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How the University of Kentucky is Redefining Living and Learning Spaces on Campus

A POST-OCCUPANCY EVALUATION OF LIVING LEARNING PROGRAMS
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WHAT'S YOUR FAVORITE PLACE TO STUDY?

DOES CC1 FEEL LIKE HOME?

WHAT IS ONE THING YOU WISH YOU COULD CHANGE ABOUT CC1?

WHAT'S YOUR FAVORITE SPOT IN CC1?
The University of Kentucky is radically transforming living and learning opportunities on campus. With potential to build up to 9,000 new residence hall beds in the next five to seven years, we are well positioned to reimagine what it means to live on campus in a university experience. But how can we strategically assess the investments made to the living learning environment and its impact on students? By utilizing a post-occupancy evaluation process, students from the School of Interiors completed a nine-month study to investigate and assess the investment in student living and learning spaces. This book presents the findings of the post occupancy evaluation of a living-learning program in a residence hall to better understand how the spaces are utilized and its impact on learning.

In the Spring Semester of 2015, the University of Kentucky Interior Design Education Studio conducted by Rebekah Radtke, completed a post-occupancy evaluation of Champions Court I to explore the utilization of learning spaces for the Living Learning Programs. The focus of the study determined how public and group space influences student success. Over the course of the summer, a team of four students worked with Rebekah to analyze and synthesize the data collected in the spring semester. Students were involved throughout the process: completing space assessments, behavioral observations, administering questionnaires, conducting focus groups, analyzing data, and making recommendations based on their experiences.

A post-occupancy evaluation (POE) is a systematic assessment of an occupied building to better understand the effectiveness of certain design elements. The key purpose of this POE is to investigate, analyze, and report on the successes and weaknesses of the Champions Court I design to inform future LLP residence hall designs. This methodology can improve new projects for the University of Kentucky and educational design nationwide.

The post-occupancy evaluation explored how space influences student behaviors to understand and track engagement, integrated activities, peer to peer learning, and culture in the residence hall of Champions Court I. The site was selected for the study because of its diverse population, high concentration of LLPs, and location. Our research explored the proportion of private to public spaces, the amount of learning spaces, and the utilization to provide insights for optimal space relationships.
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LITERATURE REVIEW

Student housing has come a long way from the dormitories occupied by the baby boomer generation. The current student population is accustomed to more amenities and more privacy at home. As a result, when they transition to college, students expect more from student housing than their parents did (Students Today Seek Quality Off Campus Housing). Universities have started to redefine what housing should be based on new student demands. Understanding the variety of functions college housing should support is an important step in the design process. Residence Halls differ from dormitories in that they create an environment that encourages much more than just sleeping (Colorado Mountain College). Research is vital to support this change in college housing. Therefore, we need to put an emphasis on post-occupancy evaluations, which benefit both designers and housing occupants. A variety of ideas about the best design for residence halls will be outlined in this literature review.
A main function of student housing is to create community among the residents. Even students recognize that living on campus supports community-building and academics better than off-campus housing (Eligon, 2013). Residence Halls can support students academically and socially by providing faculty offices, learning environments, and educational programs as well as housing students in small groups (Palmer, Broido, & Campbell, 2008). Residence halls should also support students working toward common goals which will prepare them for the professional world (Bordass & Leaman, A New Professionalism: Remedy or Fantasy?, 2013). This could come in the form of Living Learning Programs that encourage students to work together to create their own learning environment and enhance their areas of expertise. Universities are now shrinking the typical size of bedrooms to make more room for community spaces that encourage interaction among residents (Fabris, 2014). This gives evidence that universities highly value having a sense of community within residence halls.
In order to maximize retention in on-campus housing, we must understand students’ reasons for staying or leaving (Li, Sheely II, & Whalen). This information can be uncovered by communicating with residents in the form of focus groups, questionnaires, or other techniques (Dorms of Distinction: Top Residence Halls for Today’s Students, 2008). It is important for designers to understand that building occupants are “experts” on how a building functions for their needs (Watson, 2003). Opinions of students and staff should be taken seriously so their concerns can be addressed by designers. Residence halls must be up-to-date in order to attract college students to live there (Students Today Seek Quality Off Campus Housing). The residence hall needs to give students some amenities and privacy in order to encourage them to stay on campus, but not too much privacy, as it may discourage student interaction. To increase retention, residence halls must find a good middle-ground between private and open spaces.
Students expect amenities in their housing, and therefore colleges are now competing with one another for the top students by increasing the appeal of their residence halls (Fabris, 2014). While residence halls are an important factor in a student’s choice of college, it is important that the amenities aren’t overpowering the educational aspects of college. A student’s environment can greatly affect their behavior, so the amenities added should promote learning and interaction (Herman Miller). Adding amenities can greatly increase the cost of student housing, and can divide the campus between the ‘haves and have-nots’ if some residence halls are out of reach for less privileged students (Zalaznick, 2014). Amenities can be great for students and universities as long as the cost is controlled, allowing all students to benefit.
Building evaluations collect evidence to inform future design (Bordass, Stevenson, & Leaman, Building Evaluation: Practice and Principles, 2010). Fortunately, they also have the power to improve the current state of the evaluated building by giving suggestions for changes or renovations. A great way to include occupants into the evaluation process is to seek their feedback. This will encourage cooperation and empower them to give opinions that will improve the future of design (Watson, 2003). Post-occupancy evaluations should be unbiased and produce results that are easy to understand for the public (Bordass, Stevenson, & Leaman, Building Evaluation: Practice and Principles, 2010). One way to keep post-occupancies unbiased is by including actual quotes from occupants in the findings. It is tempting for designers to hide the weaknesses of their buildings, but being transparent with the results produces the best outcome.
Sustainability is a major factor in residence hall design, not only because universities are concerned with the environment, but because they need to design with the future in mind. In order to build a residence hall that can stand the test of time, it is necessary to get feedback on buildings that are already in use. Analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of current buildings can prevent mistakes from being repeated in future buildings (Bordass & Leaman, Making Feedback and Post-Occupancy Evaluation Routine 1: A Portfolio of Feedback Techniques, 2005). Sustainability lowers future costs by conserving energy and resources and by allowing the building to be useful for longer (Fabris, 2014). In the interest of sustainable design, the focus should be on long-term usage and innovation.
Living Learning Programs are increasing in popularity in university residence halls. They help to create learning environments outside of the classroom for students with similar career goals and interests. When there are spaces that support students academically in their residence halls, their classroom performance is improved (Palmer, Broido, & Campbell, 2008). Living Learning Programs also aid in a smooth transition from high school to college. This includes adapting socially as well as academically (Brower & Inkelas, 2010). When students are able to form community around similar interests and majors, they are able to connect to their campus and feel secure, which allows them to focus and better thrive in their academic pursuits.
CONCLUSION

Residence hall design is rapidly changing as we learn new ways to support students’ needs. By utilizing the findings from this study can inform issues relating to community building and student success and how the environment can impact the university experience. The utilization of evidence in future design processes is called evidence-based design. By using evidence based design, the University of Kentucky can be an innovative leader in research driven design models with a multidisciplinary collaborative team of administrators, staff, faculty, and most importantly, students.
CASE STUDIES

These case studies share aspects with the goals and context of the University of Kentucky’s residence halls including sustainability, amenities, furniture use, Living-Learning Programs, student retention, communities, and engagement. Other contemporary residence hall projects give insight into the challenges and potential solutions of residential hall design.
FRED D. BROWN JR. HALL
Architects Weeks Ambrose McDonald, Inc. and Cope Associates
2014

$3600 per semester
2 students
Bathroom

$3400 per semester
4 students
Bathroom

50 million dollar project
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN

245,000 square feet

680 beds

= 100 beds
The University of Tennessee’s newest residence hall in 40 years, Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall, was completed in 2014. The hall was built to attract new students with modern amenities and to improve student retention by supporting interaction and relationships among the students. Director of housing, Frank Cuevas, explains:

“There’s more community space... If we can get students to get engaged with one another and get more connected, then we know that by providing that support mechanism for each other, they are more likely to feel more part of the campus, and we know that has ripple effects as we’re looking at over-all retention rates (Boehnke, 2014).”
The site of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall is located along Andy Holt Avenue (a central street of the campus) and a pedestrian plaza. The residence hall is integrated into the campus at this central location by providing public seating areas at its balcony, patio, and two dining locations: Subway and Twisted Taco. These public eateries are situated on the ground level of the residence hall's atrium which also features a water fountain, seating, and an art gallery exhibiting student pieces. This public space celebrates the UT students by creating an atmosphere of artistic expression while also giving the students a sense of ownership. From this public atrium, students can move into the residential part of the hall by traveling up a grand staircase made of glass. The spirit of the University of Tennessee is demonstrated Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall as its stair towers glow orange, the school’s color.

SPIRIT OF PLACE

The site of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall is located along Andy Holt Avenue (a central street of the campus) and a pedestrian plaza. The residence hall is integrated into the campus at this central location by providing public seating areas at its balcony, patio, and two dining locations: Subway and Twisted Taco. These public eateries are situated on the ground level of the residence hall’s atrium which also features a water fountain, seating, and an art gallery exhibiting student pieces. This public space celebrates the UT students by creating an atmosphere of artistic expression while also giving the students a sense of ownership. From this public atrium, students can move into the residential part of the hall by traveling up a grand staircase made of glass. The spirit of the University of Tennessee is demonstrated Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall as its stair towers glow orange, the school’s color.
Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall houses many students from the University of Tennessee’s Chancellor’s Honors Program and Living Learning Communities. The design of its living quarters and communal interiors supports community through intentional arrangement of bedrooms, where students are grouped into “pods” of 31 students, including a resident advisor. Each pod establishes identity through unique color schemes and the ways in which they facilitate personalization. Community was further designed in Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall’s living quarters and communal interiors.

Each suite has a board located outside their entrance in the hallway which can be personalized by the residents or the resident advisor. The pods also have posting walls for the resident advisor to post memos or programming boards, facilitate interaction and community on a small and manageable level by including a small alcove with seating to accommodate either study or socializing on an intimate level.

