

# UNLV | Division of STUDENT AFFAIRS

## Campus Recreation NASPA Consortium Survey, Spring 2019 Key Findings

**Prepared by Maryam Mohieddin-Rad, Doctoral Assistant for Campus Life Assessment  
and Judd Harbin, Ph.D., Executive Director for Student Affairs Strategic Planning & Assessment**

**PURPOSE** The NASPA Consortium Campus Recreation Survey was developed through a partnership between CampusLabs, NASPA, and NIRSA. UNLV was able to customize the instrument and incorporate additional questions. The instrument is designed to assess the use, satisfaction, and student learning outcomes associated with the SRWC and Campus Recreation programs. National benchmark data is available.

**PARTICIPATION** In spring 2019, among undergraduate, graduate, and professional students 27,150 were eligible for this study. Students who were age 18 or older, registered as degree seeking, and did not restricted FERPA on their directory information were eligible to participate. Based on considering 95% confidence level and a 5% error, the sample size calculator provided by Campus Labs Baseline indicated that we needed a minimum of 379 respondents. We distributed the survey to 4,880 randomly selected students.

Additionally, SRWC had 1,813 general members during spring 2019. General members include faculty, staff, alumni, and community members who pay a monthly membership fee to use the facility. This category also includes students who were enrolled for fewer than 4 credit hours but who choose to pay a flat fee to access the facility. Considering 95% confidence level and a 5% error, the sample size calculator indicated that we needed a minimum of 318 respondents from that membership category. With an anticipated response rate of 10%, we needed to send the survey to all of the individuals in this membership category. Of the 1,813, 1,757 had a valid email address on file with SRWC, and 1,738 were delivered. The remaining 39 were rejected as bad addresses.

The first 400 participants (whether student member or general member) received \$5 in RebelCash, and everyone who participated was eligible to enter a drawing for one of two Beats headphones.

Of the 4,880 emails to student members, 4,841 were delivered. Twenty-one student members replied to the email and asked to be removed from the study. Of those 4,841 contacted student members, 947 responded (19.4%).

Of the 1,738 emails to general members, ten general members replied to the email and asked to be removed from the study. Of those 1,738 contacted members, 154 responded (8.9%). The 154

included 28 faculty members, 23 staff, 29 alumni, and 74 community members. However, the minimum number of respondents needed was not met.

Composition of the student respondents was compared to the eligible enrollment to check goodness of fit. Given the number of respondents, an alpha of .05 was used, and then, effect sizes, calculated as Phi or Cramer's V for categorical variables and as Cohen's *d* for continuous ones, needed to be at least moderate ( $|V| \geq 0.20$ ; or  $|d| \geq .50$ ). The composition of student respondents fit well with the eligible enrollment with regard to binary gender, classification, race/ethnicity, college of enrollment, residency, and age. For GPA, respondents had a slightly higher GPA than non-respondents.

#### SUMMARY

Overall satisfaction with Campus Recreational Services (CRS) was strong at 98%, and this figure did not differ significantly from the past. In seven of nine areas, satisfaction with CRS was significantly higher than national comparisons: availability of fitness equipment, number of weight machines, number of free weights, number of cardio machines, adequacy of stretching areas, availability of open rec facilities, and amount of indoor recreation space. While significantly higher than national comparisons, satisfaction in none of the nine areas differed significantly from three years ago.

Students reported placing significantly higher importance on recreation, sport, and fitness after enrolling at UNLV than prior to enrollment (70% after; 52% prior) as well as placing significantly greater importance on healthy lifestyle (91% after; 70% prior). With 87% of student respondents agreeing, efforts from staff to make SRWC more inclusive of diverse students also appeared effective. While not significantly different than three years ago, it was significantly higher than six years ago before intentional efforts to improve inclusiveness began.

Five service areas were underutilized compared to other DRU campuses: intramurals, sport clubs, outdoor adventures, weight training, and cardio vascular.

Recommendations and action items appear on page 19.

# COMPOSITION OF STUDENT RESPONDENTS COMPARED TO ELIGIBLE SPRING ENROLLMENT

Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Eligible Enrollment
Freshman	145	16.60%	15.00%
Sophomore	160	18.30%	18.00%
Junior	173	19.70%	20.00%
Senior	221	25.20%	26.10%
Post-Baccalaureate	11	1.30%	1.70%
Graduate	88	10.00%	11.60%
Professional	30	2.14%	2.10%

Gender	Frequency	Percentage	Eligible Enrollment
Female	573	65.40%	56.50%
Male	303	34.60%	43.50%
Transgender			

Race/Ethnicity	Frequency	Percentage	Eligible Enrollment
American Indian, Alaskan Native	23	2.60%	3.20%
Asian	268	30.60%	25.08%
Black, African American	95	10.08%	11.10%
Hispanic, Latino	260	29.70%	28.50%
White	429	49.00%	53.40%
Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander	56	6.40%	5.40%
Two or More	229	26.10%	26.10%
Unknown / Blank	17	1.09%	2.70%

College of Enrollment	Frequency	Percentage	Eligible Enrollment
Allied Health Sciences	62	7.10%	7.30%
Education	78	8.90%	8.90%
Engineering	76	8.70%	9.30%
Fine Arts	57	6.50%	7.50%
Hotel Administration	57	6.50%	7.00%
Liberal Arts	115	13.10%	11.10%
Sciences	101	11.50%	8.90%
Urban Affairs	76	7.80%	9.20%
Community Health Sciences	15	1.70%	1.30%
Health Sciences	66	7.50%	7.20%
Law	15	1.70%	1.40%
Business	103	11.70%	12.10%
UNLV	23	6.20%	4.20%

