Lounge or Mezzanine lounge above the lobby will tell you two things: students don’t get enough sleep and the IMU is not keeping them awake. The floor plan has also proven an impediment to many students’ use of the IMU.

One focus group leader commented:

“Several mentioned that they got lost looking for things and it was frustrating.”

As mentioned earlier in this report, students do not consider the IMU the “student center” of campus. However, the ideal college environment is one in which the spaces of the university, most visibly the Union, further engagement and the building of community for students. That said, the Committee recommends:

- The IMU reassess how it serves the students of Indiana University, and realign its strategies to encourage student use, participation and community building (this will be further explained in the points below).

**Starbucks**

The introduction of Starbucks on the first floor roughly two years ago has been an incredibly successful addition to the IMU:

“The Starbucks has been a huge improvement that has drawn me to the union.”

This space perfectly fits the model of the ideal college environment by successfully merging the three spheres of the college experience. Throughout the day students meet with peers for group discussion, faculty members for casual office hours, and even recruiters looking for new summer interns. There are currently too few areas in the IMU like this.

**Bookstore**

The IMU bookstore is heavily used during the first two weeks of each academic session and on alumni weekends (football games, parents’ weekend, etc). Outside of this, the space is largely empty, simply providing room to store books, t-shirts and related paraphernalia. While certainly an important component of a “student union,” the IMU bookstore completely disrupts the flow of traffic through the union, creating a winding, claustrophobic corridor considered “confusing” and “prohibitive.” There were a number of suggestions for the bookstore space during discussions for this report, including a café, large periodical lounge, and student meeting space. The Committee recommends:
The IMU begin discussing a more appropriate use of the bookstore space to provide for a more open, useable union.

**Bowling Alley**

Usage of “The Back Alley” (bowling alley, billiards and games) is insufficient to warrant continued allocation of such valuable space. The motivation behind The Back Alley – providing a place for students to interact outside of the classroom – is the motivation that should be guiding the majority of spaces in the union. However, the approach (bowling, billiards) is a bit of an outdated approach. One need only look at the economics of the operation to see the student demand – consistently a money loser. Very few students participating in discussions with the VOICE project stated a need for The Back Alley. This space needs to be renovated into something more agreeable with students today. The Committee recommends:

- The IMU remove The Back Alley and introduce a space more conducive to bringing students/faculty/staff together in a casual setting for both academic and non-academic work. Possible uses include providing student group resource space, relocation of the Student Activities Office (Committee recommends moving this office in the Engagement section of this report), and academic/non-academic computer clusters.

**Solarium – Traditional Public House**

One of the most beautiful, yet most underused, spaces in the IMU is the Solarium and adjoining patio. Outside of the occasional career fair, this space is just about always empty. For many years now there has been a discussion floating around campus regarding the possible addition of a student/faculty/staff “public house” to the IMU. A number of leading administrators and faculty members have mentioned the idea as a means of retaining faculty/staff on campus after traditional classroom hours. As students, the Committee asks, “What better way to encourage student/staff/faculty interaction than to allow them the pleasures of a drink?” Certainly these constituencies can move off campus for their libations, but, as this report mentions throughout, why encourage your population (and market) to move off campus? Further, what better way to encourage responsible consumption by students than to show older students, faculty and staff consuming responsibly? There certainly is a great deal of power in open, honest dialogue. (A full discussion on alcohol is included in the Safety section of this report) Though this section is a bit tongue-in-cheek, the point remains quite obvious: there is no reason students/faculty/staff should not have a space on campus to consume alcoholic beverages. The Solarium is an ideal location already serviced by the union kitchen with adequate room inside and a large patio outside. With that said, the Committee recommends:

- The university open a 21+ establishment in the Solarium or other suitable space of the IMU for students, faculty and staff.

**Food Services**

Data on general student perception of the quality of the foodservice at the IMU is both limited and mixed. However, it needs to be noted that students do consider this to be an important dining option (one of two) on the central academic campus. Considering this, the IMU needs to improve the availability of food in two ways. First, students spend a great deal of time in the
union after traditional class hours yet there are virtually zero foodservice options at these times. To make the point: Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights at 8pm and 11pm, Union Board has film screenings in the Whittenberger Auditorium. Students enter the doors of the Union at 8 and 11 and exit at roughly 10 and 1. Due to the limited casual “hangout” space and food offerings, students simply walk in the doors, watch the movie, and walk back out the doors. This seems a tragically missed opportunity to further student interaction and make a little money – another instance of the university “pushing” students off campus, rather than retaining and engaging.

The Committee recommends:

- The IMU provide late night food and beverage service in a more comfortable environment.

Secondly, the inability for students to use all ID card point systems prevents the use of the IMU by a large number of students. Those currently living in residence halls are unable to use their RPS Meal Points at any food establishment in the IMU. Students commented again and again on this. The importance of this ability is discussed in the Wells Library segment of this (Facilities) section of the report. The Committee recommends:

- The IMU accept all forms of ID payment for foodservice including RPS Meal Points.

Parking

Students often sited limited free parking as a primary reason for not going to the Union. Parking should be limited around the Union – during the day. During traditional class hours, students do not need parking on campus, as bus service and walking are both available and safe. However, after traditional class hours, public transportation becomes prohibitively sporadic, walking becomes relatively more dangerous, and parking remains (incredibly) expensive on campus. For these reasons, students state they do not frequent the IMU after hours, preventing use of the Union by student groups, academic groups and similar “engagement” activities. The Union could eliminate this barrier to use by allowing students free parking in both the north and east Union parking lots after 7pm. The Committee recommends:

- The IMU provide free parking in the north and east Union lots for all students arriving after 7pm.

Recreational Sports

According to a 2007 student survey, roughly 80% of students surveyed agree, “Participating in Recreational Sports activities and programs has expanded my interest in staying fit and healthy” – this fits the expectations laid out in the Executive Summary. Further, roughly 85% of students surveyed agree, “Recreational Sports activities and programs contribute to the quality of life at this institution,” and “I enjoy participating in Recreational Sports activities and/or utilizing facilities.”

It is abundantly clear from the above data and discussion that students find Recreational Sports an important organization and its activities overwhelmingly satisfying. When asked in the Focus Group Lunches for a defining outside the classroom experience, students stated as much as any response that intramurals were that experience. Overwhelmingly, students commented as being satisfied with the intramural experience. From a student perspective, it is clear that Recreational Sports is an important organization doing work essential to the satisfaction of the student body. However, a more important note on the importance of these activities needs to be made: general Health and Wellness.

One of the 10 characteristics expected in every IU graduate is an understanding of the importance of health and wellness. With the stresses of modern day life (#1 stated reason for using Recreational Sports facilities is stress management) and the health crisis sweeping the country, it is no wonder Governor Daniels introduced the “INShape Indiana” initiative (partnered with Indiana University no less) to encourage healthy living. (Note: this year’s INShape Indiana Health Summit took place on October 15, 2008 at IU Bloomington and focused on creating school systems focused on health and wellness). It is the contention of the Committee that the university must support these efforts through their actions. Currently, the facilities available to students/faculty/staff for health and wellness activities are dramatically less than demand or to Big 10 peers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
<th>Status of Recreational Sports Facility Projects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>In Spring, 2010, Iowa will open the doors to a 216,000 square foot facility. Cost: $70 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan is in the process of securing funds for an 110,000 square foot addition to their existing recreation facility. Cost: $32 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Michigan State has completed its facility master plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>Having completed its facility master plan, Minnesota is currently developing facility concepts and funding proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>The facility master plan for Northwestern’s new recreational sports space is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>The “RPAC” is a 570,000 square foot facility that opened in Fall, 2006. Ohio State is already drawing up plans to improve two other fitness centers on campus. The plans include the addition of a skate park, challenge course, and multipurpose fields. Cost: $140 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>In September 2006, Penn State opened a 16,000 square foot fitness center. Cost: $14 million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 2007 Student Survey Results.
28 “INShape Indiana,” <http://www.in.gov/inshape/>
University of Wisconsin | Wisconsin is just starting the planning and approval phase of adding two new and/or renovated recreation centers on campus.

Purdue University | Purdue is currently working on finalizing three to four concepts to present to the university’s President for approval this spring. These concepts consist of building either a new facility or creating additions to the existing recreation center.