Two pods make up a wing of the building and each wing features a large common room for studying and socializing. These rooms are 3,000 square feet and can accommodate substantial gatherings of students, making these common rooms a perfect spot to form relationships, community, and culture. Each common room further forms its own identity through unique color schemes and lighting.
The large common rooms are just one example of the various spaces and amenities offered to the residents of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall. In addition to the large common areas, art gallery, two dining options, small pod alcoves, the outdoor seating areas, Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall also offers a large meeting room with a catering kitchen, large laundry room, post office, recreational room, workout room, and conference rooms on each floor. Many of these spaces are strategically located on the first floor of the hall in order to facilitate more interaction among students of different floors.

The meeting room is spacious at 1,700 square feet, and can be divided in up to three different rooms in order to accommodate a variety of groups and events. The room integrates technology, including podiums, speakers, smart boards, and projectors, to facilitate lectures and conferences. The furniture adds to the flexibility of the space, as all pieces are lightweight and movable. The rectangular tables can stand alone or be arranged in a variety of groupings, while the round tables can facilitate more intimate conversations or group work. The meeting room can also be set up for more formal lectures and events by assembling individual chairs in rows.

The laundry room located on the first floor of the hall, supports the 680 residents with nearly 40 machines. It is designed to accommodate other activities students are likely to do while waiting for their laundry, such as eating, relaxing, or studying. Tables and chairs support these extra activities in addition to providing space to fold and sort laundry.

The post office is conveniently located on the second floor of the atrium, along a high traffic area where student enter and exit the building. The students can receive electronic notifications when they receive packages.

The recreational room is also located on the first floor. This is a space designed solely for entertainment purposes. The space includes a 60 inch flat screen and sofa, perfect for watching television or gaming. Additional seating is provided behind the sofa to allow more students to join in with the activities, or just observe while eating or studying on the bar height table surface. The room also has a pool table, ping-pong table, and small chairs that are a hybrid between stools and ottomans. These chairs provide convenient seating for this highly active space.

A small exercise room is located on the first floor for added convenience to the students. The work-out room includes several treadmills, bikes, and elliptical machines for quick cardio sessions. The room also provides free weights for simple weight lifting regimens.

Conference rooms are located on every floor adjacent to the large common rooms, and provide a more private space for group work. The rooms are transparent with their glass doors and windows, which provide views to the common rooms and outside. These spaces include mobile conference tables and office chairs to accommodate different group activities.
The selection of furnishings in the common areas of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall greatly impact the way students interact and become a part of the community of the University of Tennessee. The furniture promotes a variety of activities, including group study, private study, socializing, entertaining, snacking, resting, and physical conditioning.

The variety of seating offered in this residence hall is significant to its success. The meeting room has one type of chair that can be moved into a multitude of different arrangements for many different types of activities. The conference rooms and common areas all feature this same mobility, which allows students to get the most use out of their spaces. The space can therefore be used in its entirety to host RA programs, be broken down into medium sized groups to facilitate group study or entertainment, or allow an individual student to study alone, while still having the ability to feel a part of the action. Large, modular sofas will facilitate the larger group activities. Booths coupled with counters and bar seating accommodate those more intimate groups, giving that “internet café feel” (Gilman, 2014). Arm chairs provide comfortable seating for those working alone. Ottomans with a hard surface provide flexibility and offer a place to prop up feet and relax, a place to set down belongings, a surface for working, and additional seating. By providing many options in seating, the residence hall is truly providing options for community building.

The aesthetic of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall’s furniture is contemporary and bright, which creates a youthful and energetic space. Although this style is fashionable at the moment, some may worry that similarly bold and contemporary looks may not be vogue for long, and that furniture will have to be updated. The furniture in this residence hall however has the potential to last because of its classic lines and proportions. The furniture does not veer far from the traditional or transitional furniture many students may have grown up with in their childhood homes, and has therefore been comforting and appealing to the students.

The furniture selected for Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall is used by its residents not only because the styling is perfect for its residents but also because the utility of the furniture is also apparent for its users. For example, the recreational room includes very standard furniture: a sofa, pool table, and tennis table. The utility of these items is obvious: play and lounge. The introduction of a more novel item into this space, such as the Safeco Zenergy chairs has added more interest and variety to the room, without adding any confusion. These chairs look more like a cross between stools and ottomans than the chairs people are used to, however, the Safeco Zenergy chairs in the context of the recreational room have clear utility to the students. The chairs are used as quick seating in between turns at the pool table or as extra seating for observers. In this context, unusual and novel items are incorporated seamlessly into a functional space.
The design of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall assists with its administration. The space planning, communication systems, and key card access systems all aid in maintaining the security of almost 700 students, and the spaces delegated to residence programming allows the staff to make connections with their residents. The main desk is located in front of the only entrance into the residence hall, so that staff may directly see everyone who enters and exits. Not only is the staff able to maintain security at this key location but they can also greet and chat with students, which provides another opportunity to foster community and relationships. While working behind this front desk, staff also has the ability to monitor many areas of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall with its 96 security cameras. Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall contains systems that also maintain the safety of its students efficiently. The key card access system allows students to enter the residential hall and their own rooms with their student ID cards. This means students don’t have to keep track of another key. If a student should misplace their key card, staff has access to the student’s room and can let them in without having to check out any keys. Students appreciate the ease of this system, as freshman Sarah Henson remarked, “It’s just easy because you don’t have to worry about losing a key because you always have your little card on you” (Wigdahl, 2014). The message board system is another system that promotes student safety. The message boards are great communication tools that not only inform the students about community and residential events, but they also issue warnings for any emergencies.

Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall is built for great Residential Advising programs. The building features an office filled with supplies for the RAs to create programming boards for their own posting walls.

**ADMINISTRATION**

The design of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall assists with its administration. The space planning, communication systems, and key card access systems all aid in maintaining the security of almost 700 students, and the spaces delegated to residence programming allows the staff to make connections with their residents. The main desk is located in front of the only entrance into the residence hall, so that staff may directly see everyone who enters and exits. Not only is the staff able to maintain security at this key location but they can also greet and chat with students, which provides another opportunity to foster community and relationships. While working behind this front desk, staff also has the ability to monitor many areas of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall with its 96 security cameras. Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall contains systems that also maintain the safety of its students efficiently. The key card access system allows students to enter the residential hall and their own rooms with their student ID cards. This means students don’t have to keep track of another key. If a student should misplace their key card, staff has access to the student’s room and can let them in without having to check out any keys. Students appreciate the ease of this system, as freshman Sarah Henson remarked, “It’s just easy because you don’t have to worry about losing a key because you always have your little card on you” (Wigdahl, 2014). The message board system is another system that promotes student safety. The message boards are great communication tools that not only inform the students about community and residential events, but they also issue warnings for any emergencies.

Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall is built for great Residential Advising programs. The building features an office filled with supplies for the RAs to create programming boards for their own posting walls.
Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall can be expected to accomplish its goals of attracting new students while retaining existing students. The residence hall’s design is supporting these goals by providing contemporary amenities to today’s students, and by supporting students’ social well-being. Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall’s exemplary design features include its attractive and functional spaces, variety of seating, grouping of intimate student pods, and congruity within the University of Tennessee’s campus and spirit.

CONCLUSION

Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall can be expected to accomplish its goals of attracting new students while retaining existing students. The residence hall’s design is supporting these goals by providing contemporary amenities to today’s students, and by supporting students’ social well-being. Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall’s exemplary design features include its attractive and functional spaces, variety of seating, grouping of intimate student pods, and congruity within the University of Tennessee’s campus and spirit.
NORTH CAMPUS RESIDENCE HALL
Perkins+Will
2007-2009

Roger Williams University
Bristol, RI

350 beds

6 students
$4285 per semester

38.8 million dollar project

1 student
$6395 per semester
120,000 square feet

10 students $4285-5205 per semester

4 students $5655 per semester

6 students $5655 per semester

3 students $5655 per semester
INTRODUCTION

Roger Williams University built the North Campus Residence Hall with the goal of increasing on-campus living rates to 80% by providing attractive amenities. The site of the new residence hall was strategically chosen to establish and grow a new section of campus, by adding more residence halls.
North Campus Residence Hall is positioned to take full advantage of its views of Mount Hope Bay and has demonstrated the school’s mission statement, “learning to bridge the world”. By extending the campus to the bay, the school has made itself into a port of knowledge and influence. The residence hall has also united its commuting members with its on-campus residents. Built in between the main campus and the north parking area, the residence hall acts as a gateway for pedestrians to enter and exit Roger Williams University, funneling people through its courtyard. North Campus Residence Hall also enables commuters to become engaged on campus by providing a café, game room, and a great room for public use on the ground level. This allows commuting students to be united with its on-campus residents. The courtyard provides commuters with a convenient work or waiting space to occupy their times between classes, and a recreational area including volleyball and basketball courts.

The architecture of the residence hall creates an enhanced connection to the site through its V-shaped form and upper level walkways bridging the wings of the building. The path of the commuting students goes through the wings and courtyard of the building, forming a gateway. The courtyard is situated between the two wings of the building. The materials applied to the building change as the social context of the building changes. The walkways which bridge the wings of the building are mainly glass, which allows students inside and outside of the building to visually interact, and also provides beautiful views to the bay. The interior of the building’s wings which form the border of the courtyard is paneled in wood, creating a warm and modern social area. The gateway passages throughout the building feature gold painted panels, marking the transition to campus with importance. The façades of North Campus Residence Hall which face the main campus are clad in brick in order to maintain the traditional aesthetic of the established campus.
Perkins+Will

North Campus Residence Hall’s designs will attract incoming freshman, and retain currently enrolled students. The residence hall features six different sized units, ranging from individual suites to ten person apartments. The variety in student housing attracts upperclassmen who have already formed social groups. The residence hall also provides a few private suites and efficiency apartments. The residences contain living rooms, bathrooms, and kitchens.

The common areas will appeal to a variety of students with amenities such as a café, classroom, great room, “jam room” for music, and many seating areas for socializing or studying. The corridor spaces double as social and study spaces with plenty of seating.
CIRCULATION AND INTERACTION

The corridors encourage interaction among the residents throughout the building by allowing everyone to feel included. Residents don’t have to approach a closed door to a study room full of people and wonder if they are allowed in. The openness of the gathering areas also provides students with opportunities for positive distractions and chance encounters. The walkways which connect both halves of the building also act as lounge areas, meaning that students from either wing will congregate in the same spaces. The walkways feature glass walls which provide the students the ability to see what is going on in the courtyard or in other common spaces in the building. The large glass walls also give students a wonderful view of the bay.