Residence	Frequency	Percentage	Eligible Enrollment
In State	734	83.80%	84.40%
Out of State	142	16.20%	15.60%

		Mean	Minimum	Maximum	SD	SEM	95% CI
Age	Eligible	24.25	18	75	7.196	0.103	
	Respondents	23.73	18	65	6.824	0.231	23.27 - 24.19
GPA	Eligible	2.941	0.000	4.000	1.007	0.014	
	Respondents	3.279	0.000	4.000	0.651	0.022	3.24 - 3.32

Significant differences in composition were detected for age and GPA. However, for age, the effect size was trivial. For GPA, the effect size was small but did not reach the medium threshold, so GPAs of respondents were only slightly higher than non-respondents.

## FINDINGS

The following findings are based upon responses from the 947 students who responded to the survey.

Unless otherwise specified, the following tables show the percent of respondents who indicated agreement or participation in each of the items reported. The most recent three years of responses from UNLV students appear in the UNLV columns for 2019, 2016, and 2013—respectively. The final column, DRU, shows the percent of respondents from participating doctoral research universities who indicated agreement or participation in that item. For questions that collected agreement ratings, statistical significance was calculated based upon the mean of those ratings. Where mean ratings in 2016, 2013, or DRU differed significantly from mean ratings at UNLV in 2019, and where the effect size was at least moderate, the cell in the respective column(s) is highlighted. Because the cell displays the percent instead of the mean, highlighting may appear when the percent shown does not appear remarkably different than at UNLV in 2019; or highlighting may NOT appear when the percent shown does appear remarkably different than at UNLV in 2019. The reader is reminded that the highlighting is based upon statistical testing of the mean—not the percent. When no value appears in the DRU column (“—”), the item was a custom item administered at UNLV only, so no national comparison data is available.

### WHICH SERVICES OR FACILITIES DID STUDENTS REPORT USING AND WHEN?

Three out of four students indicated using SRWC facilities, programs, and services. The most popular services were cardiovascular followed by weight training / free weights. Despite a consistent level of utilization for the SRWC facilities, programs, and services overall, two areas saw declining usage rates: cardiovascular and wellness programs, and one, outdoor adventures, saw a substantial increase. Five of the 13 service areas appeared lower than rates at participating doctoral research universities (DRUs): cardiovascular, intramurals, outdoor adventure, sport clubs, and weight training. One, wellness programs, was higher.

With regards to answering when students participated in or used SRWC facilities, programs, or services, most of the day was consistent with DRU days and times. UNLV students reported lower usage during evening hours than their counterparts at DRUs reported between Monday and Friday. Reports of early evening usage was also lower than was reported three and six years ago at UNLV. For weekends, UNLV students reported lower usage between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. than did their counterparts at other DRUs.

Percentage of respondents using each:	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
SRWC (facility, programs, services)	75%	79%	81%	82%
Aquatics /pool	29%	31%	39%	30%
Cardio vascular	71%	78%	81%	82%
Fitness assessment	13%	15%	18%	11%
Group Fitness	40%	42%	46%	41%
Intramurals	20%	21%	24%	33%
Open recreation	39%	38%	40%	42%
Outdoor adventure rentals	17%	8%	- -	25%
Personal training	12%	11%	14%	13%
PEX Classes	19%	22%	20%	18%
Racquet sports	27%	30%	32%	28%
Sport Clubs	13%	15%	17%	19%
Weight training / free weights	65%	62%	67%	73%
Wellness programs	37%	43%	32%	20%
<b>Time of Day during the week (Mon-Fri):</b>				
Early morning (before 8am)	10%	9%	8%	10%
Morning (8 – 11am)	14%	10%	11%	12%
Mid-day (11am – 2pm)	17%	19%	16%	12%
Afternoon (2 – 5pm)	21%	17%	19%	17%
Early evening (5 -8pm)	22%	28%	28%	31%
Late evening (after 8pm)	11%	14%	13%	17%
Never	5%	4%	4%	3%
<b>Time of Day during the weekend (Sat –Sun):</b>				
Early morning (before 8am)	5%	5%	4%	4%
Morning (8 – 11am)	13%	14%	12%	19%
Mid-day (11am – 2pm)	13%	12%	13%	21%
Afternoon (2-5pm)	10%	17%	15%	18%
Early evening (5-8pm)	9%	9%	12%	12%
Late evening (after 8pm)	8%	9%	10%	8%
Never	42%	34%	35%	18%
<b>Average time per a visit:</b>				
less than 30 minutes	18%	16%	13%	9%
30 to 59 minutes	40%	39%	45%	46%
60 to 89 minutes	31%	34%	32%	34%
90 or more minutes	11%	11%	10%	10%

## STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS IMPACT ON USE

Use of the Student Recreation & Wellness Center (SRWC) associated significantly with only one characteristic: enrollment status. Students were enrolled either full time or less than full time. Usage rates reflect the percent of students by enrollment status who reported that they did or did not use the SRWC. For example, among the 520 who used the SRWC, 85.2% were enrolled full time. Among the 216 who did not use the SRWC, 70.8% were full time. The results of Chi-Square tests appear with the usage rates.