Source: Student Recreational Sports Association

The Committee recommends:

- The university discuss fully the Recreational Master Plan at an institutional level, and begin planning for necessary facility improvements/additions as laid out in the Master Plan. Further, the university ensure current services are not cut (intramural fields) and all additional services are more appropriately designed for use by students/faculty/staff during the workday (centralizing facilities as much as possible).

Currently Recreational Sports’ revenue (operating of SRSC, HPER (with support from School of HPER), and some programming) is provided through the Committee for Fee Review process (revenue also comes from voluntary activities). Due to the current limitations of the process (detailed extensively in the Student Input section of this report) Recreational Sports will never receive the funds necessary to adequately serve the needs of the student body. Changes must be made to the funding process to ensure Health and Wellness facilities are kept in line with demand and peers. This is more fully explained in the Student Input section of this report. The Committee recommends:

- The university assess the current funding process for one-time expenses (non-operating), like the Recreational Sports Master Plan, to ensure necessary projects are not prevented by restrictions placed on the Committee for Fee Review’s fee recommendations.

Health Center

There was very limited discussion on the Health Center during the data collection process of this report. Due to the sporadic nature of the unit, students generally do not perceive it to be a concern until necessary. Hence why every comment received in the survey was regarding hours:

“The Health Center needs to have longer hours – there are students who get hurt on Friday afternoon and don’t go in until Monday, which is unsafe. Their hotline is not even 24 hours, so there is not really full care for students on campus except the emergency room. They close at 4:30pm now, and I really think that they should be available to students outside of class time.”

“The Health Center should be open MUCH longer. People do actually get sick after 4:30 and on weekends!!!”

29 “The Results Are In…,” Student Recreational Sports Association, <http://www.recsports.indiana.edu/srsa/srsa.html>
“The Health Center having such scarce hours and not being open at all on the weekend is a big hindrance.”

The Committee recommends:

- The university work with the current Indiana University Student Association administration to explore the need and options for expanded Health Center hours. This is an issue currently being addressed by IUSA.

Student Affairs

An overview of Student Affairs is included in the Engagement section of this report.

Currently, the Office of the Division of Student Affairs is located on the second floor in the interior of Franklin Hall. To be clear, the office in charge of student life and satisfaction outside of the classroom is set in an office with no windows, on the second floor of a rarely visited building. In fact, the former Associate Dean of Students Damon Sims resided until lured to Penn State in a retrofitted closet without any air management. Further, the various offices under the direction of Student Affairs are located in eleven different buildings around campus.

Students repeatedly complained of the difficulty of locating these offices around campus. In an “ideal college environment” the majority of offices under the guidance of Student Affairs would be centrally located in an area highly visible to the student body. Similarly, the physical Office of the Division of Student Affairs should be located in a spot more easily accessed by students. The Committee recommends:

- The university evaluate options for centralizing the majority of Student Affairs offices. The Indiana Memorial Union would be an “ideal” location for many of these offices so long as student organization office space is maintained. Further, the university move the Office of the Division of Student Affairs to a location that more adequately represents the import and role of this office.

Study Abroad

An overview of Study Abroad is included in the Engagement section of this report.

Similar to the Office of the Division of Student Affairs, the Office of Overseas Study is in a decidedly non-“ideal” location. Located on the third floor of Franklin Hall, this may be the most difficult office on campus to find (if student sentiment is any guide). Repeatedly, students commented during this project on the challenge of finding the physical Office of Overseas Study. It does seem a bit counterintuitive to have an office, central to the international strategy of the university, so nondescript. Overseas Study is shown in this report to be an essential part of the ideal college environment. Accordingly, all aspects of this office (physical, virtual, and personnel) should reflect that importance. That said, the Committee recommends:
The university identify a location more visible and accessible for the Office of Overseas Study.

Cooperative Living

Included in Appendix B of this report is the quite thorough report of the Off Campus Environment subcommittee of the VOICE Project. The focus of the report is Cooperative Housing and its role in providing support, real life application, and a sense of community for those students who live off campus. The Committee believes the Coop report to be meritorious and its underlying themes to support much of what is discussed in the VOICE Report.
The Committee believed this to be an essential section of the report in light of recent events on college campuses nationwide. Indeed, to adequately take advantage of all the opportunities available at Indiana University, students must perceive the campus and surrounding area as a safe environment. Any hesitancy or unease can be detrimental to the overall student experience. The issue of alcohol on campus also served as a motivation for this section. Like perceived safety, alcohol, when approached irresponsibly, can be detrimental to the college experience, preventing it from ever becoming the “ideal” outlined in this report. The Committee contends this issue has not received the honest, open discussion it so desperately needs. The Safety section includes a discussion of perceived safety on campus and a call for an open discussion on the appropriate role of alcohol at IU.

Security Efforts

With the recent tragic events on college campuses, security on campus has taken a spot front and center for both parents and administrators. In light of these events, Indiana University took steps to increase communication in the event of an emergency or security situation, including the introduction of IU-Notify. During critical situations students receive information and instructions through e-mail, voice mail, and/or text message on the security situation. This system is seen as a positive step in the effort to provide a more comfortable, secure environment for students.

Alcohol on Campus

“The vast majority of my peer group at IU in general are quickly caught up in the influence of IU’s party atmosphere. 95% of students begin their college experience by attending fraternity parties during week one and bars by the second month. At the same time, IU has one of the richest cultural environments in the nation with the theatre, opera, and Union. The issue here is that over the course of the past 50 years, the school has pushed students physically further from campus by providing freshmen with substandard housing and little parking, by providing few upperclassmen better on campus options, and by forcing fraternities further from campus rather than pulling them in. Students will follow the path of least resistance socially. If a can of beer is more readily accessible than a nationally recognized speaker or the opera, where do you think they will go for fun?”

The issue of alcohol on college campuses has received a great deal of attention over the years. Hundreds of papers have been written attempting to address the problem and present solutions.
This discussion does not attempt to add anything to the literature already out in the hands of student affairs officials. Rather, this report attempts to present the issue from a students’ point of view – and present the issue as shockingly unaddressed.

A note: There will be a number of VERY generalized statements in this section – this is not quite fair. There is a population on campus that does not drink or drinks in consistent moderation. However, there is also a population, a quite visible population (go to any Saturday tailgate) that drinks heavily, consistently. There are students that drink at bars nearly every night of the week. Indeed, one of the biggest nights at one local bar is Wednesday – the middle of the school week. Certainly puts a new spin on “beginning the weekend.” The fact that this population exists brings credence to this discussion.

**Out of Sight, Out of Mind**

Focusing on the residence hall experience with respect to alcohol is worthwhile because of the importance of this period for students in their socialization and assimilation to Indiana University. As stated in the **Engagement** section of this report, it is vitally important that freshman students are engaged early or they will often be “lost” for the entirety of their college career – not becoming actively involved or engaged in the university. Alcohol, and the parties that go with it, can be detrimental to student engagement – and it too often is. However, alcohol, when consumed responsibly, can play a role in the college experience – even in the ideal college experience, for what better image of college is there than students and professors enthusiastically debating over a pint at the university pub? What better example for younger students than to see legal adults consuming alcohol responsibly (refer to “pub” discussion in **Facilities**). The problem is that the university’s approach is to force alcohol out of sight. After all, what is “out of sight is out of mind.”

A great quote received from the VOICE survey:

“Stop pretending that stuff doesn’t happen. This isn’t a Dry campus as you darn well know. Treat it like that for once.”