The walkways between the two wings of the residence hall allow residents to interact with each other, while the positioning of the two wings allows the residents to interact with other students and the public while maintaining security. One section of the building is open to the public on the lower level, so that the commuters feel engaged on campus, while the other wings of the building are for residents only. The division between public and private space allows both residents and non-residents to feel at home on campus.
Perkins + Will achieved LEED Silver certification on the North Campus Residence Hall. The firm focused on working toward carbon neutrality, making sure that all aspects of the design required little CO₂ consumption and emission. The firm did an excellent job of making sustainable choices in selecting materials and products, and designing a building that would use energy and resources efficiently. Perkins + Will defined and used materials that were locally available to the residence hall. Some of these materials included cypress and cedar wood and brick, which were applied to the exterior of the building. Use of local material reduces CO₂ usage as the fuel required for shipping and transportation is minimized. The design firm also made use of recycled and reused materials through their selection of salvaged brick and furnishings made up of recycled content. The firm looked to the future by selecting materials and components that would be able to be reused or recycled after the building’s life span.

Sustainable design choices also directly impact how much energy and resources the building will use during its lifetime. The building will save energy in heating and cooling costs through natural ventilation, which uses seasonal winds to help cool the building in the summer. Perkins + Will studied the angles of the sun on the building to maximize heat retention during the winter months and to minimize heat absorption during the summer months. The building will save energy in heating and cooling water by using the stable temperature of the ground to regulate water temperature through the use of underground well systems. In the interior, kitchens save energy with ENERGY STAR® appliances. The building will save energy on lighting as natural lighting has been maximized through the use of large glass walls to the exterior and the positioning of windows.

Educating the users of a building on sustainable practices can make a big impact on a building’s sustainability as well. The student group EcoReps educates new students on how to make the most use of the facility. For example, students can control cross-ventilation with their windows.

Perkins + Will were able to create North Campus Residence Hall under budget, and through good sustainable design, the costs associated with running the building will be another opportunity for savings.
TREE HOUSE STUDENT RESIDENCE

ADD Inc.

2012

4 students
$5200 per semester

52 million dollar project

3 students
$5720 per semester
MassArt Boston, MA

2 students $5200 per semester

146,000 square feet

5 students $4290–$5200 per semester

493 beds
Massachusetts College of Art and Design (MassArt) built the Tree House Student Residence in reaction to the school’s shortage on student housing. The building’s construction was part of a plan to increase the percentage of students living on campus from 26% to 44%, with a focus on housing 95% of all freshman students. The high rise has already become an icon of the Boston skyline since its completion in 2012.
COMMUNITY AND IDENTITY

The residence hall resonates with the culture of the campus and its students, and also the city on a grander scale. An architectural critic for the Boston Globe, Robert Campbell, regards Tree House Student Residence as “the most interesting Boston high-rise in years” (Campbell, 2012). The design of the building connects students to the city by including a public café and night club venue for underage students. Public outdoor spaces encourage interaction between students and other Boston residents through their use of warming tables and seating. The night venue and café were conceptualized by students who were given the opportunity to participate in design charrettes for the project. By allowing students to give input, the design firm was able to create a distinctive identity and community for this residence.

The design firm hosted a charrette with 85 participants, many of whom were MassArt design students. The students were inspired by the 1909 Gustav Klimt painting “Tree of Life”, which guided the building’s façade and interior design to feature juxtapositions of neutral and vibrant colors. Tree House Student Residence’s furniture is vibrant and contemporary, offset by wood tones and charcoal carpets.

Not only does the style of the residence hall appeal to its residents, but it also provides facilities that pique the interest of its art students. Informal art studios are on each of the residential floors, allowing for spontaneous collaboration between residents. Marker boards are also provided outside of each residence, which give these art students creative freedom to personalize their own spaces.
Tree House Student Residence offers a variety of amenities to encourage freshmen to live on campus. The common areas also serve to get students engaged in their work and to become part of a campus community. The planning of these different spaces encourages students to venture away from their rooms and congregate on the lower levels. The ground level features public dining, a night-time venue, and a large sitting area “living room” for students to gather. The second floor contains a student health facility, which is convenient for the nearly 500 residents. The third floor is called the “pajama floor”. The pajama floor holds many of the common areas of the residence hall and is the main center of congregation. Its name reflects the homey, casual nature of the spaces found on the level: a kitchen, laundry room, game room, television lounge, workout room, and vending area. The Tree House Student Residence lives up to the “house” part of its name, as it was designed much like a home, with private rooms in one section, and the public gathering spaces away from those rooms. This provides students with a comfortable balance between privacy and interaction.
The outer paneling of the Tree House Student Residence is a great example of design that is cost saving without losing aesthetics. The paneling consists of metal sheeting in wood tones instead of a more expensive wood veneer. The metal still gives the organic and natural colors integral to the “Tree of Life” concept. The apparent randomness of the application is actually calculated for further cost savings. The architects created alternating patterns up the façade, which streamlined manufacturing and installation.

The interior of the residence hall features sustainability harvested, Forestry Stewardship Council certified woods. The hall “boasts high energy efficiency, low-flow plumbing fixtures, and materials with recycled content” (Block, 2013). Tree House Student Residence has achieved LEED Silver status, proving that sustainable design does not have to compromise good design.
SIMMONS HALL

Steven Holl

2002

$4925 per semester

1 student

$4355 per semester

2 students

78.5 million dollar project
MIT
Cambridge, MA

195,000 square feet

350 beds

= 100 beds

Simmons Hall
2002
$49.25 million dollar project
Steven Holl

$43.55

1 student
per semester

2 students
per semester

BATHROOM

LEVELS
INTRODUCTION

Simmons Hall was built on MIT’s campus in 2002. The goal of the structure was to create an extension of the city onto the campus, a safe place to experience living on their own. As Yehuda Safran explains, “the student community has been offered not a machine for living, but a city segment to experiment with and to discover” (Gannon & Denison, 2004). Therefore, the design of Simmons Hall included many commons areas with amenities for the contemporary student, while creating a new aesthetic that would speak to both the campus and city skyline.
Simmons Hall is very unique in its appearance. Its block-like form has earned it several nicknames, including the affectionate “sponge”. Its programming called for common areas that encourage interaction, so architect Steven Holl’s approach was to create organic spaces and voids to facilitate encounters. The result is a sponge-like building with transparent views and passageways into the building. The architectural details in the interior play upon the organic quality of a sponge, while the exterior maintains the reference to an existing modular city block with rectilinear qualities. The interior walls are curvilinear with bulges and recesses to create mystery and complexity and encourage exploration in the space.
Simmons Hall houses a mixture of science, math, and engineering students, many of whom already possess a curious spirit. The common areas in Simmons Hall encourage these students to get to know one another and interact with the building and community. These common areas include a theater, night café, street level dining, popular rooftop terraces, and lounges. The seemingly random placement of the lounges encourages students to explore the building in search of new niches in the building. The over-arching concept of letting students find each other organically permeates throughout Simmons Hall.

The students who live in Simmons hall have called themselves “Sims” and have a love for their residence hall. The hall has become just as much of an MIT campus icon as the Baker House built by Alvar Aalto. Further adding to the residence hall’s unique community is the grouping of students into “houses”, creating several communities of 30-40 students. Former student residents Amanda and Renee reminisced over their times living in the MIT residence hall.

Amanda explained, “I lived in a tower on a higher floor, which is a smaller niche group. Long floors have a bigger ‘dorm’ community.”

Renee agreed, “The architecture creates a wide variety in living groups, and has a huge effect on social relationships” (Chu, 2009).
SUSTAINABILITY

The design concept of Simmons Hall is derived from the natural form of the sponge, and inspiration for sustainability was drawn from the same source. The heating and cooling costs of the building have been reduced because of the porosity of the building, which allows for natural ventilation. The building features 5,538 2’x2’ windows. Each of the students’ rooms contains nine fully operable windows, which allow students to have a great control over their own thermal comfort while lowering energy costs.

In addition to the energy saving windows, the wall thickness also provides passive thermal regulation. As architect Steven Holl explains, “An 18” wall depth shades out the summer sun while allowing the low angled winter sun to help heat the building” (Steven Holl Architects).
Tietgenkollegiet
Lundgaard & Tranberg
2005

1 student
$1813
per semester

1 student
$1883
per semester

1 student
$1953
per semester

1 student
$2024
per semester
Copenhagen Business School
Copenhagen, Denmark

= 100 beds

288,000 square feet

= 1 student

$2094 per semester

= 1 student

$3000 per semester

360 beds

LEVELS
The celebrated Tietgenkollegiet residence hall at the Copenhagen Business School in Denmark was built in 2005 in order to attract more international students. The resulting architectural gem has indeed attracted many students, resulting in a waiting list that spans over a year.

**INTRODUCTION**

The celebrated Tietgenkollegiet residence hall at the Copenhagen Business School in Denmark was built in 2005 in order to attract more international students. The resulting architectural gem has indeed attracted many students, resulting in a waiting list that spans over a year.
Community and Interaction

The building is circular with housing units arranged around a central courtyard. Each of the student “homes” accommodates 12 students in private rooms, with two rooms reserved for international students. Each of the six residential floors contains five unique student homes. The total number of beds provided in the circle-shaped residence hall is 360, which is symbolic of the degrees which make up a circle. This symbolism is representative of the individual’s part in the community of Tietgenkollegiet. Each private room is located on the outer facing wall, occupying their own slice of the circular structure.