Enrollment Characteristics	Group	Use SRWC (%)		X <sup>2</sup>	df	N	p
		No (216)	Yes (520)				
Enrollment Status	Full time	70.8	85.2	20.427	1	736	0.000
	Less than full time	29.2	14.8				

Appendix B provides an expanded version of this table which includes all of the demographic, enrollment, and student characteristics gathered by the consortium study.

## RECRUITMENT & RETENTION OF STUDENTS TO UNLV

The SRWC facility in general was a moderate or very important factor for less half of the respondents in deciding to attend UNLV. This importance was consistent with UNLV results from 2016 and 2013 as well as this year's national comparison to other doctoral research universities. For Campus Recreational Service programs more specifically, the portion of students for whom they were moderately or very important was smaller than for the facility in general.

Six out of ten students indicated that the SRWC was moderately or very important to their decision to continue at UNLV. Similarly, five out of ten students reported that CRS programs were important to their decision to continue here. Both of these findings were significantly higher than national benchmarks (highlighted yellow in table below).

<u>IMPORTANCE (percent answering "moderately" or "very" important to the following)</u>	UNLV Students				DRU
	2019	2016	2013	2010	
of SRWC facilities in deciding to attend UNLV	43%	49%	40%	43%	40%
of CRS programs in deciding to attend UNLV	39%	39%	31%	35%	34%
of SRWC facilities in deciding to continue here	57%	59%	52%	65%	48%
of CRS programs in deciding to continue	50%	45%	41%	51%	40%
of recreation, sport, fitness prior to UNLV	52%	53%	54%	58%	61%
of recreation, sport, fitness after leaving UNLV	70%	70%	71%	75%	72%
of a healthy lifestyle prior to UNLV	70%	68%	73%	75%	76%
of a healthy lifestyle after leaving UNLV	91%	91%	92%	93%	91%

In addition, use of the SRWC was associated with increased commitment to sport, recreation, and fitness (52% prior to UNLV vs 70% afterward) as well as healthy lifestyle (70% prior vs 91% afterward).

The percent of students indicating that recreation, sport, and fitness will be important to them after they leave UNLV was 18 points higher than prior to enrolling at UNLV. After students enrolled at UNLV, the importance that they placed on recreation, sport, and fitness increased.

Similarly, the percent of students indicating that a healthy lifestyle will be important to them after leaving UNLV was 21 points higher than prior to enrolling at UNLV. After students enrolled at UNLV, the importance that they placed on a healthy lifestyle increased.

### OUTCOMES FOR USE OF SRWC

General outcomes related to the use of SRWC differed significantly in 3 areas from results of participating DRU campuses. With regard to their counterparts at DRU campuses, UNLV students rated recreation and wellness programs significantly higher in three areas: would recommend to others, offers something for everyone, and recreational needs are met by CRS.

	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
<u>Outcomes</u> -percent answering somewhat or strongly agree related to SRWC programs - 5 pt scale	-	-	-	-
Would recommend to others	92%	92%	93%	87%
Offers something for everyone	89%	88%	90%	83%
Enjoy using SRWC activities/facility	84%	80%	84%	86%
Recreational needs are met by CRS	85%	82%	85%	79%
Contribute to quality of life at UNLV	89%	84%	86%	85%
Expanded interest in stay fit/healthy	76%	79%	75%	76%
Provided w skills will use after college	66%	67%	63%	65%
SRWC inclusive of diverse pop	87%	91%	80%	--

Wellness and fitness outcomes did not differ significantly for UNLV students this year compared to three and six years ago. They also did not differ significantly from national counterparts.

	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
<u>Wellness/fitness Outcomes</u> - percent indicating participation in SRWC activities somewhat or definitely enhances – 3 pt scale	-	-	-	-
Ability to get a good night sleep	73%	73%	72%	74%
Athletic ability	85%	85%	83%	86%
Balance coordination	79%	83%	81%	81%
Feeling of well-being	89%	89%	91%	92%
Fitness level	89%	86%	88%	90%
Overall health	90%	90%	92%	93%
Physical strength	85%	86%	87%	91%
Stress management	83%	82%	85%	86%
Weight control	79%	81%	84%	82%

With regard to learning outcomes, when current ratings were compared to previous ratings, statistically significant but small effects were detected for two outcomes over time: ability to multitask (higher than 2013) and concentration (higher than 2013). None differed significantly from 2016 or from national benchmarks.

	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
<u>Learning Outcomes</u>	-	-	-	-
Ability to develop friendships	65%	69%	72%	65%
Ability to multi-task	68%	76%	67%	65%
Academic performance	73%	74%	67%	71%
Communication skills	63%	66%	57%	59%
Concentration	77%	81%	76%	76%
Group cooperation skills	63%	65%	56%	60%
Leadership skills	54%	58%	50%	52%
Multicultural awareness	67%	72%	59%	61%
Personal motivation	85%	85%	83%	--
Problem solving	61%	65%	54%	58%
Respect for others	77%	78%	71%	74%
Self-confidence	83%	83%	84%	85%
Sense of adventure	69%	72%	66%	69%
Sense of belonging	69%	70%	66%	68%
Time management	73%	77%	75%	79%

## SATISFACTION

Of the 862 students who completed the survey, 510 agreed to continue responding to items specifically related to satisfaction. When a respondent finished the main set of items, the consortium study asked if they were willing to answer additional questions related to satisfaction. If they answered affirmatively, then they continued to this item set. If they answered negatively, then they were finished with the survey.