One need only look at student ethics violations to get an idea of the presence of alcohol in the residence hall community. There is alcohol in the residence halls of IU, and the current policy is “closed door, no noise, no problem.” Police cadets and residence assistants cruise the hallways of residence centers on weekend nights looking for suspicious behavior (noise, quickly shut door, smell of alcohol). When suspicion is raised, the RA or cadet knock on the door and expect immediate opening of the door. The RA or cadet then looks in the room for alcohol or paraphernalia. If nothing is found, they continue on. So, what approach do those students who do wish to imbibe take? The incentive is to “drink quickly and put the bottles away.” This way students do not risk the chance of an RA or cadet identifying any alcohol containers. Put crudely, students are encouraged to drink quickly, and to drink enough for the “buzz to last.” Herein lies two central problems with the treatment of alcohol at IU: alcohol is encouraged to be drank behind close doors and heavily enough for the effects to last when one moves outside the closed doors – out of sight, out of mind. These two issues create a very combustible situation that too often leads to alcohol poisoning and other related problems.
Similar to the experience of residence hall students, IU Greeks generally operate on a policy of “out of sight, out of mind.” A surprisingly accurate tale of a party night at an IU fraternity house is depicted in the book Binge: what your college student won’t tell you. The anecdote details the security apparatus organized by individual Greek chapters to deal with “Party Patrol.” Party Patrol is essentially a group of Interfraternity Council or university representatives walking through fraternity houses on weekend nights to ensure that all functions are in accordance with IU policies. Binge covers the nature of the security apparatus, and details a standard “shutdown” procedure whereby fraternities eliminate the presence of alcohol during a Party Patrol visit so the fraternity is not found in violation of university regulations.30 “Shutdown” procedures have been in place for many years; their continued use is a sign of their effectiveness – everyone is well aware alcohol is present in IU fraternities but few organizations are ever sited for it. So, although the university is aware of what goes on in fraternity houses on this campus, “what is out of sight is out of mind.” Once again, similar to residence halls this encourages students to drink secretly and heavily/quickly.

The university must work to bring alcohol out of the dark recesses of campus and into an open, honest discussion on responsible personal conduct and consumption. Ignoring the issue, pushing it out of one’s periphery, is a policy that does not work. The Committee does not pretend to be scholars on alcohol consumption on college campuses. We understand the difficult situation presented by state law and a fear of student/alumni backlash. That said, the Committee recommends:

- The university appoint a taskforce on alcohol consumption, to address, openly and honestly, current university policies regarding the consumption of alcohol on campus.

First-Year Neighborhood Selection

As most administrators know, each residence hall on campus has a stereotype: Collins for arts students, Wright for academics and McNutt for partiers. The Committee fully supports students having the ability to select living arrangements based on shared interest (LLCs, Academic floors, etc). However, there is an obvious issue with students selecting residence centers based on well-known stereotypes – the Northwest neighborhood being the prime culprit. Foster, McNutt and Briscoe are known to be “party dorms,” and those students interested in this experience select this neighborhood during initial enrollment with the university. This results in a dense population of party-inclined students, newly independent, with a seeming universal emphasis on the social sphere of the college experience. The neighborhood’s relative proximity to the Greek houses on Jordan certainly does not help the cause. The Committee believes it is in the best interest of both the students and the university to expose students to a more broadly focused peer group. Through diversification of students, encouraging partiers/studiers/extroverts/introverts to all live together (though individual rooms needn’t be so diversified), the university can help to eliminate an environment overly conducive to developing party-inclined students during a very impressionable and important time. The Committee recommends:

The university eliminate (for a trial period) the neighborhood selection process for incoming freshman. This would ensure student exposure to a more diverse group of individuals and help to remedy many of the quite accurately stereotyped environments of certain residence halls on campus (i.e., concentration of “party oriented” individuals in the northwest neighborhood). This recommendation does not include interest-group living arrangements or living requests based on necessary proximity to specific school (tuba player living in Read).
Appendix A

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
Roommate Compatibility Questionnaire

NAME (please print)

If you would like to request a roommate, please list his/her name:
(Your requested roommate must list you on their questionnaire as well or we will not be able to honor the request)
Please complete the questionnaire in case your requested roommate is not available.

Your answers to the following questions will help to determine your degree of compatibility with possible roommates. Answer all questions by circling the letter. It is strongly suggested that you complete this questionnaire by yourself. You may circle more than one letter, or write in, to complete your answer.

1. Depending on my schedule, I usually go to bed around:
   a. midnight
   b. 1:00/2:00 a.m.
   c. after 2:00 a.m.

2. I like to sleep:
   a. with the TV/music/computer on
   b. in a quiet room
   c. other: __________________________

3. I prefer to study:
   a. with music/TV on
   b. in a quiet room
   c. in the library

4. I would describe my housekeeping habits as:
   a. very neat
   b. neat most of the time
   c. cluttered

5. Which of the following best describes how you feel about sharing your personal belongings?
   a. I don’t mind if my roommate uses or borrows some of my belongings.
   b. Some sharing is OK, but I want to be asked first.
   c. Generally, I do not share my personal belongings.

6. Which type of atmosphere do you prefer for your room?
   a. quiet, study-oriented
   b. quiet during the week, social gathering on the weekend
Appendix B

Communication & Outreach “Beyond the Sample Gates”

An Education & Outreach Subcommittee Report

Off-Campus Environment Committee

Student VOICE Project

Authored by

Emily Cheney & Amanda Forgash

With input from

Christine Novotny, Alex Smith, & Ran Tao

In cooperation with

Bloomington Cooperative Living, Inc.

& the Office of the Dean of Students
CONTENTS: “Beyond the Sample Gates”

I. Introduction: Place
II. Physical Place: Cooperative Housing
   i. Inter Cooperative Council
   ii. Oberlin Student Cooperative Association
   iii. Purdue University Cooperatives
III. Cooperative Housing at Indiana University
   i. Social Community
   ii. Education
   iii. Identity
IV. Virtual Place: Off-Campus Website
   i. Craigslist.org
   ii. Ohio State University Off-Campus Living
V. Off-Campus Website at Indiana University
   i. Social Community
   ii. Education
   iii. Identity
VI. Conclusion: Ideal Places at Indiana University
INTRODUCTION: PLACE

The Indiana University campus encompasses the center of Bloomington and covers an expanse of over thirty-five-hundred acres. The people and places in propinquity to the institution are scattered over an even greater expanse extending beyond the city limits. Those IU students living off-campus are encouraged to treat the Indiana Memorial Union as a “home away from home.” As a result, the IMU welcomes a convergence of students from every corner of our great institution; daily, students use IMU spaces and services for class meetings, socializing, shopping, dining, and attending lectures and arts entertainment. Alumni also choose the IMU as a special place to visit each time they return to campus. For all IU students and alumni, the IMU symbolizes a sense of community, an extension of learning outside the classroom, and a reminder of the overall Indiana University student experience.

The founding mission of the Off-Campus Environment committee of the Student VOICE Project championed the need to enrich off-campus life for students while simultaneously strengthening the off-campus student’s connection to the University and its services, academics, arts, and leisure activities. In essence, the larger aim of our committee work is to create an environment and sense of social community, continuing education, and campus identity for off-campus students that mirrors the experience of on-campus students.

While the original Off-Campus Environment mission indicated a lesser focus on physical facilities to foster community beyond the Sample Gates, the Student VOICE Project recognized early on that “…missions may change as the student participants become engaged in the process and redefine their activities to suit purposes they may yet identify.”31 Through discussion, research, and reflection, the Education and Outreach subcommittee of Off-Campus Environment concluded that a physical facility is necessary and imperative to facilitate an environment of greater connectedness and support among the off-campus student community and the on-campus community of Indiana University. The need for place to create true community coupled with all its positive attributes is a concept eloquently expounded upon by Wendell Berry, a renowned American author, in over thirty fiction and non-fiction works. He is widely respected for his views on ecological, economic, and social sustainability. Berry’s emphasis on place and community can be found explicitly in what many have called the canon of his work.

“A community is the mental and spiritual condition of knowing that the place is shared, and that the people who share the place define and limit the possibilities of each other's lives.”32

Work in properly identifying and addressing the needs of students living off-campus begins with this direct question: How can Indiana University provide a sense of community and sharing among its students beyond its borders – “beyond the Sample Gates?”

As members of the Education and Outreach subcommittee, we have carefully weighed the issues and ideas presented to us, and we have identified community, education, and identity as key for conceptualizing and evaluating a plan for the ideal off-campus environment. After deliberation and research of other university communities, we have concluded that the creation,

development, and maintenance of unique student spaces off-campus are necessary to create the
ideal college environment. In this technological age, we are given myriad opportunities to create
connections that can surmount obstacles of space and time with considerable ease. With regard
to enhancing the university and community connection of off-campus students, Communications
and Outreach has crafted a plan for both physical and virtual places unique to the off-campus
living experience. It is vital that the planning for the physical and virtual places are accomplished
in tandem since the modern day university student expects this connection.

