

Community Survey about the Proposed "Arena District" on Cook Field

Final Report of Survey Findings

February 2026

Executive Summary **3**
Introduction **5**
Background on the Proposed "Arena District" 5
Review of Relevant Research 9
Community Survey: Purpose & Research Questions 13
Data, Sample, & Quantitative Methods 15
Qualitative Methods 17
Acknowledgements 18
Survey Results & Findings **20**
Sample Description 20
Q1: How frequently and in what ways do members of the greater Miami University community use Cook Field and Millett Hall (and how important are they to the Miami University experience)? **20**
Cook Field 20
Millett Hall 21
Additional Analyses 23
Summary 23
Q2: How would significant changes to existing facilities impact their current and future use (and with what tradeoffs/opportunity costs)? **25**
Cook Field 25
Millett Hall 26
Impacts of New Arena Proposals on Future Attendance 27
Summary 28
Q3: What do stakeholders consider Miami's identity and core values (and to what extent do they align with the Arena District proposal)? **29**
Values, Qualities, and Factors that Make Miami Unique & Attractive 29
Strategic Investment Preferences 30
Summary 32
Q4: What do members of the greater Miami University community want/prefer for Cook Field and Millett Hall (and how might such decisions impact stakeholders' future support for the university)? **32**
Vision for Cook Field 32
Support/Opposition to Arena District on Cook Field 33
Project-related Concerns 35
Impacts on Future Donations 36
Summary 37
Summary of Qualitative Findings **37**
Perceived Administrative Disconnect 38
Modernization of Miami 38
Cook Field as the Genius Loci of Oxford 39
Summary 39
Conclusion **40**
Discussion of Findings 41
Public Sentiment & Project Planning 43
Final Remarks 46
Appendix I: Data Tables **51**
Appendix II: Qualitative Codebook **91**

Appendix III: Qualitative Response Tables **98**
Appendix IV: Survey Questionnaire **117**
Appendix V: List of Relevant Sources **124**
Appendix VI: Project Team Members **130**

Executive Summary

In February 2025, Miami University's Board of Trustees voted to approve the Cook Field site for a new "multipurpose arena and entertainment district" to replace Millett Hall. According to university leadership, Millett Hall has approximately $85 million in deferred maintenance. Building a new arena at the Cook Field site is estimated to cost approximately $220 million. Because the proposed Arena District project would be one of the largest capital investment projects in Miami's history, an independent, interdisciplinary team of undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, and faculty created a community survey to gauge stakeholder sentiment and evaluate the extent to which the Board-approved plan aligns with stakeholder practices and preferences, which resulted in a sample size of **3,347 respondents**.

This survey project sought to answer four research questions: (1) How frequently and in what ways do members of the greater Miami University community use Cook Field and Millett Hall (and how important are they to the Miami experience)? (2) How would significant changes to existing facilities impact their current and future use (and with what tradeoffs/opportunity costs)? (3) What do stakeholders consider Miami University's identity and core values (and to what extent do they align with the proposed Arena District project)? (4) What do members of the greater Miami University community want/prefer for Cook Field and Millett Hall (and how might such decisions impact Miami stakeholders' future relationship to and support for the university)?

The survey was analyzed to evaluate how respondents' connections to Miami, donor status, athletic event attendance, values associated with Miami, and facility use practices correlated with their preferences. A full description of the proposed Arena District project's background, a review of relevant scholarly research, and explanation of this community survey's purpose/goals, research questions, and methodology are included in this report, along with detailed analyses of results and a discussion of the findings and public sentiment for project planning. The full, de-identified dataset is available for download on our project website, as well as the previously released "initial findings" report documents. This project was approved for human subjects research by the Miami University Institutional Review Board (#05223e).