In the following table, yellow highlighting indicates statistically significant differences with small effect sizes. Orange highlighting indicates statistically significant differences with medium effect sizes.

Satisfaction with SRWC programs and services indicated that UNLV was consistent with or exceeded DRU campuses in seven of nine areas. In two, satisfaction exceeded 80%. At 91%, satisfaction with cardio machines was consistent with 2016 and moderately better than other campuses. At 83%, the amount of indoor recreation space was consistent with 2016 and slightly better than other campuses. In addition to the nine areas covered by the national instrument, UNLV included a custom question about overall satisfaction. At 98%, it did not differ significantly from 2016 or 2013.



Satisfaction	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
Overall satisfaction	98%	93%	97%	--
Fitness equipment is available	78%	72%	80%	59%
Number of weight machines	79%	76%	79%	69%
Number of free weights	78%	71%	77%	67%
Number of cardio machines	91%	91%	87%	77%
Adequate stretching areas	62%	66%	66%	50%
Availability of facilities for open rec	77%	77%	76%	70%
Location of SRWC	79%	83%	--	78%
Amount of indoor recreation space	83%	81%	80%	73%
Amount of outdoor recreation space	69%	67%	63%	68%

Still, results did indicate room for improvement in many areas. In two areas the results fell in the 60% range including adequate stretching areas and amount of outdoor recreation space. In five areas satisfaction fell in the 70% range. Two of these areas were significant higher than in 2016: availability of fitness equipment, and number of free weights.

With regards to SRWC Hours of operation Sat-Sun percentages showed we were significantly higher in comparison to 2016. With regards to hours of operation, pool hours were significantly higher than DRU campuses.

The satisfaction items regarding UNLV staff were significantly higher in three areas compared to 2013: Recreation staff are friendly, Recreation staff are knowledgeable, and Rec staff are available to answer questions.

With regards to the cleanliness of the SRWC, UNLV students were significantly higher in two areas in comparison to DRU campuses; cleanliness of fitness equipment and well maintenance of fitness equipment. In cleanliness of equipment, UNLV students were also significantly higher in 2019 compared with 2013.

	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
Number of students completing satisfaction set of items	510	337	621	6901
<b>Hours</b>				
SRWC Hours of operation Mon-Fri	90%	87%	87%	88%
SRWC Hours of operation Sat-Sun	83%	75%	77%	77%
Pool hours of operation	88%	76%	71%	69%
<b>Staff</b>				
Recreation staff are friendly	87%	88%	83%	91%
Recreation staff are knowledgeable	80%	78%	75%	73%
Rec staff are available to answer questions	86%	86%	79%	85%
Lifeguards / aquatics staff	87%	79%	72%	82%
Fitness class instructors	82%	87%	80%	97%
Intramural sports staff and referees	65%	48%	67%	81%
<b>Cleanliness</b>				
Recreation facilities are clean	94%	96%	92%	90%
Rec facilities provide safe environment	90%	97%	93%	92%
Rec facilities maintained to encourage participation (temp, vent)	94%	92%	91%	87%
Fitness equipment is clean	92%	91%	87%	87%
Fitness equipment is well-maintained	90%	95%	85%	87%
Cleanliness of locker rooms	80%	78%	78%	78%
Cleanliness of the pool	90%	86%	81%	81%

Satisfaction with SRWC hours of operation on Saturday and Sunday reflected a change in those hours over the past three years. Based upon student feedback prior to Summer 2016, SRWC adjusted the hours beginning in Summer 2016. Prior to the change, hours were 12 noon to 12 midnight. After the change, the hours became 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Satisfaction items continued with focus on particular programming areas within Campus Recreational Services. All but one were consistent with national benchmark, and satisfaction on that programming area was significantly higher than at participating DRU campuses: Availability of pool for lap / free swim

	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
Aquatics				
Aquatics classes	57%	66%	58%	81%
Availability of pool for lap / free swim	86%	79%	75%	70%
Group Fitness				
Number of group fitness classes	85%	82%	77%	83%
Variety of fitness classes	86%	86%	80%	85%
Days and times of fitness classes	66%	67%	61%	64%
Intramural sports				
Number of team intramural sports	82%	61%	76%	87%
Number of individual IM sports	78%	63%	72%	81%
Variety of team intramural sports	80%	67%	77%	86%
Variety of individual IM sports	79%	76%	77%	82%
Participation costs for IM sports	68%	56%	63%	--
Location of outdoor fields	57%	45%	63%	--
Quality (condition) of outdoor fields	57%	39%	60%	--
Sport Clubs				
Number of Sport Clubs offered	86%	56%	71%	85%
Variety of Sport Clubs offered	72%	69%	70%	83%
Registration process for Sport Clubs *	79%	60%	66%	--
Resources to assist Sport Clubs *	70%	62%	68%	--
Wellness / Fitness				
Wellness facilities	91%	94%	87%	85%
Fitness assessments	84%	85%	73%	76%
Personal training	85%	82%	75%	70%

## MARKETING AND PROMOTION

With regards to marketing and promotion, results in 3 areas has been changed; hours of operation, percentage of the students who have never visited the webpage of SRWC and the schedule of the events. Almost all of the students indicated that they could find information about SRWC and CRS on the web. Almost two out of three thought flyers effectively promoted activities, and six out of ten thought recreational services were effectively promoted on campus. Word of mouth, flyers, and web were the most common method of learning about SRWC activities.