PHYSICAL PLACE: COOPERATIVE HOUSING

We have found the cooperative housing model to be particularly conducive to
creating community and providing an extension of education outside the walls
of the University; it essentially provides a shared student identity off-campus.
Successful cooperative housing models have been in place for decades at respected institutions
such as Oberlin College, the University of Michigan, the University of California –Berkeley, and
Purdue University.

INTER COOPERATIVE COUNCIL (University of Michigan – Ann Arbor)

“The Student Co-ops, also known as the Inter-Cooperative Council (ICC) were first started in
1932 by students trying to find a way to stay in college during the Great Depression. Over the
years, students have continued to work together to provide themselves with affordable and
convenient housing with the added advantage of having meaningful and fun exchanges between
co-op members.

Today we have 18 group houses and one apartment house on North and Central campuses at the
University of Michigan. Because students created the co-ops to meet their own needs, the ICC
offers eight month Fall/Winter contracts and two or four months Spring/Summer contracts. Our
houses range in size from 12 to 85 members. The average house holds 30 people. North Campus
attracts a large graduate student population (about 50%) and a sizable international student
population (at least 30%) . Central Campus is a large, diverse group comprised of mostly
undergraduate students. Because co-ops are open to all students, each house is made up of
members representing a wide variety of backgrounds. What brings us together is our dedication
to creating the best living atmosphere possible. Most houses are very social with shared activities
ranging from. inter-mural soccer to apple picking, bowling, and ice skating.

Eating and working together with housemates, participating in group decision-making,
and sharing good times help “co-opers” to develop close bonds. This strong sense of community,
combined with the knowledge of shared ownership, is what turns co-op houses into homes.
House meetings, which are held once or twice a month, provide a forum for open
communication. Members vote on issues relating to how much to spend on food, how many
meat meals to serve per week, which newspapers to order, and when to schedule social
exchanges. Group meetings provide an essential and valuable opportunity for members to
resolve any conflicts that might occur within the community.
- Co-ops are owned and run by the members who live in them—not landlords or the University.
- Co-ops are economical and convenient because members share the work necessary to run them.
- Co-ops have a friendly and close atmosphere from shared decision-making and shared responsibilities—more personal than residence halls, more social than apartments.”

OBERLIN STUDENT COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION (OSCA at Oberlin College)

“OSCA is a student-owned and student-operated nonprofit corporation that provides at-cost housing and dining services to hundreds of students at Oberlin. The corporation is entirely separate from Oberlin College, but all member-owners of OSCA are Oberlin students. Each of the nine individual OSCA co-ops is responsible for its own day-to-day operations; together, they make up the umbrella organization of OSCA.

630 Oberlin students—more than 20%—are members of OSCA each semester. 175 of these “co-operators” are in housing co-ops, which means they eat, sleep, and live in co-ops. Most of our members only dine in OSCA while residing in either a college-run residence hall or off-campus apartment.”

PURDUE UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVES

“More than 50 years ago ---1933 for women, 1935 for men, the Purdue cooperative housing concept was born. Now we pause to honor the dreamers and realists who parented it ---this fellowship in shelter-keeping. The cooperative idea was not new 50 years ago as some of the names of houses indicate --- Rochdale, Ann Tweedale, Dover, Maclure, Luma, Antiqua, and Owen. People in England, Sweden, the West Indies, and even Indiana (at New Harmony) had practiced cooperative living long before.

At Purdue University, financial necessity prompted women in the School of Home Economics to band together as the Women’s Cooperative House in 1933. Ten men did the same in 1935 when founding Wesleys Boys’ House in rooms above the Wesley Foundation and with the blessing and help of Rev. and Mrs. William McFadden. Mrs. McFadden scoured the secondhand stores and the attics of friends for furnishings; and her husband, along with 10 additional male supporters, supplied the manual labor.

The necessity to share responsibilities in a co-op corresponds to the fundamental philosophy of all student housing at Purdue --- the establishment of homes managed by students and shared with their friends.

Two brothers (farm boys, in the 1930s) lived on campus in one room; they ate canned beans, meat, and fruit brought hundred miles from home every month. They knew few other students. Once they graduated, they went back home to the farm, lived, and died with no

--- Excerpted and Paraphrased from “Inter Cooperative Council” Website <http://www.icc.coop>
--- Excerpted and Paraphrased from Oberlin Student Cooperative Association. An Introduction to OSCA. Available at <http://osca.wilder.oberlin.edu/>
personal contacts garnered from college life. In contrast, one of the letters from a Tippecanoe County farm boy who lived in Wesley Boys House said:

Living closely with 10 young men in the co-op, all with different backgrounds, cultures, and life-styles exposed me to a variety of new perspectives. Without co-op living, I would have lived at home and would not have established the relationships and fellowships that I have. I would have merely skimmed the top of university life - both academic and social. Friendships made during these years continue to benefit, enrich, and endure; they make me grateful to have chosen cooperative college living.

The sharing of experiences in co-ops is one of the system’s strongest assets. In the 1940s, a variety of such activities developed: trade dinners, camp-outs, hog roasts, caroling, and picnics. In 1940, the Student Cooperative Association sponsored its first dance in the Purdue Memorial Union. It underwrote movies and lectures and developed the Student Credit Union and Co-op Book Store.”  

35 Excerpted and Paraphrased from Purdue University Cooperatives. Co-op Housing: A Look Back. <http://www.purduecooperatives.org/home>
COOPERATIVE HOUSING AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL COMMUNITY

Increased community cohesiveness between off-campus students and their non-student neighbors can be achieved through social interaction. As we gain familiarity with our neighbors, as scholars such as Robert Putnam have concluded, we begin to feel safer, more connected, and more responsible for our neighborhood and its inhabitants. However, at Indiana University and within the greater Bloomington community, we are faced with obstacles to increasing this kind of familiarity and trust. The student body’s size of almost 40,000 students from varying backgrounds presents clear hindrances to crafting relationships with more than a few of these students, and these hindrances certainly extend to developing relationships with the more than 70,000 Bloomington residents. As a student population, our transient nature thwarts almost any attempt at “getting to know one another” fully. Cooperative housing provides for positive social interaction between a diverse group of students and our permanent Bloomington neighbors.

Individuals from all walks of life and all academic disciplines are attracted to cooperative housing for its universal positives. Perhaps the most notable positive is its low cost for comfortable, shared housing. College is an expensive pursuit with many students forced to support themselves by working one or more jobs or with many students supporting themselves via a budgeted stipend from parents or guardians. Sharing costs in cooperative housing universally attracts individuals to create households with a variety of interesting people who they may otherwise have never met during their time at IU.

Cooperative housing is also particularly appealing to the population of international students who are typically required to live on-campus but who are often out of this country during the times that apartment rentals are being advertised. This is a population representative of individuals with whom the majority of the IU-Bloomington student body would never be given the opportunity to share housing. University affiliated and facilitated cooperative housing offers international students a unique off-campus living experience and American students the pleasure of becoming better acquainted with foreign people and cultures. By gathering a diverse group of students under one roof, household members are forced to confront and handle group work and problem solving with housemates outside of their comfort zone. Not only does this foster a feeling of solidarity with the larger student body, but it serves to create and nurture a sense of community with our global society. The cooperative housing model has the wonderful potential to become a meeting place for forging new friendships where all types of students can feel comfortable and at ease. The community members can even reach beyond the co-op members to stage special student events or musical performances at the house.

A barrier to community cohesiveness all too common in college towns within the United States is the ‘town-gown gap,’ the campus-community disconnect between year-round residents and seasonal students. Bloomington’s ‘town-gown’ gap exists in many forms including friction between family-owned residences and student-occupied rental houses due to loud, late-night parties and/or parking issues. The “town-gown gap” also contributes to a public service volunteer shortage since students living in residential neighborhood apartments do not typically act like a household with regard for their neighbors or with concern for neighborhood issues. Overall, the “town-gown” gap now results in an unfortunate resentment between the two groups. A
cooperative household of students within a residential section of Bloomington would provide an opportunity for increasing familiarity between these two groups in many positive ways.

The members of the cooperative house would ensure a continuing positive presence by hosting fundraisers for community organizations, undertaking service projects as a household, and committing to the maintenance of their outdoor spaces (yard and porch). A successful cooperative household would be respectful of the neighbors and would help dispel the stereotypical student rental property condition – a living unit surrounded by overflowing trash barrels, littered beer cans, and unsightly porch furniture.