The common areas of the homes face the courtyard. These include large kitchens with dining tables and sitting areas, referencing the kitchen as the center of household gatherings. Resident Kasper can attest, “The best part of living at Tietgen is the life in the kitchen. I appreciate having someone to come home to... that there are lovely people with whom you can share your day. It’s really like a sort of family” (Tietgenkollegiet Amager). The homes also contain an extra room to serve as a flexible space that residents can use how they wish. Some students have turned these rooms into screening rooms and bars. These common rooms are open to other students outside of the “home” and are highly transparent to the inner courtyard and student homes across the building, promoting interaction among residents. Resident Nicolas explains:

“You feel a sense of community across the kitchens, not because you necessarily know them but because you can see them across the circle. If I see a party going on somewhere in the building, I would definitely consider going over there. You feel welcome everywhere in the building (Tietgenkollegiet Amager).”
Tietgenkollegiet provides many amenities for its residents outside of the “home” units. The first floor of the residence hall contains laundry rooms, mailboxes, computer rooms, and a venue for hosting parties and events. The interior courtyard provides benches for studying or gathering. Tietgenkollegiet also meets its residents’ transportation needs through its bicycle parking systems and an underground parking garage of over 100 spaces. The students typically ride bikes, so parking spaces are often rented out to business professionals working in Copenhagen.
VAN METER HALL
HMFH Architects, Inc.
2011

1 student
$3920 per semester

2 students
$2927 per semester
Van Meter Hall at the University of Massachusetts was renovated in 2011 in order to improve the common areas and meet the needs of contemporary students. The building was originally constructed in 1957 in the Georgian Revival style, the same style and period of the central campus area. In order to keep in character with the area, the University chose to renovate rather than replace the historic building.
While saving the exterior of Van Meter Hall kept the Spirit of the UMass campus, the new interiors are able to support the modern culture of its students. Van Meter Hall’s residents are comprised of incoming freshman and art students, therefore it was of great importance to design the interiors to create a “space for young artists to explore their interests and ideas, create a community, and a home within the university campus”, design principle at HMFH Architects Laura Wernick explains (Higginbotham, 2013). Design features catered toward these art students include display space in the lounges to accommodate wall art and three-dimensional pieces of student work, marker boards for sharing ideas, as well as an overall vibrant and youthful aesthetic.
The styling of Van Meter Hall is eclectic, featuring both historic architecture and contemporary design. While undergoing construction, Van Meter Hall’s original columns were discovered hidden among wiring. The new interior design of the hall has incorporated these lost architectural features. New features in design include glass walls and partitions, vibrant color schemes of red, green, orange, and blue, graphically patterned floors, dramatic lighting, and contemporary furniture.
Even more attractive than Van Meter’s style is its amenities. Students at Van Meter Hall have access to a kitchen, laundry room, lounge, mail room, dance room, recreational room, and meeting room. These common areas of Van Meter Hall are all located on the first two floors of the residence hall and are all open to one another, meaning that students are encouraged to interact openly without exclusivity and closed doors.
HULLABALOO HALL
Treanor Architects and SHW Group
2013

$3713 per semester
2 students

$4613 per semester
2 students

$3713 per semester
4 students
Texas A&M College Station, TX

100 beds

253,452 square feet

648 beds

1 student

$4963 per semester

66 million dollar project

LEVELS

1 2 3 4 5
Hullabaloo Hall joined Texas A&M’s campus in 2013. It has already become a landmark on that campus, linking the future of the university to its past. The residence hall’s name is derived from the school’s Aggie War Hymn, written in the trenches of World War I by a student. The Hall has been said to celebrate the “Aggie Spirit”. The school colors and logos have been incorporated into Hullabaloo’s design. The hall design also references the older housing that once stood at its site: McInnis Hall, Crocker Hall and Moore Hall. Bricks from these old dorms have been salvaged and reused in Hullabaloo Hall’s fireplace. Old t-shirts from these dorms have also been sewn into a nostalgic quilt for Hullabaloo Hall.
Texas A&M provides its students with many amenities in this new residence hall. On Hullabaloo Hall’s first floor is a convenience store named “Rattlers”, stocked with groceries, household supplies, and Texas A&M branded products. The Hall also provides a large kitchen for every 40 students, making cooking a convenient alternative to fast food. Students share lounges and study rooms with the same 40 residents that they share kitchens with, allowing students to easily form relationships. In addition to these intimate study and social spaces, Hullabaloo Hall also provides specialized social and study spaces on a grander scale, allowing students to explore their interests and meet students which share the same interests. These amenities include two music rooms, a 3,000 square foot game room, conference rooms, and a media room.
Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

North Campus Residence Hall
Roger Williams University

Treehouse Student Residence
Massachusetts College of Art and Design

Simmons Hall
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Tietgenkollegiet
Copenhagen Business School

Van Meter Hall
University of Massachusetts

Hullabaloo Hall
Texas A&M
"We also are creating a campus more closely linked to a resurgent downtown that is becoming a destination place for our community. Together, we are a university city that grows best when we grow together—something we have committed to now and for the future."

—University of Kentucky President Eli Capilouto
Located on North Campus, Champions Court I is a co-ed residence hall opened in 2014 under the university’s contract with EdR. The residence hall holds 740 residents on its eight floors. It features living learning communities, which place students with the same major or with similar interests together and provide activities and special services that are related to the community. The residence hall featured the Engineering Residential College, EDLIFE Community, iNet Community, CI Connect Community, and Business Enterprise Community during the 2014-2015 school year.

Champions Court I features two-bedroom suites, providing students with their own room and one bathroom to share. Each floor includes between 2-6 study rooms, and laundry rooms on floors one and two. The third floor features a community kitchen for the residence hall with a stove, dishwasher, and full size refrigerator. The eighth floor features a rooftop garden for residents to enjoy. The second floor looks onto the lobby below, providing an open, inviting feeling to the space. The residence hall also includes murals created by students at the University of Kentucky in the College of Design.
Champions Court 1
Located on the corner of Ave. Of Champions, S Martin Luther King Blvd., And Lexington Ave.
Champions Court I
Sherman, Carter, Barnhart
2013

2 students
$3904 per semester

45.6 million dollar project
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY

285,000 square feet

740 beds

$3904 per semester

2013 millon dollar project

Sherman, Carter, Barnhart

2 students

2 levels
Rebekah Radtke, Assistant Professor, led an interior design education studio course, unofficially titled ‘Live Learn Studio’ at the University of Kentucky during the Spring 2015 semester. This course focused on post-occupancy evaluation of Champions Court I, a north campus residence hall. The class of 12 second year interior design students created high quality design research that supports student and faculty collaborative research on the University of Kentucky campus.
Beginning with IRB certification, students completed a series of online tests to certify the students as researchers and to ensure the students know the appropriate process for collecting data. After each student in the Live Learn Studio became IRB certified, they completed several research exercises including analyzing articles and designing infographics. While researching articles, the students worked in a study room in Champions Court I, which helped them to understand the design of the building and stay focused on the importance of the task at hand. Being exposed to scholarly articles allowed students to look at residence halls in a new way, explore modern educational design ideas, and guide their focus to certain topics. Designing infographics for the research ideas they discovered helped to organize information, see relationships among ideas, and share findings visually with others.
To incorporate the students’ research, the class brainstormed four main goals: sense of place, productivity, community interaction, and learning styles. The students explored these issues in a creative way by designing and submitting entries to a mural competition for the new UK residence halls. Four of the students in the Live Learn Studio won the competition and will have their mural designs featured in the new residence halls.
In addition, students were asked to design a learning intervention for campus. Students were challenged to design a learning environment for the future that allows learning to occur everywhere, and helps increase student engagement and learning retention. Solutions varied from desks that accommodate learning disabilities to interactive way-finding kiosks throughout campus.
In order to explore the world of educational design, students submitted videos to a Herman Miller contest that answered the question, “What’s next in learning spaces?”. The students worked together in groups of four, taking ten days to create a storyboard, film, and edit footage to create a video submission. Of the three groups, one student group received an honorable mention from the national competition for their submission.
The final project of the semester allowed students to design a residence hall for the University of Kentucky on the site that Limestone Park I and II are currently being built. The students worked in groups of two and utilized the research they had conducted to inform their designs. The final design was presented to UK Housing staff and administration. These projects explored themes of sense of place, student success, and local culture.
Throughout the semester, the students in Live Learn Studio had the opportunity to participate in Radtke's post-occupancy evaluation by completing observations at Champions Court I in shifts from 8 am to 2 am. Some students also took part in organizing focus groups and a community activity to better understand the opinions of the residents of Champions Court I after the semester was completed. The data collected was organized by a research team of undergraduate students and their professor, Rebekah Radtke, and is illustrated in this book.
An integral part of the post-occupancy evaluation of Champion’s Court I is observing and recording students’ use of public spaces. The building’s public spaces were studied over the course of two separate one week rounds of observations. The observations were spread out over the semester to give insight into the behavior of students around two very important academic times: midterms and finals weeks. Observers recorded activity levels, furniture use, and temperature, coupled with photographs and sketches over floorplans.
During the week of observations, the student researchers documented how many students were located in each public space. These statistics informed how often the spaces were used throughout the week. The rooms were ranked on each floor based on most occupied to least occupied.

OCCUPANCIES OF STUDY ROOMS ON EACH FLOOR
FLOOR OCCUPANCY RATES

Key:

0% 1-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%

Percentage of the room was occupied during observations.
Key:  
- 0%  
- 1-20%  
- 21-40%  
- 41-60%  
- 61-80%  
- 81-100%  

Percentage of the room was occupied during observations.
COMMON SPACES AVERAGES

3.1 Occupants

78.3° F
### Top Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>Number of Occupancies Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homework/Studying</td>
<td>12 AM - 1 AM</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking/Hanging Out</td>
<td>2 AM - 3 AM</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>4 AM - 5 AM</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activity Level

- **31% Together**
- **59% Independently**

### Work Method

- **44.5%**
- **19%**
- **9.5%**
**User Type**

- 90% Students
- 9% Faculty/Staff
- 1% Other

**Technology Use and Device Distribution**

- 67% Personal Laptop Only
- 1.9% Cell Phone Only
- 16.1% TV Only
- 9% Cell Phone and Laptop
- 14% TV and Laptop

**Recorded Device Types Used by Students**

- PERSONAL LAPTOP
  - 4
- CELL PHONE
  - 70
- TV
  - 29

**Top Activities**

- 44.5% Home Work/Study
- 19% Talking/Hanging Out
- 9.5% Music
- 0% Work Method
- 31% Independent Work

**Occupancies Per Study Room**

- Number of Occupancies Recorded
  - 1 AM: 2
  - 2 AM: 3
  - 3 AM: 4
  - 4 AM: 5
  - 5 AM: 6
  - 6 AM: 7
  - 7 AM: 8
  - 8 AM: 9
  - 9 AM: 10
  - 10 AM: 11
  - 11 AM: 12
  - 12 PM: 13
  - 1 PM: 14
  - 2 PM: 15
  - 3 PM: 16
  - 4 PM: 17
  - 5 PM: 18
  - 6 PM: 19
  - 7 PM: 20
  - 8 PM: 21
  - 9 PM: 22
  - 10 PM: 23
  - 11 PM: 24
  - 12 AM: 25