As in years past and similar to other campuses, the most common interval for visiting the SRWC website was never followed closely by once or twice per semester. The most common reason to visit the website was to find the hours of operation.

	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
<b>Marketing / Promotion</b>		-	-	-
Recreational activities and services are effectively promoted	61%	58%	55%	62%
Flyers effectively promote activities	64%	64%	57%	63%
Able to find information on the web	96%	96%	95%	96%
<b>How do you learn about what is happening in SRWC?</b>				
Word of mouth	40%	43%	33%	48%
Flyers	40%	39%	30%	41%
Web	40%	38%	40%	43%
Direct mailing	16%	17%	12%	14%
Social networking	17%	13%	21%	24%
Not applicable	9%	11%	5%	9%
Brochures	6%	4%	7%	5%
Newspaper	2%	2%	4%	2%
<b>How often visit the web page</b>				
weekly	14%	18%	18%	18%
monthly	13%	14%	17%	20%
1-2 semester	27%	31%	26%	27%
never	46%	37%	39%	35%
<b>What do you use the web page for</b>				
hours of operation	68%	78%	73%	73%
info on activities	53%	57%	52%	51%
schedule of events	42%	50%	46%	47%

## ASSOCIATION BETWEEN USE OF SRWC AND STUDENTS' RETENTION

All respondents to the survey were asked two questions related to their choice to attend UNLV and their plans to enroll here again next semester. For enrolling next semester, students had the option to indicate that they were graduating, so the percentages shown adjust for respondents who indicated they would not enroll next semester because they were graduating.

UNLV students did not differ significantly from students nationally in whether they would choose the same institution again or plan to enroll next semester. Our students this year also did not differ significantly from our students in the past.

	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
OVERALL UNLV EXPERIENCE				
If could start over, would attend UNLV again	86%	77%	77%	77%
Plan to enroll at UNLV next semester	97%	89%	90%	83%

Whether or not a student used SRWC did not associate significantly with the student's indication of whether they would choose UNLV again if given the chance nor with the student's stated intentions to enroll next semester. Most students who responded to the survey, whether they used SRWC or not, provided favorable answers to choosing UNLV again and enrolling next term.

Outcome	Group	Use SRWC (%)		X <sup>2</sup>	df	N	p
		No	Yes				
Choose UNLV again	Definitely Would	34%	36%	1.518	4	727	0.823
	Probably Would	44%	43%				
	Probably Not	9%	10%				
	Definitely Not	3%	3%				
Enroll next term	Extremely Likely	83%	81%	2.892	5	727	0.717
	Somewhat Likely	7%	5%				
	Not Sure	1%	2%				
	Somewhat Unlikely	2%	2%				
	Extremely Unlikely	1%	1%				

## BARRIERS TO USE OF SRWC

Students who did not use the SRWC identified factors that impeded their use followed by the other recreational facilities that they currently use: more than half of the students indicated that they had no time to use the SRWC facilities followed by more than one fourth of the students who indicated they were not aware of the offerings in SRWC. 21% of the students indicated that they are using off campus facilities and one fifth of the students believed the facilities in SRWC were too crowded which impede their use.

Factors Impeding Your Use of SRWC	UNLV Students			DRU
	2019	2016	2013	
No time	55%	54%	68%	56%
Not aware of offerings	26%	24%	27%	25%
Other	25%	9%	6%	8%
I use facilities off campus	21%	16%	28%	14%
Facilities too crowded	20%	22%	12%	46%
Do not know how to use the equipment	19%	11%	12%	19%
Parking was a problem	18%	18%	22%	28%
Programs not at convenient times	16%	14%	18%	18%
Do not like to exercise	16%	11%	13%	14%
Lack of privacy	12%	12%	15%	19%
Hours are not convenient	7%	9%	8%	11%
Injury or disability	6%	8%	8%	11%
Price not affordable	5%	4%	5%	9%
Facilities closed for event I do not wish to do	4%	3%	2%	5%
Facilities lack right equipment	3%	3%	1%	8%
Facilities too spread across campus	3%	4%	10%	6%
Childcare not available	3%	3%	9%	2%
Lack of quality facilities	2%	2%	1%	6%
Facilities are too outdated	2%	2%	1%	7%
<b>Other rec facilities do you currently use:</b>				
Local health club	28%	23%	27%	17%
Facilities at your place of residence	16%	16%	18%	20%
Community parks and recreation	23%	22%	27%	19%
Home equipment	32%	31%	32%	30%
Outdoor	41%	44%	46%	51%
Other	3%	6%	4%	7%
None	21%	19%	20%	21%

## SERVICES TO CONSIDER ADDING AT SRWC

Of the 510 students who agreed to continue into the satisfaction portion of the survey, 402 of them provided suggestions on what additional services or activities they would like to see at SRWC. Of them, 296 students who did use SRWC provided 1,420 responses, and 106 students who did not use SRWC provided 397 responses. Overall, the most common response favored adding more strength equipment (weights) followed by a climbing wall and then mind/body offerings. Non user respondents indicated that the most popular addition is Personal Training, which SRWC already offers.