EDUCATION

The skill and discipline required for maintaining a tidy home and yard are difficult to instill in post-adolescents living on their own for the first time. For many students, moving out of the dorms - an environment where bathrooms are cleaned daily, carpets are vacuumed, and floors are mopped – into a rental property where they are responsible for housekeeping and yard maintenance can be uncomfortably uprooting. Education in property maintenance may not be included in an academic curriculum, but it most certainly is included in the category of important life skills.

Life skills range from cooking to gardening to emergency midnight plumbing; they include tasks most people will frequently encounter when they one day own property and have a family. It seems very sensible and reasonable to acquaint young adults with these experiences and skills in a cooperative housing arrangement during their college years. This study of life skills occurs in a cooperative house through the sharing of chores – from doing dishes, cooking meals, cleaning bathrooms, or tending to the yard. It is an environment in which each co-op’er is held responsible for his or her share of the duties in order to continue to be a part of the cooperative unit. This requirement is very motivating and should translate to co-op’ers being accomplished, disciplined, and conscientious property owners after graduation.

Within the context of property management, there are important financial tasks and duties. Bill payment, food purchasing, and house investments give students the chance to also “learn” money management with the assistance of all household members. The most valuable skill learned in cooperative households is fully revealed in collective management of money and resources, a skill that requires group work, decision-making, and compromise. These skills will certainly continue to be applicable for IU graduates in both their professional and personal lives. Facilitating group discussion in a productive fashion is an invaluable skill that is difficult to learn. Opportunities to acquire these skills as young adults in cooperative housing is another reason for adopting this type of living arrangement on the IU-Bloomington community. A current IU graduate student who resided in a university facilitated cooperative house while a student at Stanford said, “Working well with others is really the only skill you need to do well in this world, and, surprisingly, it’s just about the only thing not taught at most liberal arts institutions these days.” An Indiana University facilitated cooperative house would bring group mediation and social skills into its extended household “classrooms.”

IDENTITY
A student’s time in a college setting provides myriad learning opportunities, but perhaps the most important learning that takes place during these years is the process of self-realization. The average Indiana University student today is in a post-adolescent period of development, a time during which individuals begin to determine their worth as individuals away from their immediate families and childhood friends. Many scholars and studies in the social sciences have indicated this sort of maturation as being most beneficial when the young adult is confronted with cultural and ideological differences. Through being faced with opposing and complementary viewpoints, an individual becomes forced to better articulate and, in turn, understand his or her own views and beliefs. The end result is a stronger sense of self. A cooperative house, with its diverse social make-up and unavoidable potential for frequent social interaction, is a prime location for young adults to “come of age.” A cooperative household serves as a small community in which each of the co-op’ers must orient themselves in relation to the particular needs of others. This practice of orientation in a diverse community allows the co-op’er a greater ability to understand and appreciate who they are within the context of family, social groups, greater communities, and, ultimately, global society.

The cooperative household in a university community aids the off-campus student population and Bloomington residents in understanding and appreciating each other as part of a shared community. The focal nature of the cooperative house makes the co-op'ers accountable for maintaining a positive student image. All in all, cooperative households in large university communities allow students to “find” themselves amidst thousands of other students while providing a positive student image within the neighborhood they share with local residents.
VIRTUAL PLACE: OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT WEBSITE

A key focal point of the Off-Campus Student Environment Subcommittee is strengthening the interconnections between students living off-campus and the institution of Indiana University. It is important for those students who reside in non-university housing to feel linked to IU, and at the same time, form a bond with the surrounding community of Bloomington. The Communication and Outreach subcommittee of Off-Campus Environment developed a solution to bridge the gaps of isolation within both relationships.

The establishment of a student-orchestrated website provides off-campus students with a virtual place where they can easily access each other, Indiana University departments, and the community of Bloomington with only the click of a mouse. While the Indiana University student currently enjoys a wide range of online resources, student internet users encounter frustrations resulting from the lack of organization of information on the available sites (e.g. OneStart, Oncourse). Student classified ads, rideboards, financial aid information, course registration, and events calendars are all found on OneStart. Not all of these services are of daily use or interest for a student living off-campus, nor do these services account for all the possible information and communication needs an off-campus student has. The ideal student website for those living off-campus would be independent of IU’s larger educational and service websites. The ideal student website for those living off-campus would allow for immediate student interaction through forums and postings as well as providing information and resources specific to the off-campus living experience. This identity-specific online community needs to supply connections to the IU educational community as well as information for how to live on one’s own “Beyond the Sample Gates.” With these elements in mind, it becomes clear that such a virtual place would emphasize the important factors of education, identity, and community recognized by the Communication and Outreach subcommittee.

The virtual place would be accessible to those with a valid Indiana University student Webmail account and password. Students could do postings on the message and event boards, could participate in discussion forums, could provide restaurant and local business reviews, and could utilize a digg function to display those Indiana University and local news stories of most interest to the off-campus population.

Main components of a successful virtual space would include:

- Event Board (local, university, public, private, etc.)
- Discussion Forum (recent news, student advice, etc.)
- Local Business Reviews
- University Course and Instructor Reviews
- “Digg-ed” News Section
- Relevant Informative Resources and Links (city services, housing searches, property management and maintenance, cooking help, etc.)
- Rideshare and Carpool

---

36 “Digg is a community-based news article popularity website. It combines social bookmarking, blogging, and syndication with a form of non-hierarchical, democratic editorial control. News stories and websites are submitted by users, and then promoted to the front page through a user-based ranking system. This differs from the hierarchical editorial system that many other news sites employ.” [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digg]
- Snow Day and Emergency Notification Posting
- Information on Cooperative Student Housing Options

There are many community websites that service both student and non-student populations. Two of the most notable examples are detailed below. The second is an example of a university-specific website.

CRAIGSLIST [http://www.craigslist.org]

“Craigslist is a centralized network of online communities, featuring free classified advertisements (with jobs, internships, housing, personals, for sale/barter/wanted, services, community, gigs, resume, and pets categories) and forums on various topics.

The service was founded in 1995 by Craig Newmark for the San Francisco Bay Area. After incorporation as a private for-profit company in 1999, Craigslist expanded into nine more U.S. cities in 2000, four each in 2001 and 2002, and 14 in 2003. As of September 2007, Craigslist had established itself in approximately 450 cities in 50 countries.

As of 2007, Craigslist operates with a staff of 24 people. Its sole source of revenue is paid job ads in select cities ($75 per ad for the San Francisco Bay Area; $25 per ad for New York, Los Angeles, San Diego, Boston, Seattle, Washington D.C., Chicago and recently Portland, OR) and paid broker apartment listings in New York City ($10 per ad).

The site serves over nine billion page views per month, putting it in 56th place overall among websites worldwide, ninth place overall among web sites in the United States (per Alexa.com on January 10, 2008), to over thirty million unique visitors. With over thirty million new classified advertisements each month, Craigslist is the leading classifieds service in any medium. The site receives over two million new job listings each month, making it one of the top job boards in the world. The classified advertisements range from traditional buy/sell ads and community announcements, to personal ads and even erotic services.

Newmark says that Craigslist works because it gives people a voice, a sense of community trust and even intimacy. Other factors he cites are consistency of down-to-earth values, customer service and simplicity.”

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY OFF-CAMPUS LIVING [http://offcampus.osu.edu/]

Ohio State University’s Off-Campus website provides news updates on issues and events ranging from cooking classes to traffic notices. Its strong connection to the surrounding community is apparent through its linking with neighborhood association networks, adopt-a-road programs, and OSU’s own community ambassador program. The site details renters’ rights, insurance options, roommate searches, landlord resources, and housing care services available in the area. Further resources made available through OSU’s website are links to childcare, carpool programs, and mediation for disputes arising between roommates or renters and landlords.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Craigslist
While Ohio State University offers a great deal of services on its Off-Campus Services websites, it was found that the overwhelming majority of off-campus websites did not cover or provide material and information beyond basic house-finding services and/or links to external community or commuter websites. Communication and Outreach recognizes the potential for growth and development in this area, an area in which Indiana University can once again be a leader in excellence and innovation.
OFF-CAMPUS STUDENT WEBSITE AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL COMMUNITY

IU’s imagined Off-Campus student website will promote increased cohesiveness among off-campus students and with the greater Bloomington community by creating a space for students to post, discuss, and be kept up-to-date on local events, services, and issues.