**Technology Use and Device Distribution**

- 67% Personal Laptop Only
- 1.9% Cell Phone Only
- 16.1% TV Only
- 9% Cell Phone and Laptop
- 14% TV and Laptop

**Recorded Device Types Used by Students**

- PERSONAL LAPTOP
  - 4
- CELL PHONE
  - 70
- TV
  - 29

**Top Activities**

- 44.5% Home Work/Study
- 19% Talking/Hanging Out
- 9.5% Music
- 0% Work Method
- 31% Independent Work

**Occupancies Per Study Room**

- Number of Occupancies Recorded
  - 1 AM: 2
  - 2 AM: 3
  - 3 AM: 4
  - 4 AM: 5
  - 5 AM: 6
  - 6 AM: 7
  - 7 AM: 8
  - 8 AM: 9
  - 9 AM: 10
  - 10 AM: 11
  - 11 AM: 12
  - 12 PM: 13
  - 1 PM: 14
  - 2 PM: 15
  - 3 PM: 16
  - 4 PM: 17
  - 5 PM: 18
  - 6 PM: 19
  - 7 PM: 20
  - 8 PM: 21
  - 9 PM: 22
  - 10 PM: 23
  - 11 PM: 24
  - 12 AM: 25
FURNITURE USE

All observed students and their locations throughout round 1 observations.
Observations 2

University of Kentucky-Champions Court I
March 30, 2015 - April 3, 2015
During the week of observations, the student researchers documented how many students were located in each public space. These statistics informed how often the spaces were being used throughout the week. The rooms were ranked on each floor based on most occupied to least occupied.
FLOOR OCCUPANCY RATES

Key:

- 0% 1-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%

Percentage of the room was occupied during observations.
Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Light gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20%</td>
<td>Light gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td>Dark gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of the room was occupied during observations.
COMMON SPACES AVERAGES

- Occupants: 2.6
- Temperature: 74.1°F
- Noise Level: 28.3 dB
USER TYPE

97% Students
3% Faculty/Staff

TECHNOLOGY USE AND DEVICE DISTRIBUTION

56% PERSONAL LAPTOP ONLY
7% CELL PHONE ONLY
16% TV ONLY
17% TV AND LAPTOP
4% CELL PHONE AND LAPTOP

RECORDED DEVICE TYPES USED BY STUDENTS

PERSONAL LAPTOPS

97%

CELL PHONES

7%

TV IN STUDY ROOM

19

CELL PHONE AND LAPTOP

17%

TV AND LAPTOP

4%

PERSONAL LAPTOP

47
All observed students and their locations, throughout round 2 observations.
The staff of Resident Advisors for Champions Court I were given an anonymous questionnaire to fill out at the end of the school year. It included questions regarding the design characteristics, built environment, community, and learning in Champions Court I.
RSSIE SURVEY

[Resident Student Staff Interaction and Engagement]

The University of Kentucky Office of Residence Life provided the research team with a survey they distributed to the students of Champions Court I. The survey included questions about how the students used their time, how they felt about hall resources, their LLP involvement and about the building. We utilized the data relating to the design of the space.

LIVING
“The residency here is great and I suggest it to all incoming Frshman”
“Just love the new dorms!”
“I think my experience has been good.”

COMMUNITY
“Build the dorms for a better community.”
“Living in the new dorms makes it hard to meet people because everyone is always in their rooms.”
“North campus halls are not set up to meet people.”

STUDY ROOMS
“Studying in the room is not ideal. It confuses the brain because the bedroom should be a place of relaxation while a place of study should be more energetic to keep alert.”

STAFF
“There are often messes/throw-up in the halls. UK FixIT has been slow to respond to these issues.”
“I am very dissatisfied with how the new dorms are run.”

BEST WAY TO COMMUNICATE HALL PROGRAMS

49.3% 0
50.7% 0
76% OF RESPONDENTS REPORTED BEING IN AN LLP
14.6% FIRST GEN STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEST WAY TO COMMUNICATE HALL PROGRAMS</th>
<th>STUDENT RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-MAIL</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL MEDIA</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT MESSAGE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLYERS ON DOOR TO ROOM</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN PERSON</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE-BOARD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURING HALL MEETINGS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKLY/ MONTHLY HANDOUT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOST SATISFYING ASPECT OF YOUR LEARNING COMMUNITY?

- Moving in Early
- Getting to live in the newer dorms
- Friends with similar major
- Nice Beds
- Meeting People
- Community Events
- Quality of the rooms
- Peer Mentor
- Study Groups
- Being in a family type group

HOW HAS HAVING A PEER MENTOR BEEN BENEFICIAL?

- Helps out when studying
- Willing to talk
- Helped adjust to college
- Helps to keep me on track
- Available to help
- They have helped answer questions
- They have provided study sessions
- Academic and emotional support
- Someone older to go to

MOST DISAPPOINTING ASPECT OF YOUR LEARNING COMMUNITY?

- The dorm wasn’t very social
- Lack of Activities
- EGR Class
- It wasn’t very social because people stay in their rooms
- Didn’t meet as many people as they hoped
- Haven’t met people in the same LLP as me
- Peer Mentor
- Peer Mentor
- The lack of couches in the common areas. No one uses the weird chairs
- Organization of the LLP
- Poor Community Areas
- All of the mandatory meetings

SUGGESTIONS FOR LIVING LEARNING PROGRAM:

- Community areas like in Ingels Hall are the best
- Make it more social, pool tables, more washing machines
- Most washing machines
- Make it smaller. Individual dorms for the communities. Events in the dorm not in other buildings
- Post more flyers about the events
- Get more washers and dryers for doing laundry. There never seem to be enough

REASONS RESIDENTS DON’T ATTEND PROGRAMS

- Not Interested
- Busy
- Don’t Know About Them
- Don’t Know Anyone
- Don’t Want to Attend
- Boring Things Outside of Residence Hall
- Don’t Like People in the Hall
- In a Sor./Frat.
- Not Many Activities
- Not in LLP
- Don’t Like Having an Opposite Sex RA
- Athlete
FOCUS GROUPS

Members of the research team conducted focus groups, in which students were directly asked a set of questions addressing issues such as furniture use, Living-Learning Communities, study habits, and socializing to better understand student satisfaction within the residence hall. The focus groups conducted with the users of Champion’s Court I provided clear insights into what aspects of design were perceived successful or successful.

April 23, 2015

**STUDENT 1**: Freshman, Male, Pursuing a degree in Mechanical Engineering

**STUDENT 2**: Freshman, Male, Pursuing a degree in Civil Engineering

April 30, 2015

**RESIDENT ADVISOR**: Senior, Female, Pursuing degrees in Early Childhood and Business, wants to own a preschool.
Both engineering students had a lot to say pertaining to the building quality of construction and finishing. The students have experienced water damage in their rooms, leaking sinks and windows. They have also noticed a wind tunnel forces an entrance door to Champion’s Court I open during rain storms, causing the carpet to be soaked. Student 1 voiced frustration with the choices in finishes, noting that the countertops on the multi-purpose rooms will outlast the building itself, and the money spent on them could have been delegated for something else. Student 2 is annoyed by how thin the paint is in his room. Student 1 thinks many of the furniture pieces are made of uncomfortable materials that would be better suited for children who “spill everything”.

Student 2 calls his favorite spot in CCI “the green chair room”. The room is his favorite because of the comfortable chairs, and also in combination with the room’s location and windows which provide a view and natural lighting. Both students agree that the pod chairs are “a joke”, and are only used for brief moments waiting for an elevator. Student 1 wished that the residence hall had more sofas, made from comfortable materials, like the ones he has seen in Central. Student 1 likes having the counter-height surface that he can “do whatever” at in the common room of his residence, but he hates the seating around it. The chairs do not provide him with any back support, so he cannot use them for long. He says the seating at the counters in the multi-purpose rooms have a similar problem. They like their desks, but dislike the square tables in the common areas which tilt and wobble around. They both appreciate the variety of furniture around CCI.
Student 2 and Student 1 both spoke of the importance of technology in their area of study. They stated that WiFi and outlets needed to be throughout the residence hall and in working consistent at all times. Student 1 mentioned that not all outlets have been working. Student 2 thinks that the media tables are pretty cool and useful, but they do not always work. Both students also note that there are not enough laundry machines and that they do not clean their clothing well.

Student 1 perceives some issues with the way the residence hall was designed and how it has affected community among its students. Student 1 does not like having doors closing off study rooms. Seeing people already in a room prevents him from entering. He also does not like that the door to the residents rooms lock automatically behind him. He wishes he and his roommates could keep their room doors open so that other students could visit more easily. Student 1 thinks another problem with interaction in the building is that many students do not feel compelled to leave their room with so many things provided to them there. He notes that he still sees people come out of their rooms that he has never seen before.

Student 2 brainstormed ways that the hall could feel more inclusive; he suggested that larger, more open hallways with student rooms at the end and study rooms in the center could be a better solution. He also thinks the footprint of the building in general hindered the hall from the beginning. He thinks a circular or square shaped building would have been better for interaction.

Student 1 thinks that the residence hall is a great location for people who love an urban environment. He loves CCI's proximity to downtown Lexington, with the busy streets and activity that goes on outside. Student 2 does not prefer this side of campus. He spends most of his study time in “the Library” (William T. Young) located on central campus, and most of his social time with his fraternity. Student 2 will be moving to Haggin Hall next semester. Student 1 plans on moving off campus with some friends.
“We don’t have a grand lobby type thing; it’s hard to have a big program in here.”

COMMUNITY

The RA's main concerns stem from her experiences as an RA at the older residence hall Patterson Hall before her experience at Champions Court I. She believes that the design of Patterson was more successful in creating an intimate and lively community among students. She cites the grand lobby as the most important feature, and that CCI lacks in comparison. In her experience, accommodating large programs has been much more difficult in CCI because there is no designated space to accommodate large groups of students. She feels as though shy students will have a hard time entering closed study rooms already occupied by other students, and believes there is less community in CCI because students can stay in their rooms, whereas in older style residence halls, students would at least have the opportunity to interact in the community bathrooms. She believes these apartment style rooms would be better suited to upperclassmen, whereas socialization is very important for freshman.