The rankings varied by whether students used or did not use the SRWC. For students who did not use SWRC the top item was Personal training followed by Adding a juice bar or food service area third most selected items belongs to four choices which gained the exact same percentage; additional cardio equipment, indoor track, mind/body offerings and Climbing wall. However, for students who used the SRWC the most selected item was additional strength equipment (weights) followed by climbing wall.

	UNLV 2019	Non Users	Users	DRU
Respondents	402	106	296	3916
Additional strength equipment (weights)	37%	21%	43%	47%
Climbing wall	36%	26%	40%	24%
Mind/body offerings	34%	26%	37%	33%
Adding a juice bar or food service area	32%	27%	34%	40%
Ropes course	30%	13%	36%	26%
Personal training	28%	34%	26%	27%
Multi-purpose rooms for group fitness or other classes	28%	25%	30%	30%
Additional cardio equipment	25%	26%	25%	39%
Additional open and/or park space	24%	16%	27%	34%
Multi-purpose courts (gymnasium)	23%	14%	26%	24%
Adding a social lounge area	22%	18%	23%	18%
Expand outdoor or seasonal activities	19%	17%	20%	23%
Indoor track	18%	26%	16%	20%
Adding childcare facilities	15%	17%	15%	6%
Additional aquatic offerings	12%	13%	12%	21%
Additional fields	11%	6%	14%	15%
Skate park	11%	7%	12%	6%
Additional tennis courts	8%	8%	8%	8%
Additional racquetball courts	7%	7%	7%	5%
None of the above	6%	12%	3%	3%
Other (please specify)	6%	8%	5%	8%
Challenge Course Option		10%	23%	

## **HISTORICAL BENCHMARKS**

Responses from the 947 UNLV students were compared to responses from 1,016 UNLV students in spring 2013 and 419 UNLV students in spring 2016.

Fewer students use the SRWC on the weekends than in the past.

Compared to students in 2016, current students indicated that SRWC facilities were slightly less important to their decision to attend UNLV in the first place. Learning outcome results indicated UNLV students in 2019 were significantly higher compared to 2013: multicultural awareness, and respect for other.

Satisfaction with SRWC Hours of operation Sat-Sun was significantly higher than 2016. Current students were significantly higher in six items compared to 2013: Recreation staff are friendly, Pool hours of operation, Recreation staff are knowledgeable, Rec staff are available to answer questions, Fitness equipment is clean, and Availability of pool for lap / free swim.

## **NATIONAL BENCHMARKS**

Responses from the 947 UNLV students were compared to responses from 9,926 students at participating doctoral research universities (DRU).

Smaller percentages of students at UNLV participated in five service areas compared to students at other DRU campuses. The five areas were cardio-vascular, intramurals, outdoor adventure rentals, sport clubs and Weight training / free weights. In addition, a smaller percentage of students at UNLV reported participating in recreation and wellness facilities, programs, and services overall.

Satisfaction rate in 4 service areas, UNLV students were moderately higher compared with DRU campus students: Fitness equipment is available, Number of weight machines, Number of free weights, Number of cardio machines. Satisfaction rate in 3 service areas among UNLV students were slightly higher in comparison to DRU students: Adequate stretching areas, Availability of facilities for open rec, Amount of indoor recreation space.

In some areas UNLV students showed higher rates compared to DRU campuses; 42% UNLV students indicated that they never visited SRWC facilities on campus which shows higher rate compared to 18% of DRU campus students. In addition, UNLV students showed higher rates of spending fewer than 30 minutes of time per visit compared to DRU campus students.

With regards to usage rate of SRWC during weeknight evenings, UNLV students showed less usage rate (33%) compared to DRU campuses (48%).

In percentage rate of weekend usage, UNLV students indicated smaller percentage in comparison with DRU campuses;

- 13% in Morning usage compared to 19% in DRU campuses
- 13% in mid-day usage compared to 21% in DRU campuses.
- 10% in Afternoon usage compared to 18% in DRU campuses



Comparing average time spent per visit, UNLV students showed smaller percentage (40%) in spending 30 to 59 minutes compared to DRU campuses (46%).

With respect to satisfaction rates, UNLV students indicated significantly higher rates in seven areas in comparison with the DRU campuses: fitness equipment is available, number of weight machines, Number of free weights, number of cardio machines, adequate stretching areas, availability of facilities for open rec, amount of indoor recreation space.

Intramural sports trailed DRU comparisons. UNLV students were less satisfied than DRU students with the number of team intramural sports, the number of individual intramural sports, and the variety of team intramural sports that UNLV offers.

With regards to satisfaction items UNLV students were significantly higher satisfied in eleven areas; SRWC hours of operation on Sat-Sun (compared with 2016), pool hours of operation ( compared with 2013 and DRU), reaction staff are friendly, recreation staff are knowledgeable, Rec staff are available to answer questions, (all three compared to 2016) fitness equipment is clean ( compared to 2013 and DRU), fitness equipment is well-maintained( compared with 2016), availability of pool for lap / free swim (compared with 2013 and DRU) .

With regards to outcome, results from UNLV students were significantly higher in three items compared to DRU campuses: Would recommend to others, Offers something for everyone, Recreational needs are met by CRS.

Otherwise, UNLV did not perform substantially better or worse than other participating DRU campuses.