- Club and Organization event listings
- Art exhibits
- Music venues, schedules, and special
- Restaurant and Bar locations, links for menu postings and customer reviews
- Movie and Theatre reviews with links to showing times and locations
- Business locations, reviews, and special events or sales
- Food purchasing locations and information
  - BloomingFoods and Co-op Membership
  - Farmers’ Market and Local Growers’ Guild Information
- Local News and Issues
  - Property development
  - Municipal policy changes
- Public Transit Links and Information (including route delays and weather notifications)
- Bloomington Community Event Information (e.g. Lotus Festival)
- Bloomington Volunteer Network Updates and Needs
- Neighborhood Association Links
- City of Bloomington Housing and Neighborhood Development Link
- Crisis Services and Information (e.g. Rape, Domestic Abuse)

The most unique community element of the ideal Off-Campus website would be the potential for interactions among the site’s users. Craigslist.org was successful in cultivating a sense of community that Communication and Outreach would like to create in an Indiana University-specific virtual place. The ability to post student-hosted events or to post information of particular interest to off-campus students would be considered a great asset. Real-time posting forums allow active discussion and social encounters to take place among students who otherwise may never meet or talk to one another. This community contact also aids in a student’s understanding of who they are in the context of the larger student body. Becoming acquainted with other students and their diverse interests and opportunities within the larger community will serve to enrich every student’s experience as both a student at Indiana University and as a resident of Bloomington, Indiana.
EDUCATION

A virtual place connects the students living off-campus to IU and its facilities despite the physical distance separating them from the institution. Via the website format detailed above, students living off-campus would always be connected to the arts and educational opportunities on campus including:

- Tutoring
- IU Lecture Series and Talks
- UnionBoard Event Schedule
- IU Art Museum: Current Art Exhibits and Opening Hours
- Links to existing campus and student online services (e.g. OnCourse, OneStart, IU Auditorium)

Education of off-campus students extends beyond what is offered within the walls of classrooms and campus borders. Many off-campus students face the challenge of living on their own for the first time. This virtual place helps those students cope with the hardships of independent living by supplying them with some of the necessary skills for survival, or the “How-To’s” of everyday life. Examples of topics emphasized in the “How-To’s” of off-campus living would include:

- Cooking tips, discussion forums, and recipe postings and links
- Suggested “student-friendly” service providers (e.g. Plumbing, landscaping)
- Fix-It Tips or Property Management Help
- Mediation Resources (e.g. Household and Landlord disputes)
- Legal Services (e.g. Renters’ Rights, City Housing Regulations)

IDENTITY

The Communication and Outreach subcommittee believe that a majority of a student’s learning and growing during her/his college years translates to self-realization. The interactive element of the Off-Campus website serves to encourage and facilitate the process of self-realization within the truly diverse setting of Indiana University and Bloomington. Strengthening a student’s sense of self and community will allow them to be a more contributing member of the Bloomington community. To aid in furthering developing contributive relationships among students and with the community, the Off-Campus website provides opportunities for students to offer one another assistance, cooperative in exchanges of goods and services, and help to make the lives of student’s living off-campus easier and more enjoyable. These exchanges and interactions can serve to empower young students by encouraging a strong sense of responsibility to other members of a community, as well as for one’s finances, belongings, and personal knowledge. Specific opportunities not listed in previous sections are listed here below.

- Housing and General Classifieds (as on OneStart)
- IU “Marketplace;” students can sell, buy, or trade merchandise such as books or furniture
- General Question and Answer Forum
CONCLUSION: IDEAL PLACES AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In a commencement speech at the College of the Atlantic in Bar Harbor, Maine Wendell Berry provided students with what he considered to be the absolute rules for right living. “Make a home. Help to make a community. Be loyal to what you have made. Put the interest of the community first. Love your neighbors—not the neighbors you pick out, but the ones you have.”

The creation and maintenance of a cooperative house and an off-campus student website at Indiana University would meet Wendell Berry’s goals. A co-op household supported by a website would connect students, local residents and community services in unique and positive ways. Additionally, a cooperative house would directly affect and enhance the lives of each person coming into contact with the house or its residents. An Indiana University student co-op house would provide off-campus social community, life skills education, and the experiences needed for young adults to create his or her identity.

An off-campus student website will connect the Indiana University student with information and updates pertaining to the social community, like skills education, and potential opportunities for cooperation and interaction outside of a student’s immediate household and circle of friends. A website has the potential to come into contact with students in every corner of Bloomington and from every academic discipline.

Wendell Berry's premise is that we must have a particular place, must identify with it, must learn from it, must love it, and must care for it. And only by living in this place long enough, and by attending to the knowledge of those who have lived there before us, will we fully realize the consequences of our presence there: "We may deeply affect a place we own for good or ill," Berry has written, "but our lives are nevertheless included in its life; it will survive us, bearing the results.”

Student housing cooperatives provide place and community for students while in attendance at Indiana University. They will continue to be a place to which students return just as IU alumni continue to return to the IMU. Friendships made through the cooperative have greater potential to survive beyond graduation, thereby strengthening the alumni base of the University. As students return to fraternal organizations decades after leaving them, the creation of a stable physical space such as a co-op house allows students, who do not choose to participate in the Greek system, a chance to return and celebrate his or her own unique Indiana University cooperative living experience.

The creation and maintenance of a virtual connection for Indiana University students living off-campus will provide immediate and up-to-date information and resources for the creation of a strong “gown-town” sense of community. An off-campus student website’s ability to present students with information about local events and services beyond campus will assist in removing or diminishing the “town-gown gap.” Communications and Outreach encourage Indiana University to seriously consider the proposal for establishing a student place “Beyond the Sample Gates.” As Indiana University students, we see the development of cooperative housing and an off-campus student website to be vital to ensure the ideal tradition of off-campus

student communities at Indiana University that successfully and productively co-exist with the long-time residents of the City of Bloomington, Indiana.
Appendix C

VOICE Survey Questions

Academic Experience

The first set of questions asks you about academic experiences you’ve had at Indiana University Bloomington.

1. (If respondent is a freshman ask) How many times during the fall semester did you meet with your advisor?
   <0-25>

   (For all other respondents ask) How many times in a typical semester do you meet with your advisor?

   <0-25>

2. (If respondent is a freshman ask) Overall, how would you rate the quality of academic advising you received during the fall semester?
   1 Excellent
   2 Good
   3 Fair
   4 Poor

   (For all other respondents ask) Overall, how would you rate the quality of academic advising you received since coming to Indiana University?

   1 Excellent
   2 Good
   3 Fair
   4 Poor

3. (For freshman respondents ask) How many times, if any, during the fall semester did you meet informally outside of the classroom with faculty or administrators?
   <0-100>

   (For all others ask) In a typical semester, how many times, if any, do you meet informally outside of the classroom with faculty or administrators?

   <0-100>
4. (For those that indicate they have meet outside classroom ask) How much did meeting informally outside of the classroom with faculty or administrators improve your academic experience at IU?
   1  A lot
   2  Some
   3  Not too much
   4  Not at all

5. (For respondents who are Juniors and higher) Have you studied abroad while attending Indiana University?
   1  Yes
   2  No

6. (If respondent indicates they studied abroad) How much did your experience abroad contribute to your IU education?
   1  Did not contribute
   2  Did not contribute much
   3  Contributed some
   4  Contributed a lot

7. Thinking of the courses you’ve taken at IU, how many do you feel challenged you intellectually, that is, the work was difficult but attainable given sufficient effort and a willingness to seriously engage your thinking skills?
   1  Nearly all
   2  Most
   3  Some
   4  Practically none

8. (For only upper classmen and graduate students ask) To what extent do you feel prepared for what you plan to do professionally after graduation?
   1  Very prepared
   2  Somewhat prepared
   3  Slightly prepared
   4  Not at all prepared
   5  I currently have no specific plans for after graduation

9 Please describe any other experiences at IU that have impacted you academically.

   TEXT BOX

Technology

The next set of questions asks you about technology used in both your classes and around campus.