SENSE OF PLACE

This RA does not think Champions Court I feels like home. She likens it to a hotel. She says that the key card system adds to the hotel-feel of the residence hall, and reminisced about residents in Patterson actually buying their room keys at the end of the year so they can keep them as a memento. She wishes that her students had the ability to personalize their rooms more. She has personalized her own room with Christmas lights for reading, but wishes she could decorate her students' doors and the hallway more. She loved to see how excited new students would be when coming to Patterson Hall, and seeing their name and decorations on their doors.

“I don’t feel like it’s my official home; it feels so much like a hotel room. You have a card to get into your room.”

“That made my girls real excited when they showed up, like, “Oh, look! My name’s on the door!””

“I don’t think they really got attached to the building, like in Patterson.”
This RA feels as though it is harder to do her job in CCI compared to Patterson. Monitoring the large building has been difficult to choreograph with a small staff, given its size and layout. She says making a round requires two staff members to walk about a mile. She is fearful that there are spaces in the hall where residents are harder to supervise. She does not like how many students she has under her supervision at CCI, saying it was more manageable and intimate at Patterson. She does not like the key card system in comparison to the physical keys she had at Patterson. It has been very difficult to get students back into their rooms if they have been locked out. In Patterson, staff members could check out a key to the student and the student could go up to their room and resolve the issue on their own, then come back to the desk and return the key. Now, in CCI, the staff has to figure out a way to get away from the desk to accompany the student to their room and unlock the door with a staff key card. She also wishes she and the staff had more power to make changes in the building. She’s frustrated because the desk workers cannot see who is coming in and out through one of the back entrances. She is concerned students are able to sneak underage companions past staff at that location. Staff had put up a large mirror positioned so that the back entrance would be more visible, but they were told to take it down. She also says she has had to work harder on figuring out ways to inform her students of programs and general information. She has had to set up her own app, which sends texts out to all of her students when she needs to communicate something, but she wants to have the ability to post fliers or bulletins. She explained that the dry erase board in the lobby is not always effective, as students like to erase memos and doodle on it. She thinks a PA system would be a great addition to the hall, so that staff could remind students of programs. She believes more students would attend programs if they could be reminded in this way.
Designate Study Rooms
+ TV/Rec Rooms

Close to Class

having my own room

close to class

Nice beds ü

The People +

The area roff
COMMUNITY EVENT

The research team hosted a community event in Champions Court I. A booth was set up with several questions so that residents passing could answer questions about CCI by writing their answer down on a post-it note and sticking it to the question.
Does CCI feel like home?

- Yes: 50%
- No: 50%

What is your favorite spot?

- My room: 16.6%
- Green chairs: 16.6%
- Elevator: 16.8%
- Roof: 50%
WHAT IS ONE THING YOU WOULD CHANGE?

ELEVATORS
MAIL
PRINTER
PEOPLE
PAINT JOB
8TH FLOOR STUDY ROOMS
AMT OF FURNITURE IN LOBBIES
LAUNDRY AND KITCHEN

WHAT IS YOUR FAVORITE PLACE TO STUDY?

STUDY ROOMS
CLASSROOMS
IN ROOM
IN BED
ROOF

WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT CCI?
FUTURE STEPS

The post-occupancy evaluation revealed four key issues that impacted student success in the design Champion’s Court I: community, user suitability, amenities, and operations. This section outlines the successes of the implemented design and areas for improvement of the finished building respectively. Implementation of these strategies in future living and learning spaces at the University of Kentucky campus will set a model for excellence in university design projects nationally by utilizing effective evidence-based design.
The ability and willingness students have to participate in their own education and residential environment.

The way students feel about their housing and their likelihood of returning.

The ability of students to make connections between areas of study.

The ability of students to interact with one another in order to work towards an educational goal.

The ability of students to guide their peers in a common direction.

The ability of students to become a positive influence on the community around them.
UK Connection

Research

Engagement
The ability and willingness students have to participate in their own education and residential environment.

Retention
The way students feel about their housing and their likelihood of returning.

Integrated Learning
The ability of students to make connections between areas of study.

Peer-to-Peer
The ability of students to interact with one another in order to work towards an educational goal.

Leadership
The ability of students to guide their peers in a common direction.

Citizenship
The ability of students to become a positive influence on the community around them.

Well-Implemented

Needs Improvement
The overall mission of this study is to understand utilization of learning spaces for the living learning program in Champions Court I at the University of Kentucky. The focus of the research is to better understand engagement, retention, integrated learning, peer to peer interaction, leadership and citizenship and how those values can be supported through community, user suitability, amenities, and operations.
Community

GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Residence Halls should cultivate a sense of community in order to support students and allow them to feel at home. In this community, students will be able to learn from one another and gain interpersonal skills.

According to case studies and literature reviews conducted by the research team, it was apparent that the residence hall has a great effect on students’ sense of community at the university. Major trends in residence halls are community-oriented spaces and a homey atmosphere (Dorms of Distinction: Top Residence Halls for Today’s Students, 2008). According to ‘Living Learning Programs: One High-Impact Educational Practice We Now Know A Lot About’, LLP students are more committed to civic engagement and mentoring other students (Brower & Inkelas, 2010). The case study of Tree House Student Residence showed that personalization can enhance community in a residence hall and that public outdoor spaces were good for student interaction. In Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall, students were grouped into separate pods, each with a residential advisor and its own unique identity.

The overall goal of forming community in the residence halls should be focused on the engagement of students, integrated learning, peer to peer relationships and retention of students.

WELL IMPLEMENTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LLPs that support academics</th>
<th>Students responded that they enjoyed their LLP because they were able to form study groups and be around people with similar goals. (RSSIE survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LLPs support sense of community</td>
<td>76% of students agreed or strongly agreed that their participation in an LLP has improved their sense of belonging in the UK community. (RSSIE survey)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM CONCLUSIONS

The research team found that Champions Court I was successful in its ability to form communities that supported academic success and the sense of belonging at the University of Kentucky. Living Learning Programs allowed students to be around peers who had similar goals and majors as themselves. It helped to foster the formation of in-hall study groups and relationships between students in similar academic programs.
OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCEMENT

Create smaller student networks

“Smaller. Individual dorms for communities.” - student response during RSSIE survey

Spaces to support social communities

“The dorm is much less social because people just stay in their rooms and the doors are always closed. It’s just because of the layout of the dorm, I think.”
- Student response, RSSIE survey

Improve student communications

The top three responses of students during the RSSIE survey of how they would like to be notified about hall events were by email, social media, and flyers/posters.

Although the Champions Court I was successful in forming academic communities, it was not as successful in promoting social communities. Students and hall staff were not allowed to personalize the hall or post flyers/notifications, so students felt there was a lack of communication. Students also felt that it was hard to meet and get to know people because no one wanted to leave the privacy of their bedrooms. Even some of the Resident Advisors of the hall responded that they felt it was hard to form communities in their hall because of the private rooms and the lack of large gathering spaces to get their halls together in. The large number of students in the hall also seemed to hinder community, and having smaller pods or separate communities would have been more successful than one large one.
USER SUITABILITY
USER SUITABILITY

GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Universities should keep their building users in mind when designing the residence halls, including both students and faculty. By including diverse user populations in a participation process, the various voices can be represented.

The article ‘Review of Building Quality Using Post Occupancy Evaluation’ states that building users are an asset for informing future design (Watson, 2003). Including the building users was successful as seen in the Tree House Student Residence. Allowing students to have a say in what they wanted in a residence hall made the design more effective. The North Campus Residence Hall case study showed that the building materials should be appropriate for the age group and for the activities going on within the built environment. In addition, including a variety of room sizes and layouts to accommodate for all student types was found to be successful.

For a residence hall to have appropriate user suitability and be successful, overall design goals should focus around engagement, integrated learning, retention and peer to peer interactions.

WELL IMPLEMENTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privates spaces</th>
<th>Having private rooms was the top response among students during the community event about what they liked best about CCI.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside social spaces</td>
<td>During the community event, half of residents who responded to what their favorite spot in CCI, named the rooftop garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>“I like the green chair room.” -Ethan focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM CONCLUSIONS

Students responded positively to having their own rooms in the residence hall because they enjoyed the privacy it provided them with. Students also enjoyed having public outdoor spaces to gather and having unique, whimsical furniture, particularly the green chairs.
## OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More open common areas</th>
<th>“I think it would be more effective if there were study rooms without doors” - RA of CCI, RA survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More areas for student personalization</td>
<td>During a focus group, one of the RAs voiced her concern that the residents were not attached to CCI as much as the older halls because there was not enough freedom to personalize the space. “That made my girls real excited when they showed up, like, ‘Oh look! My name’s on the door!...I don’t think they got really attached to the building, like in Patterson.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More group seating, less cubicles</td>
<td>Only one resident was recorded using the cubicles in Observation 1 Only two residents were recorded using the cubicles during Observation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of elevator lobbies as social spaces</td>
<td>“More couches would be better in the center lobby.” - RA of CCI, RA survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the areas in CCI that could be improved are the lobby spaces, common areas, seating options and the ability to personalize the space. Students noted that some of the study rooms were closed off and they did not feel they could enter if it was occupied by other students. One RA suggested the rooms might be more effective without doors. It was also seen during the observations that the cubicle seating was rarely used. Other furniture, such as tables and chairs, were more effective at providing areas for students to work and study. The utilization of the elevator lobbies needed to be enhanced as well. Several students felt the pod chairs were not effective. Instead, placing couches in those spaces would be more appropriate for their use. The inability for students to personalize the hall was seen as a problem. It was hard for students to make the space their own and for Resident Advisors to communicate about events when they were not allowed to hang posters or flyers up in the hall.
GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Universities should add amenities to residence halls that support students socially and academically without increasing the cost of the residence hall significantly.

To be able to compete for top students, universities have begun to add amenities to residence halls. (Major Trends in University Residence Halls). According to ‘Room and Board Redefined’, residence halls play a large part in attracting students and the students expect upgraded amenities without an upgraded cost (Herman Miller). However, all students should have the opportunity to live on campus so costs should stay under control. (Five-star Accomodations on Campus). Throughout case studies of residence halls on other university campuses, some of the amenities being added to the hall are large common rooms, post offices, laundry facilities, fitness centers, bicycle parking and convenience stores.