Summary of Results

Cook Field is frequently used for a variety of purposes, which more than 8 in 10 (82%) respondents considered important to the Miami experience, compared to 3 in 10 (31%) for Millett Hall. Millett Hall is not frequently used by respondents, with low athletic event attendance (54% did not attend *any* athletic events at Millett Hall in the past 12 months, and only 7.5% attended 6 or more athletic events). Interest in college sports (74%), quality of the teams (62%), and costs of attendance (60%) were the most important factors shaping attendance decisions, whereas the location convenience (50%) and quality of the facilities (35%) were the least important for respondents.

For most respondents, moving the facilities currently located at Cook Field to the Millett Hall site would substantially reduce their use of both facilities. The plan approved by the Board of Trustees—to

build an Arena District at the Cook Field site—would most likely reduce the use of Cook Field's facilities for a majority of respondents for all uses, while simultaneously reducing attendance at the athletic (and other) events that the new arena would host. Alternatively, renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at/near Millett Hall's current site would likely most increase respondents' future athletic event attendance.

Among a clear majority of respondents, the aesthetic beauty of Miami's campus, its academic reputation/prestige, high-quality education, career preparation, and the college town experience that Oxford offers are highly valued and considered integral to Miami's identity. Conversely, very few respondents see collegiate athletics and the quality of athletic facilities as important to the institution's identity (or "brand") and values. For the most part, this remained consistent across respondents' connections to Miami and donor status. Collegiate athletics and athletic facilities were considered among the lowest of 13 strategic investment priorities. In short, stakeholders in this survey do not regard athletic programs/facilities as an important area to strategically invest the university's limited resources, and instead advocate for investing in areas they most associate with Miami's identity and value: a high-quality education, a beautiful campus, and an engaging college town experience.

Respondents overwhelmingly (89%) oppose the plan approved by the Board of Trustees to build an Arena District at the Cook Field site. Opposition to the Board-approved plan was near consensus, regardless of respondents' connections to Miami, their ideas about Miami's identity, the factors that drew them to Miami, their donor status, their uses of both Cook Field and Millett Hall, and the number of athletic events they attended at Millett Hall over the past 12 months. Instead, respondents overwhelmingly prefer preserving Cook Field as an open/green space (79%).

Nearly all respondents (94%) indicated that moving forward with the plan to construct an Arena District on Cook Field would decrease (69%) or have no impact (25%) on the likelihood that they donate to Miami University in the future. In short, the plan approved by the Board of Trustees to build a new Arena District on Cook Field would, among respondents, most likely result in the worst outcomes with respect to stakeholder support for the project, future attendance at athletic events, use of facilities currently offered at Cook Field and Millett Hall, and future donations. Preserving Cook Field as an open/green space and either renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at its current location most aligns with respondents' preferences and is most likely to increase their attendance at athletic events.

Public Sentiment & Project Planning

Survey results suggest that public sentiment favors the following with respect to project planning:

- Preserving Cook Field as an open green space.
- Renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at/near its current site.
- Investing university resources in what makes Miami unique—i.e., high quality education, academic prestige, campus beauty, and college town student experience.
- When possible, collaboratively partnering and transparently communicating with faculty, staff, students, alumni, and local businesses/organizations when making important university-related decisions—not only to maximize existing expertise, passion, and resources (and reinforce its mission to innovate through research and teaching), but also to help ensure stakeholders' buy-in, use of the facilities, and ongoing support for the university.

Miami University Community Survey on the Proposed "Arena District" Development on Cook Field

Final Report

February 2026

Introduction

This report provides context for and results of the community survey regarding the proposed "Arena District" that the Miami University Board of Trustees approved for the current Cook Field site in February 2025. The community survey was developed by an independent, interdisciplinary team of Miami University undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, and faculty to evaluate how the Board-approved plan aligns with stakeholder practices and preferences. The results of the survey are presented in accordance with the project's guiding research questions (see "Community Survey: Purpose & Research Questions" section below). Building upon the previously released "initial findings" report, this final report includes additional nuanced analyses, with the goal of providing meaningful, actionable, empirically sound information to help inform project planning.