10. How many of your courses used Oncourse during the fall semester?
    <0-6>
11. How well did your instructors incorporate the following parts of Oncourse into your courses during the fall semester?
   a. Syllabus
   b. Calendar
   c. Assignments
   d. Resources
   e. Messages
   f. Forums
   g. Announcements
   h. Chat Room

   1. Poorly
   2. Not too well
   3. Somewhat
   4. Very well

12. Overall, how satisfied are you with the amount of technology being used in your classes?
   1. Very satisfied
   2. Somewhat satisfied
   3. Not too satisfied
   4. Not at all satisfied

For the following set of questions, you are asked to rank the importance of five on-campus resources. For these questions, assume that you have a finite amount of resources such as space and funding to work with.

13. Which of the following on-campus resources would you allocate the greatest amount of your finite resources?
   1. Printers
   2. Computers
   3. Other technology
   4. Wireless Internet access
   5. Quiet study space

14. (Program survey so when respondent selects the first time then the survey goes to a new page and asks: Which of the following on-campus resources would you allocate the next greatest amount of your finite resources? where the option the respondent initially selected does not display and there are only 4 options.)

15. (When respondent selects a second option program the survey to ask: Which of the following on-campus resources would you allocate the third greatest amount of your finite resources? where the options selected in the previous two do not appear and there are only 3 options)
16. (When respondent selects a third option program survey to ask: Which of the following on-campus resources would you allocate the fourth greatest amount of your finite resources? where the options selected in the previous three options do not appear and there are only 2 options.)

17. How adequately does each of the following on-campus resources meet your current needs?
   1. Very adequately
   2. Somewhat adequately
   3. Somewhat poorly
   4. Very poorly
   5. Do not use

18. (For freshman ask) How often during the fall semester did you use Onestart for anything other than registration and for Bursar/Bill Paying?
   1. Often
   2. Sometimes
   3. Seldom
   4. Never

(For all others ask) In a typical semester, how often do you use Onestart for anything other than registration and for Bursar/Bill Paying?
   1. Often
   2. Sometimes
   3. Seldom
   4. Never

19. Overall, how satisfied are you with Onestart?
   1. Very satisfied
   2. Somewhat satisfied
   3. Not too satisfied
   4. Not at all satisfied

20. Please indicate any additional comments you have about the technology used in your classrooms and around campus.

   TEXT BOX

**IU Services**

There are many services on campus that are available to students, such as the Health Center, entertainment events, and special lectures. The next few questions ask about your use of these services.

21. Overall, how satisfied are you with the following student support services at IU?
   a. Career advising
   b. Student Legal Services
   c. Office of the Bursar
d. Office of the Registrar  
e. Campus bookstore  
f. Indiana Memorial Union  
g. IU Libraries  
h. University Information Technology Services (UITS)  
i. Student Academic Centers (tutoring)  
j. Writing Tutorial Services  
k. Support for international students  
l. Support for non-traditional students

1 Very satisfied  
2 Somewhat satisfied  
3 Not too satisfied  
4 Not at all satisfied  
5 Not applicable/Do not use

22. How much would it benefit you if there were extended hours at support offices such as the Bursar, the Registrar, and Student Academic Centers during peak times of the year?  
1 A lot  
2 Some  
3 Not much  
4 Not at all

23. (For freshman ask) How often did you use the IU Health Center during the fall semester?  
1 Often  
2 Sometimes  
3 Seldom  
4 Never

(For all others ask) In a typical semester, about how often do you use the IU Health Center?  
1 Often  
2 Sometimes  
3 Seldom  
4 Never

24. (For respondents who indicate they’ve used the Health Center ask) Overall, how satisfied are you with services provided by the IU Health Center?  
1 Not at all satisfied  
2 Not too satisfied  
3 Somewhat satisfied  
4 Very satisfied  
5 Not applicable

For the following question, please add together all of the events/exhibits you attended.
25. (For freshmen ask) How many times, during the fall semester, did you attend events or exhibits at the following: IU Auditorium, IU Art Museum, Musical Arts Center (MAC), Jacobs School of Music, Wells-Metz Theatre, or Ruth N Halls Theatre?
   <0-200>

(For all others ask) On average, how many times during a typical semester do you attend events/exhibits at the following: IU Auditorium, IU Art Museum, Musical Arts Center (MAC), Jacobs School of Music, Wells-Metz Theatre, or Ruth N Halls Theatre?
   <0-200>

26. (For respondents who indicated they went to any events/exhibits ask) Overall, how satisfied are you with the events/exhibits you have attended at IU?
   1. Very satisfied
   2. Somewhat satisfied
   3. Not too satisfied
   4. Not at all satisfied

27. (For freshman ask) About how many times, if any, in the fall semester did you attend lectures sponsored by an IU department?
   <0-95>

(For all others ask) About how many times, if any, in a typical semester do you attend lectures sponsored by an IU department?
   <0-95>

28. (For respondents who indicated they attended lectures ask) Overall, how would you rate the lectures you attended?
   1. Excellent
   2. Good
   3. Fair
   4. Poor

29. How informed do you feel you are about cultural events that are happening on campus?
   1. Very informed
   2. Somewhat informed
   3. Not too informed
   4. Not at all informed

30. In a typical week, how often do you go to the Indiana Memorial Union for any reason at all?
   <0-100>

31. Please provide any comments you may have about Indiana University cultural events or student services.
TEXT BOX

Orientation

The next section asks about your experience with orientation.

32. (For all undergraduates ask) Overall, how would you rate freshman orientation?
   1 Excellent
   2 Good
   3 Fair
   4 Poor
   5 Did not attend

33. (For graduate students ask) In your opinion, is there a need for a graduate orientation conducted outside of your department that would cover additional aspects of being an IU graduate student?
   1 Yes
   2 No

34. (For all undergraduates ask) How much did freshman orientation help you adjust to the college academic environment?
   1 A lot
   2 Some
   3 Not too much
   4 Not at all
   5 Did not attend

(For graduate students ask) How much did your departmental graduate orientation help you adjust to the academic environment of graduate school?
   1 A lot
   2 Some
   3 Not too much
   4 Not at all
   5 Department did not have a graduate orientation

35. (For all undergraduates ask) How much did freshman orientation help you adjust to the college social environment?
   1 A lot
   2 Some
   3 Not too much
   4 Not at all
   5 Did not attend

36. Have you ever attended a student organization fair?
   1 Yes
   2 No
37. Are you actively involved in any campus or community organization?
   1 Yes
   2 No

38. (For all undergraduates ask) Please provide any comments you have about freshman orientation.
   
   TEXT BOX
   (For graduates ask) Please provide any comments you have about your department orientation.
   
   TEXT BOX

Residential Experience

In the next section, the questions ask about where you have lived while attending IU.

39. Where do you currently live?
   1 On-campus residence hall
   2 On-campus apartment
   3 Off campus house or apartment
   4 In a fraternity or sorority house
   5 At home with parents
   6 Other

40. (If respondent answers >= 2 in #39) Have you ever lived in the residence halls while attending IU?
   1 Yes
   2 No

41. How often do you use the dining services on campus?
   1 Often
   2 Sometimes
   3 Seldom
   4 Never

42. (If respondent answers 1 to #39 ask) How satisfied are you with each of the following?
   a. Condition of your residence hall
   b. Size of your dorm room
   c. Location of your residence hall in relation to your classes
   d. The amenities of your residence hall
   e. Leadership opportunities provided in your residence hall
   f. Dining facilities
   g. Meal plan
   h. Residence hall sponsored activities
1 Very satisfied
2 Somewhat satisfied
3 Not too satisfied
4 Not at all satisfied

(If respondent answers Yes to #40) How satisfied were you with each of the following?
   a. Condition of your residence hall
   b. Size of your dorm room
   c. Location of your residence hall in relation to your classes
   d. The amenities of your residence hall
   e. Leadership opportunities provided in your residence hall
   f. Dining facilities
   g. Meal plan
   h. Residence hall sponsored activities

   1 Very satisfied
   2 Somewhat satisfied
   3 Not too satisfied
   4 Not at all satisfied

43. (For freshman who answered 1 to #39 ask) Where are you planning on living next school year?
   1 On-campus residence hall
   2 On-campus apartment
   3 Off campus house or apartment
   4 In a fraternity or sorority house
   5 At home with parents
   6 Other

44. (If respondent answers Yes to #40) Did you leave the residence hall after your freshman year?
   1 Yes
   2 No

45. (For freshman who answered >=2 to #43 ask) How important is each of the following for your decision to leave your residence hall:
   a. The condition of your dorm room
   b. Size of your dorm room
   c. The amenities of your residence hall
   d. Dining facilities
   e. Meal plan
   f. Opportunity to make better grades
   g. Moving into fraternity/sorority
   h. Moving in with friends
   i. Cost
   j. Having little privacy
(If respondent answers Yes to #40 AND #44) How important was each of the following for your decision to leave:

a. The condition of your dorm room
b. Size of your dorm room
c. The amenities of your residence hall
d. Dining facilities
e. Meal plan
f. Opportunity to make better grades
g. Moving into fraternity/sorority
h. Moving in with friends
i. Cost
j. Having little privacy
k. Other

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not too important
4 Not at all important

46. (For freshman ask) How does your Resident Assistant (RA) affect your residence hall experience?