#### **OPEN ENDED RESPONSES (themes reported by respondents)**

The respondents were asked to mention any recreational activities, program or services they had participated in. Total of 140 students responded to this question. The followings are the highlighted theme from the results:

- Almost 8% participated in fitness related activities
- Almost 5 % mentioned they have participated on everything in recreational center
- Almost 5% mentioned Yoga as their field of participation
- About 4 % mentioned basketball and massage chair as the participation field in SRWC
- 3% of the respondents mentioned either intramural, equipment , or Zumba
- About 1.5% of the respondents mentioned Aikido and Volleyball
- 43% of the students mentioned they participated in nothing special
- Almost 23% of those who participated in the survey, gave unrelated answers like comments about the improvement of SRWC

Students were asked to write down the things that need to change about the recreation center. A considerable amount of the students answered to this question. Below are the main themes of the total of 176 respondents:

- About 19.8% of the respondents answered “Nothing, I don’t know, and None” and about 19% mentioned everything looks fine to them in Recreation Center
- Approximately 13% of the students asked for later closing time especially on weekends
- 9% of the respondents asked for earlier opening time on weekends
- 7% of the students asked for better hour scheduling on winter break and holidays
- 6% asked for more and cleaner equipment
- 3% asked for increasing the security of the Recreation Center

- Less than 2% of the respondents asked for either:  
Larger area for facilities, more cleaning, more yoga classes to fit the students' schedule, more squat racks, in advance announcement of holidays, or fixed and clean the bathrooms
- Less than 1% of the respondents asked for:
  - More massage chairs, group fitness machine room, dance class, convenient pool hours, open outdoor area, and weight training

Students were asked what else SRWC could offer. Total of 218 students responded to this question. The followings are the themes indicated from the comments:

- Approximately 8 % of the respondents asked for group fitness classes
- 5% of the respondents asked for outdoor and actual track and outdoor soccer field
- About 5% of the students asked for Hockey, skydiving, dodgeball, ice rink, cricket, softball, paintball
- About 4% asked for Boxing room and punching bag
- Less than 3% of the respondents either asked for Bouldering/ Squat rack/Climbing wall, Yoga, better food choice or free spaces
- Less than 2 % asked either for CrossFit, better equipment, Water sport training, Woman area, Tennis table/ game room, Archery
- Less than 1% asked for Safety training, Pilates, Cheaper membership, Professional staff, Better security, Dance class, Better lockers, Skating park

Respondents were asked to mention the most liked items in SRWC. Total of 505 students answered to this question. The followings are the main themes from the comments provided by the students:

- Almost 18% of the students liked the variety of activities that SRWC has been provided them with
- About 15% liked the accessibility/availability of hours of operation
- Almost 10% liked the cleanness of SRWC
- Approximately 8% liked the environment and the equipment
- About 6% liked either the convenience or nice staff members
- Almost 5% liked either fitness facilities or basketball
- Less than 4% liked either the group fitness classes or free condoms, or the track
- Less than 3% either liked massage chairs, gym, or the pool
- Less than 2% liked either wellness zone, the tread wall or everything in SRWC

## **ACTION ITEMS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

Celebrate the fact that 98% of respondents expressed satisfaction with the SRWC overall. Share this finding in appreciative marketing.

Because students are reporting shorter workout times than in the past, staff at SRWC might develop materials or tips to assist students in maximizing these shorter workouts. With the largest growth being in the workouts of 30 or fewer minutes, staff might provide students with multiple options for workouts of 30 or fewer minutes.

Intramurals may also address time constraints of students. Staff at SRWC might offer intramural leagues with shorter seasons.

Students who did not use SRWC noted wanting services which SRWC already provided such as personal training and juice bar. Identifying groups of students who underutilize SRWC and then providing targeted advertising to them about the availability of personal training, cardio equipment, group fitness, and mind/body options might boost utilization.

Looking at the student satisfaction with intramural staffing vs fitness class instructors and other functional areas staffing, student satisfaction for intramural staffing draws concern. Consider reviewing staffing of intramural games.

Leadership at SRWC might develop similar appreciative messaging for the staff involved in these significant improvements to let them know that the students noticed their efforts--including student staff ratings.

Another appreciative message that SRWC leadership might convey to staff would address the impact of efforts to enhance the inclusive atmosphere at SRWC. Student satisfaction with the SRWC's inclusion of diverse students rose significantly from 80% in 2013 to 91% in 2016. Leadership, staff, and student staff at SRWC deserve accolades for that gain.

Adjust programming during lower usage times so building use grows during those times. Grow weekend utilization by offering group fitness on weekends. Grow intramural participation by offering tournaments on weekends. Offer intramural opportunities at different times during the week (now primarily 5 p.m. to 11 p.m., M-TH)

Focus on increasing student awareness of how the skills they learn will be useful after college.

Create a challenge course that provides opportunities for students to enhance learning outcomes related to communication, group cooperation, leadership, problem solving, and developing friendships.