Goals when including amenities within the hall should focus around supporting academics, engaging residents, retention, and interpersonal relationships between students.

WELL IMPLEMENTED

Seating variety

During observations, study rooms with higher variety in seating, especially those with couches and tables and chairs had higher occupancy rates.

Amenities support academics

44.5% of residents in study rooms during Observation 1 and 64.9% of residents in study rooms during Observation 2 were recorded doing homework or studying.

TEAM CONCLUSIONS

The variety of seating throughout the building was successful in providing students with places to gather to study and socialize. Students enjoyed having a variety of choices from couches and tables and chairs to the green chairs. It was also successful to have study rooms and areas that supported academics. Students had many spaces to go to study and work on homework individually or with their peers.
## OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCEMENT

| Create larger community spaces | “Need places to meet and the ability to get residents outside of their rooms.” -RA of CCI, RA survey  
|                              | “We don’t have a grand lobby type thing; it’s hard to have a big program here.” -RA of CCI, focus group |
| Provide more laundry/kitchen spaces | “We need more laundry rooms and kitchens.” -RA of CCI, RA survey |
| Fewer individual study rooms | “I think it would be more effective if there were study rooms without doors.” -RA of CCI, RA survey  
|                              | During a focus group, students Male 1 and Male 2 believed the spread out locations of the study rooms hindered community and interaction. |
| Offer a mix of living spaces at a variety of rates | According the the RSSIE survey, off campus housing being less expensive was the top reason for students not returning to on campus housing |

Some of the study rooms were too closed off and not large enough for large community events to take place. While they helped provide space for small study groups, it was hard for an entire floor community to gather together. A common concern among both students and staff of the hall was the number of laundry and kitchen facilities. There was one kitchen and a total of 10 washers and 12 dryers for the 740 residents living in the hall. In addition, the higher cost of living in the hall was a concern for students living in the building and it was one of the top residents had for leaving the hall. By providing a mix of room layouts, a more diverse rate system could accommodate various budgets, which would support inclusion and diversity. Larger gathering spaces would encourage community, rather than an abundance of mid-size rooms. By providing more laundry and kitchen spaces, user satisfaction would increase.
WELL IMPLEMENTED

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to campus</td>
<td>“Being close to classes.” - Student response, RSSIE survey, response to what the most satisfying aspect of their learning community was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room layout</td>
<td>“Private rooms” was the top response among residents during the community event in reference to what they liked best about CCI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM CONCLUSIONS

The location of Champions Court I was a substantial benefit to its residents. Students reported that they enjoyed the location because they were close to their classes. Students also enjoyed the amount of privacy they had in the building with their own room and bathroom.

GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The building performance and operation should be able to support the users and their activities. Students should be able to positively interact with the technology in the residence hall in order to enhance their education.

The literature reviews conducted by the research team showed that it was important to consider how the building interacts with its users and the environment, and asking users what they were looking for in a residence hall greatly improved the functionality of the design.

The case study of Fred D. Brown Jr. Hall showed that residence halls functioned better when they housed multiple groups of fewer students. It also showed that it was beneficial for there to be a designated office with supplies for Resident Advisors and that allowing them to personalize their hall and post notices about events allowed them to communicate with their residents better.

Forming goals around leadership, retention, engagement and communication will help make the design of the hall more successful and functional for its users.
## OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriately technology integration</th>
<th>During Observation 1, TVs in study rooms were recorded being used 29 times compared to personal laptops being used 70 times. During Observation 2, TVs were used 19 times compared to 47 students using personal laptops.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a user-friendly key system</td>
<td>“A lot. Every other desk shift.” - RA, focus group, when asked how often they experienced card issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient transportation and circulation</td>
<td>36% of residents responded the elevators would be the one thing they would change about CCI during the community event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create clear sightlines for security</td>
<td>“I think that the desk is not placed correctly because many people can just slip in unnoticed without verification if they truly live in the dorm.” - Respondent of RSSIE survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through observations, surveys, and focus groups, the research team found that there were several areas that had opportunities to be improved. Hall staff and students noted that there had been multiple issues with the key card system, where cards had stopped working or students would lock themselves out of their room. A common complaint among students during the community event was that the elevators were slow. The layout of the main lobby was also problematic. Both students and staff noted that it was a security issue as people could easily come in and out of the building regardless of if they lived in the hall or not. Staff noted that they did not have direct sightlines to all of the entrances and exits to the building. In the future, spaces should provide clear sightlines for staff and consider the scale of the key system to the building. Technology should be integrated in a simple and effective manner for ease of student use and an appropriate number of devices should be provided.
Using our findings from the observations, we were able to determine the most used and underused pieces of furniture. The number of times each piece of furniture was used was only counted during the two weeks of observations. After speaking with students through focus groups, and the community event we were also able to determine their favorite and most under used pieces.

**Most Used**
- Used 184 times
- Used 95 times
- Used 114 times
- Used 49 times

**Most Underused**
- Used 41 times
- Used 49 times

**Underused**
- Used 41 times
Using our findings from the observations, we were able to determine the most used and underused pieces of furniture. The number of times each piece of furniture was used was only counted during the two weeks of observations. After speaking with students through focus groups, and the community event, we were also able to determine their favorite and most underused pieces.
UNDERUSED

Used 2 times

Used 3 times

Used 33 times

Used 7 times

Used 1 time

Used 9 times
Used 5 times

UNDERUSED
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APPENDIX
Is this your first residence life experience?
  Student #1: Yes
  Student #2: Yes
What kind of community activities do you participate in?
  Student #1: “If you’re in per-engineering LLP, your dorm community’s pretty important. It’s unfortunate, our opinions kinda stick around how, derived from all the rooms have doors, and if there is one person in the room, we don’t want to go in. You don’t feel like walking in on someone studying. That really creates a secluded atmosphere, and then each room has an automatic lock... so there’s not really community here at all.. do not like doors, so do not want to enter, door automatically lock so not community. Second floor nicer because more open. Mostly structural problems.
  Student #2: “I would agree”
  Student #1: “There are secluded spots.. The best place where I have seen multiple people in a study room and actually doing work and having fun, you know, just talking cuz there’s stress you know, is the 7th floor.. It’d be nice if they could completely redesign the dorm, and they’re not going to.. Unfortunately what I have to say is mostly structural”
  Student #2: “He said pretty good, about the community in general. So I can say something about programs in general.. I know when they are, but I never end up actually going to them. I played cards with somebody once.. and they do that thing on the roof now. Community: Do not go when a lot, know when they were but don’t go a lot. Know when events are going on, email and fliers.
  Student #1: “There was a Halloween thing. A Halloween pumpkin carving contest”
  Student #2: “Oh! We won that”
  Student #1: There’s an engineer who comes to speak to us, so I went to one of those. There were people there.. as far as letting everyone know what’s going on, you can get things to me by email address, but ...
Do you interact with other LLPs?
  Student #2: We don’t really know what LLPs are here No, do not even know about what LLPs are in the residence hall.
  Student #1: .. LLPs are not effective, except the honors students because it has a more positive atmosphere.
What would you say is your favorite spot in CC1? Why? Follow up: Why do you decide to go to certain spaces over others?
  Student #2: I like the green chair room, on the 6th floor. I just like the location. Lots of windows... Green chair room on 6th floor, got location, view,
  You called it the green chair room, so the chairs?
  Student #2: Ehh, I’m indifferent. They’re cool; I like them. and furniture.
Do you use the media table?
  Student #2: It’s pretty neat you can plug up to it... When it’s not broken it’s pretty cool. The media thing is useful but is broken.
What do you do there?
  Student #2: We study there a lot, I studied there yesterday with a friend of mine. Study with group.
Student #1: There's a ping pong table on the 5th floor, unfortunately my room is the room adjacent to that, so I both love it and hate it. Ping pong room, Love and hate because room right next to it.

Can you hear what's going on in that room from your room?
Student #1: Yes. There is strong community.. It turns out the room below the one he likes, on the 5th floor, it's just because of the people who hang out there, so that's one place I actually like to hang out and likewise.. Sound isolation not well. People hang out a lot on 5th floor below green chair room.

Do you feel like you have made this place your home?
Student #2: Yeah
Student #1: It has become my home.. It has become, but not really feel like it.

How have you personalized your space?
Student #2: Yeah, I have a.. had a poster. Posters
Student #1: <chuckles>
Student #2: There's problems. I took pictures. I have a window that's leaking. I also have paint that's pealing.
Student #1: Will that be an eventual question? Structural integrity questions?

We can talk about that now.
Student #2: Every time it rains, something leaks. It was storming the other day and I woke up and I looked up and it leaked to the top of the bed. On the wall. Not good. Window leaking, peeling paint from the rain in personal room. If bed was in original space it would've got wet
Student #1: Those were leaking the very first week of school. And then, we actually have a wind tunnel, going to the back entrance on the .. that next to the classroom, and it sucks, everytime the doors, the outer door stays open, the entire carpet was soaked. Large windows were leaking when first come in. Back entrance creates wind tunnel and sucked the door open and interior got soaked
Student #2: Our first week our sink was leaking, we didn't even know it was leaking until.. Sinks leaking, other people must have had the same problem because maintenance were sent to fix the problem before they even noticed the leak
Student #2: Paint is bad quality, thin

Are you using the spaces outside of your residence room in CCI? If so, what do you use them for primarily?
Student #2: I use it for studying.
Student #1: He's going Sigma Pi. fraternities do not socialize very much in the dorm.
Student #2: Studying and entertainment, ping pong.
Student #2: Play video games and watch TV
Student #1: Like the TVs everywhere, everyone has an HDMI cord and can play whatever you want.

What do you like best about CC1?
Student #2: I like the green chair room. And there are lots of study rooms. Even though I study at the library. Green chair room, study rooms
Student #1: Great location. If you're from the city and you don't mind, cuz this really is the city, if you're anywhere else, in other dorms, you're not in the city. If you're used to the traffic, and the sirens, and people yelling when you go outside, if you're that type of person, you already love it, the location is unbeatable. Great location, like the city feel if you're from the city. Loud and sirens so if used to that, nice location
Student #2: I'm moving to Haggin next year. Likes Haggin better.