1 Very positively
2 Somewhat positively
3 No impact
4 Somewhat negatively
5 Very negatively

(For respondents who answer Yes to #40 ask) How did your Resident Assistant (RA) affect your residence hall experience?

1 Very positively
2 Somewhat positively
3 No impact
4 Somewhat negatively
5 Very negatively

47. (For respondents who answered 1 to #39) In general, how much does dorm life affect your academic success?

1 Harms a lot
2 Somewhat harms
3 Does not impact
4 Somewhat improves
5 Improves a lot

(For respondents who answered Yes to #40 ask) In general, how much did dorm life affect your academic success?
1 Harmed a lot
2 Somewhat harmed
3 Did not impact
4 Somewhat improved
5 Improved a lot

48. (If respondent answered 1 to #39 ask) How much does living in your residence hall provide you with a sense of community?
1 A lot
2 Somewhat
3 Not too much
4 Not at all

(If respondent answered Yes to #40) How much did living in your residence hall provide you with a sense of community?
1 A lot
2 Somewhat
3 Not too much
4 Not at all

49. (For freshman) How helpful is requiring freshman to live in residence halls for each of the following:
   a. Making the transition into college easier
   b. Making friends
   c. Encouraging campus involvement

   1 Very helpful
   2 Somewhat helpful
   3 Not too helpful
   4 Not at all helpful

(For all other undergraduates) How helpful was requiring freshman to live in residence halls for each of the following:
   a. Making the transition into college easier
   b. Making friends
   c. Encouraging campus involvement

   1 Very helpful
   2 Somewhat helpful
   3 Not too helpful
   4 Not at all helpful

120
4 Not at all helpful

50. Overall, how do you think living off campus compares to living on campus?
   1 Off campus is much better
   2 Off campus is somewhat better
   3 They are about the same
   4 On campus is somewhat better
   5 On campus is much better

(Only for undergraduates) Greek Community at Indiana University

The next few questions are about the Greek community at Indiana University. The Greek community includes all active Greek-letter organizations such as fraternities, sororities, professional fraternities, but not honor societies.

51. (Ask only if #39 /= 4) Are you a member of an active Greek-letter organization not including honor societies?
   1 Yes
   2 No

52. (If No to previous question ask) Are you considering becoming a member of an active Greek-letter organization?
   1 Yes
   2 No

53. In your opinion, how valuable an asset is the Greek community to Indiana University with respect to the social environment?
   1 Very valuable
   2 Somewhat valuable
   3 Not too valuable
   4 Not at all valuable
   5 Don’t know/No opinion

54. In your opinion, how valuable an asset is the Greek community to Indiana University with respect to the academic and intellectual environment?
   1 Very valuable
   2 Somewhat valuable
   3 Not too valuable
   4 Not at all valuable
   5 Don’t know/No opinion

55. In your opinion, how valuable an asset is the Greek community to Indiana University with respect to philanthropy and community service?
   1 Very valuable
   2 Somewhat valuable
   3 Not too valuable
   4 Not at all valuable
5 Don’t know/No opinion

56. In your opinion, how valuable an asset is the Greek community to Indiana University with respect to involvement and leadership development on campus?
   1 Very valuable
   2 Somewhat valuable
   3 Not too valuable
   4 Not at all valuable
   5 Don’t know/No opinion

57. Please provide any comments you may have about the Indiana University Greek community.

TEXT BOX

Indiana University and Bloomington Communities

The following questions ask your opinions about the Indiana University and the local community.

58. How supportive do you feel the Bloomington community is of college students?
   1 Very supportive
   2 Somewhat supportive
   3 Not too supportive
   4 Not at all supportive

59. (If respondent indicates they live off campus, 3, in #39) Have you ever had a problem with a landlord while living off campus in Bloomington?
   1 Yes
   2 No

60. (If respondent answers 1 to #59 ask) In your opinion, was the landlord you had a problem with fair and transparent in his or her response?
   1 Yes
   2 No

61. How involved are you in Indiana University outside the classroom?
   1 A lot
   2 Some
   3 Not much
   4 Not at all

62. How much a part of the Indiana University community do you feel?
   1 A lot
   2 Some
   3 Not much
   4 Not at all
63. How much do your peers help your academic success?
   1 A lot
   2 Somewhat
   3 Not too much
   4 Not at all

64. How connected to your peers at Indiana University do you feel?
   1 Very connected
   2 Somewhat connected
   3 Not too connected
   4 Not at all connected

65. (If respondent answers >= 3 to #39) How difficult do you find it to stay involved in the IU community?
   1 Not at all difficult
   2 Not too difficult
   3 Somewhat difficult
   4 Very difficult

66. When alone at night, how safe do you feel on the Indiana University campus?
   1 Very safe
   2 Somewhat safe
   3 Not too safe
   4 Not at all safe

67. When alone at night, how safe do you feel off-campus in Bloomington?
   1 Very safe
   2 Somewhat safe
   3 Not too safe
   4 Not at all safe

68. How often do you use Bloomington city buses?
   1 Never
   2 Not too often
   3 Somewhat often
   4 Often

69. How adequate is the Bloomington city bus system for your needs?
   1 Very adequate
   2 Somewhat adequate
   3 Not too adequate
   4 Not at all adequate

70. How often do you use IU bus services?
   1 Never
2 Not too often
3 Somewhat often
4 Often

71. How adequate is IU bus system for your needs?
   1 Very adequate
   2 Somewhat adequate
   3 Not too adequate
   4 Not at all adequate

72. What do you consider to be irresponsible alcohol consumption?
   Anything over _______ drinks at any one time. TEXT BOX

73. In your opinion, how much does the student culture at IU encourage irresponsible alcohol consumption?
   1 A lot
   2 Some
   3 Not much
   4 Not at all

**Demographics**

The last couple of questions are general information about you.

74. (Ask for all but freshman) What is your current G.P.A.?
   1 0.0 - 2
   2 2.01 - 2.50
   3 2.51 - 3.0
   4 3.01 - 3.50
   5 3.51 - 4.0

75. Are you currently:
   1 Single
   2 Married/Domestic Partnership
   3 Other

76. In what year were you born?
   <1940-1992>

77. Have any of your immediate family members (parents, guardians, siblings) completed a college degree?
   1 Yes
   2 No

78. Do you consider yourself:
   1 African-American (Black American)
2 White, non-Hispanic
3 Asian or Pacific Islander
4 Hispanic (Mex. American, Puerto Rican, Latino)
5 American Indian or Alaskan Native
6 Some other race, please specify:

79. Are you an international student?
   1 Yes
   2 No

80. Are you a citizen of the United States?
   1 Yes
   2 No

81. Are you:
   1 Female
   2 Male

82. What Indiana University school are you in:

   1 College of Arts and Sciences
   2 Jacobs School of Music
   3 Kelley School of Business
   4 School of Education
   5 School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
   6 School of Informatics
   7 School of Journalism
   8 School of Law
   9 School of Library and Information Sciences
   10 School of Nursing
   11 School of Optometry
   12 School of Public and Environmental Affairs
   13 University Graduate School
A big “Thank You” to the following individuals for their help forming and vetting the VOICE Report:

Desiree Zerquera
Luke Fields
Kelley Kish
AD King
Sara Stombaugh
Rhett Tanselle
Joshua Sutton
Matthew Hodes
Liu Qian
Neil Shah
Lindsey Livingston
Alex Sidebottom
Molly Phillips
Tiffany Fick
Sarah Taylor
Angelo Perez
Jennifer Chen
Ruchi Shah
Emily Kasavana
Jerry Dorsey