Appendix A: Large, four-year, non-residential campuses participating in NASPA Consortium Study for Recreation and Wellness Programs during Spring 2019

Stony Brook University  
University of Arizona  
University of Connecticut  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
University of North Dakota  
University of Vermont  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Western Michigan University

Appendix B: Demographic, Enrollment, and Student Characteristics by Use of the SRWC

Demographic Characteristic	Group	Use SRWC (%)		X <sup>2</sup>	df	N	p
		No	Yes				
First Generation	No	65.7	66.3	0.200	1	732	0.888
	Yes	34.3	33.7				
Gender Identity	Woman	66.2	61.7	1.325	1	733	0.250
	Man	31.5	35.8	1.247	1	733	0.264
	Prefer not to respond	1.4	1.7	0.117	1	733	0.732
	GenderQueer, NonBinary, Transgender, Self-Described or Unsure	1.9	2.7	0.466	1	733	0.495
Race/Ethnicity	African American/Black	6.9	9.6	1.336	1	737	0.248
	Asian	25.5	32.2	3.329	1	737	0.068
	Hispanic/Latino/a	29.2	25.9	0.823	1	737	0.364
	Indigenous/Native American/American Indian	1.9	1.3	0.268	1	737	0.604
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3.2	5.2	1.308	1	737	0.253
	Arab or Middle Eastern	1.9	2.3	0.147	1	737	0.702
	Multiracial	2.8	5.6	2.625	1	737	0.105
	White	40.7	34.4	2.693	1	737	0.101
	Prefer not to respond	3.7	3.8	0.008	1	737	0.930
International	No	96.8	94.6	1.585	1	733	0.208
	Yes	3.2	5.4				
LGBPQUA	No	85	82.1	0.801	1	651	0.371
	Yes	15	17.9				
Veteran	No	94.9	96.5	1.017	1	724	0.313
	Yes	5.1	3.5				

Enrollment Characteristics	Group	Use SRWC (%)		X <sup>2</sup>	df	N	p
		No	Yes				
Current Classification	First-Year	20.4	15.9	6.665	6	737	0.353
	Sophomore	16.7	21.3				
	Junior	24.1	25.7				
	Senior	15.3	18.4				
	Graduate Student	20.8	16.7				
	Professional Student	1.9	1.9				
	Non Degree-Seeking	0.9	0.8				
Enrollment Status	Full time	70.8	85.2	20.427	1	736	0
	Less than full time	29.2	14.8				
Transfer	No	65.3	72	4.67	2	737	0.097
	From 2-year	25	18				
	From 4-year	9.7	10				
College of Enrollment	Allied HS	4.6	7.7	29.345	17	737	0.031
	Business	12.5	11.9				
	Community HS	0.9	2.3				
	Dental	1.4	1.2				
	Education	13	6.5				
	Engineering	9.7	8.4				
	Hospitality	6	7.5				
	Law	1.9	1.7				
	Liberal Arts	10.6	10.2				
	Medicine	1.9	2.3				
	Nursing	5.6	4.8				
	Sciences	7.4	14.8				
	Urban Affairs	10.2	7.3				
	Multiple	0.9	0.8				
	Undecided	2.3	4				
	Other	3.3	2.5				
Hours spent studying (per week)	0 hours	2.8	1.4	7.429	5	726	0.191
	1-10 hours	37.7	40.5				
	11-20 hours	39.5	32.1				
	21-30 hours	13	15.3				
	31-40 hours	4.2	5.7				
	More than 40 hours	2.8	5.1				
Hours spent studying what you expected?	More hours than expected	20.9	18.8	0.483	2	725	0.785
	About what I expected	65.6	66.7				
	Fewer hours than expected	13.5	14.5				
Expected GPA Range for this term	3.5-4.0	55.8	57.7	4.878	4	726	0.3
	3.0-3.4	34	32.7				
	2.5-2.9	8.4	9.2				
	2.0-2.4	1.4	0.4				
	Below 2.0	0.5	0				

Student Characteristics	Group	Use SRWC (%)		X <sup>2</sup>	df	N	p
		No	Yes				
Student Club Member	No	72.8	52.6	25.099	1	724	0
	Yes	27.2	47.4				
Intercollegiate Athlete	No	99.5	96.1	6.327	1	721	0.12
	Yes	0.5	3.9				
Intramurals, club sports, or organized fitness participant	No	97.7	84.8	24.725	1	727	0
	Yes	2.3	15.2				
Fraternity/Sorority Member	No	94.7	92.6	1.031	1	719	0.31
	Yes	5.3	7.4				
Currently Residing	On campus	2.3	11.9	32.086	5	737	0
	Off campus: alone or with friends/roommates	14.8	18				
	Off campus: with parents/guardians	55.6	54.9				
	Off campus: with my spouse/partner/children	26.9	14.2				
Miles from Campus	Less than one mile	2.3	13.6	30.312	5	736	0
	1-5 miles	13.5	14.2				
	6-10 miles	25.1	27.3				
	11-15 miles	29.8	27.3				
	16-20	17.2	9				
	More than 20 miles	12.1	8.6				
Hours working for pay (per week)	0 hours	37.4	29	30.213	5	725	0
	1-10 hours	6.5	10.8				
	11-20 hours	16.4	23.9				
	21-30 hours	11.7	19.2				
	31-40 hours	17.8	13.9				
	More than 40 hours	10.3	3.3				
Percent of college expenses personally responsible for	0%	20.6	17	8.413	4	726	0.078
	1-25%	17.8	24.6				
	26-50%	7.5	11.3				
	51-75%	10.3	7.6				
	76-100%	43.9	39.5				
Employed by CRS	No	98.6	96.9	2.107	2	725	0.349
	Yes	0.5	1.8				