When you go to study, where do you go? Why? This can be on or off campus, in or out of the residence halls.
Student #2: So like last semester if I had to do a paper I would go to the library, and I'd just sit in there until I finished it. go to library when writing a paper, green chair for normal homework
Student #1: Last year I ended up going to the library just because I had a class there.. Library because with class, but now with room

What is one thing you wish you could change about CC1?
Student #2: The location and like how the dorms are structured. I think it’d be better. Location and how the dorms are structured. Likes Blanding

Student #1: How things are set up because things are so separate. and you go into your room and you literally don’t have to leave except for class. You have.. Made cheaply.. college kids have.. You can eat in there and you can sleep, you don’t have to leave for anything but class. If there were a way to make it more open. with giant hallways and people at the end of them, the footprint, go around in circles.. and the square.. in here you..I guarantee most people in those dorms have no idea the people in those dorms. I’m still amazed, every day I see people I’ve never seen before. More open, do not have to leave unless for class, can make food, sleep, etc. Likes circle, the corners and opposite people don’t see each other. See people every day they do not know.

Student #2: It’s also really expensive REALLY EXPENSIVE

Is there any additional information you’d like to give us?

Student #1: Right behind you, that granite [pointing to countertops in multipurpose room] is totally unnecessary, and sure it has longevity, but this dorm, it will be in perfect condition once this dorm is ready to fall apart. And another thing, make sure WiFi works. Granite is unnecessary for college students

Student #2: Yeah make sure the dorms have lots of wifi keep TVs, dorms block WiFi

Student #1: Some of the priorities they could raise are quality of the things touching. Things like paint, in my room, if I nick the wall I don’t want a huge chunk falling because it’s not put together right. I assume you’ve seen the bar height counters, bar height stools in the common rooms? It was a good idea, you can stand at it you can do whatever you want at it. They’re like this [the chairs at the counter in the multipurpose room], but the backs actually don’t come up quit as far. But sitting in that and trying to... Quality of things you touch, paint- in personal rooms Furniture: bars in room, chairs are not comfortable, want regular table with backs on chair

Student #2: More common areas.

Student #1: Oh that was ridiculous. Squeaking. Pipes squeaking that have fixed themselves.

Student #2: Circular.

Student #1: Circular rooms?! You want-

Student #2: No, not the rooms! The shape of the building itself, or a square. More inclusive. Smaller study rooms around. Shape of building, want more square, inclusive instead of wings. Want study rooms by each other (subjective)

Student #1: Towards the beginning of this semester, last semester, there was a squeaking. That fortunately has fixed itself...or they came and fixed it..

Student #2: Lighting. I don’t like the automatic lighting, sometimes it turns off when you’re not moving a lot. Lighting improved, do not like automatic lighting, turns off when not moving a lot, not enough lumens in bathroom light

Student #2: We can’t change the thermostats, they have boxes on them

Student #1: I can see them thinking, they’re college students, in the summer they’re gonna turn it to 60, and in the winter they’re gonna turn it up to 90 and we’re gonna pay a lot of money, so they put a box on it, They’re ineffective because engineering students know how to get into them, they’re just more of a nuisance. thermostats in room nice, but want to control ones in study room, Engineers find box annoying, because they can get in it but just added

Student #1: Some of the outlets are not working

So when you’re doing your studying outlets are important? Is that because you are studying on laptops?

Student #1: Outlets important, everything is on laptops, no books

Student #2: The more power outlets the better.

Maintenance slow, light in bathroom not fixed for 4 weeks

Very luxurious, with closet, microwave, extras but necessities not addressed

Student #2: TVs are nice but need to be working

Student #1: I can’t believe we forgot about this, the furniture in common areas. They’re nice if we were kids and we were gonna spill everything, it’s not comfortable to sit in there and watch a movie. Have you been in central? They have
actual couches. nice if going to spill stuff, but not comfortable for long periods of time Like central better because more homey and comfortable

Mushroom chairs are a good joke and for waiting for the elevator

More couches

Do not like square tables, because they rock like longer,

Green chairs, desk chairs nice, plastic chairs fine, green chairs tall good

Bar in study room a waste

Like nice mix of furniture

TV, HDMI, table combo doesn't work and too frustrating to work

Not enough laundry and too expensive,

Some do not work and don't clean well

Kitchen: never cooked in there, the kitchen gets used, 90% by fourth floor

Living on campus, need a meal plan, so you would be buying food twice.
Resident Advisor, pursuing degrees in Early Childhood and Business, wants to own a preschool.

Is this your first residence life experience?
   Ra for two years and lived in dorms for 1 year. Lived on Patterson.
   Do not feel community over here compared to other dorms.
   Liked shared bathrooms as RA because you got to see the people are your dorm.

What kind of community activities do you participate in? If you do not participate, tell us why not?
   RA: Probably like a third of our building, we don’t even have enough, because like I said we don’t have a grand lobby type thing, it’s hard to have a big program in here, because people, all the stations were in one big room, study rooms, also the buildings
   Remind me app, and then I can send a text to everyone, like I have to,
   Um I think about half of them are
   With programs it was easier with Patterson to get more people, instead of rooms being closed off. Now can’t hang fliers, so harder and need to find creative ways. Now use remind me app.

Floor meetings?
   About half of the people there.

If you had to say your favorite place is in the building, what would you say is your favorite spot in CC1? Why? Follow up: Why do you decide to go to certain spaces over others?
   My room because, my residents now know they can come hang out and stuff. In Patterson it would be the grand lobby where everyone would hang out. And like the lobby areas in the middle. We had to beg for couches. The couches were a big help, people actually hang out there now. I would have more lobby space for people to hang out in. I would put a PA system in the building, because when there are emergencies we have to run around. For the programs, I feel like we could get a whole lot more people if we could announce in their rooms. We have the white board in the lobby, but people erase things off of it, we someone actually stole it. I bought a bunch of pillows, hung up Christmas lights. I don’t feel like it’s my official home, it feels so much like a hotel room. You have a card to get into your room. That made my girls real excited when they showed up, like, “Oh, look my name’s on the door!” All the new buildings they like all look the same. I don’t think they really got attached to the building, like in Patterson. I just think their bedrooms are pretty small for the beds they have. The mattresses are awesome, but it’s just that they don’t have much space to move around in. They want to live off campus. They’re living in the newer dorms. For boys.. all my girls hang out in other places or in their rooms. When we first started doing rounds, we really didn’t know how to do them. We found other ways to do it. In this building, I have to make sure I look at the study rooms a lot. In the other building there weren’t as many study rooms. A round is you have to walk around the building, make sure everything is ok. We have to walk from one end of the building to the other. ..the way my shift does it is we both pick a side and then we make a right turn every time, so if I’m on that side of the 7th floor, then I’ll go down one hall way and then … the other Ra’s who just started here love this building. She says she likes working here because there are less shifts you have to work. They can run in and run out. Like we yell at them, they’ll be trying to get their girlfriend in here. They don’t have the minor form. We had a mirror there but EDR took it down because it wasn’t aesthetically pleasing. They gave us that little round one. I’m like that it makes it a lot harder for me to do my job. I would have more kitchens and more laundry rooms. I would have a bigger laundry room with more machines. There’s only one stove for 700 residents. I think it’s kinda ridiculous.
My room is my favorite place, because feels like its mine, homey, residences can come and hang out there, unlike the lobby where we hung out in Patterson. Had TVs with no couches, but thats second favorite now that couches are there. Like when residence congregate.

Do you feel like your have made this place your home? How have you personalized your space to feel like its your own place?

In my room, I bought pillow and blankets, hung stuff on walls, bookshelf because I like to read, Christmas lights. Its hard to make home because like hotel, can’t hang things on doors like signs to mork who lives there to decorate when they first move in, cards and not keys like at home.

Depersonalization, of buildings, hard to tell apart, and now look like cookie cutter houses. Now people are not attached. In Patterson people took keys because it was their first dorm, now people can’t wait to go back home. Rooms are small for size of bed.

Next year residences want to move off campus, or if they live staying in new dorms because they are used to. Guys hang out in study rooms because TVs to play games, girls hang out in rooms. Rounds, horrible, because so big. It is a mile to go around the whole building. Have to look in study rooms so hard to see everything. Other dorms easier in other building because straight forward. Places for people to hide in this building and do stuff. Make sure dryer not on fire, mechanical closets locked, study rooms make sure no trash, make sure people are tearing things up. Make sure emergency exits are still operational. Now take half and make rights rounds, twice a night 8, 10, 12. Weekends, 10, 12, 2 rounds. It takes 15-20 with no incidences on week days, weekends 30-45. Girls hate the 8th floor boys, but otherwise much better. Hate this building from Patterson.

Want smaller staff, less residents. One girl likes it because doesn’t have to work as many hours. Now work the desk with someone. 20, 30 and 44 residences compared to 12-15.

Take out door between buildings, can sneak in the room, like minors sneaking in. EdR took mirror down because not aesthetically pleasing. Safety wise otherwise good.

More kitchens and more laundry rooms, have to pay someone else or go to friends. Or bigger laundry room. Only one stove for 700 people.

How often do you have card issues?

A lot, Every other desk shift. Phones breaks it. Locks sometimes break, one residence and sometimes master key. Master key now has to walk and travel all over the building to unlock persons door and bring them the key. If someone calls in the middle of the night. Lived in Ingles and Baldwin and K3 and 4 over the summer. K3 is gross. Not enough lighting in those rooms, only closet light and light by bed, so used tall lamps. No one likes using community showers. Ingles and Baldwin nice because had kitchen and laundry room on each floor. More there with less residences, more lobby space and classroom. Liked study spaces and lobby space that were open with door open. Hard with shy residences with doors closed if they can join in.

These dorms should be for older residences so people can socialize their first year because that’s an important part of their first year.

Are you using the spaces outside of your residence room in CCI? If so, what do you use them for primarily?

When you go to study, where do you go? Why? This can be on or off campus, in or out of the residence halls.

Liked study spaces and lobby space that were open with door open. Hard with shy residences with doors closed if they can join in.

These dorms should be for older residences so people can socialize their first year because that’s an important part of their first year.

What do you like best about CC1?

What is one thing you wish you could change about CC1?

Want to hang things up, maybe bulletin boards on floors or elevators.
More lobby space to hang out in front lobby
desks more inviting, lowered desks.
PA system in case of emergency, or for programs, for announcements.
I do not think TV is bulletin TVs are good idea because change so fast hard to read.
White board, people steal, erase, take fliers.