This report begins with background information about the Arena District proposal, a description of the project approval process and timeline, and a review of relevant research on the impacts of similar investments at other universities and municipalities. This is followed by a detailed description of the community survey's purpose, research questions and methodology. The survey findings are then presented in the order of the four research questions that guided the project, followed by a summary analysis of open-ended, qualitative survey responses. This report then concludes with a discussion of the findings, a summary of community sentiment and preferences for project planning, and reflections on the project and its findings in light of Miami University's mission and history.

This report also contains a series of appendices, including the data tables referenced throughout the report, the survey instrument (including the informed consent document and procedures), data tables for qualitative coded responses, a qualitative codebook, a list of relevant sources about the proposed Arena District, and the survey project team members. The previously released "initial findings" announcement and report documents, as well as the full, deidentified dataset are available on our project website.

Background on the Proposed "Arena District"

The following description of the Arena District project's background is derived from a systematic review of over one hundred relevant documents, including Board of Trustees meeting documents, local media reports, editorials, and Miami University announcements, statements, and other public documents (see Appendix V). This background is also informed by faculty and staff with direct knowledge of the arena development project through their service on virtually

all relevant university committees. This background description is particularly indebted to the information compiled in a recent report to the University Senate prepared by the Fiscal Priorities and Campus Planning Committees regarding the proposed Arena District.[1] The goal is to help readers understand (1) the project planning-related decisions to date, (2) the proposed project's current status in the university's capital investment planning and approval process, and (3) the next steps involved with project planning and review/approval.

The public first became aware of the project in October 2024 when leadership announced it was "in the very early phases of exploring potential projects on its Oxford campus to enhance campus life and stimulate the local economy, including building a new multipurpose arena and leasing space on campus for a new university-affiliated hotel." Sites considered for the new arena initially included Slant Walk, Cook Field, and the historic buildings of the southwest quad, sparking concern among students and alumni.[2] This announcement—which came six months after Miami's annual budget symposium when leadership reported a $10.3 million annual budget deficit[3]—included some early project planning details. The university also announced it had recently issued a request for proposals seeking a "development team to design, construct, finance, operate, and maintain a university-affiliated full-service hotel with meeting space, high-quality food and beverage service, and fitness amenities on university-owned property. Though firms have expressed interest in the northwest corner of Cook Field, a final site has not been determined. If the university were to pursue this, it would expand Cook Field's turfed playing surface to the south in order to preserve sufficient recreation space for students."[4]

There are various viable locations, including adjacent to Millett Hall, but Cook Field is preferred by the administration and hotel developers for its centrality on campus: "Ideally, the site of a new multipurpose arena would be centrally located on campus, within walking distance for students and to Uptown Oxford, able to hold multiple events concurrently, and could better host university and city events, such as lectures, convocations, concerts, career fairs, and graduations."[5] The administration prefers to develop the Arena District in a central location to improve attendance at athletic events, leverage existing entertainment Uptown, and provide a 'gateway experience.' Hotel developers have also expressed a preference for a more central location.

In late fall 2024 the administration created and charged a committee, which included a single faculty member and no students, to evaluate possible locations for the arena district, with a focus on Cook Field and the Southwest Quad. Cook Field has historically been designated as

[1] Fiscal Priorities and Campus Planning Committees (2025), "Report of the Miami University Senate Fiscal Priorities and Campus Planning Committees Regarding the Proposed Arena Entertainment District: Executive Summary." [Draft provided in advance of its formal presentation to the Faculty Senate]

[2] Carreon, Zack (2024), "Miami University may build a new arena, but where it could end up is raising concerns." *WYXU*, December 11.

[3] Macy, L. (2024). "Budget Symposium 2024: Miami Looks to Diversify as Tuition Revenue Falls." *The Miami Student*, May 2.

[4] Miami University - Campus Life (2024), "Enhancing campus life and stimulating the local economy." October 17.

[5] Miami University - Campus Life (2024), "Arena exploration project committee seeks feedback." January 28.

open space for recreational sports. Half of Cook Field has been covered in artificial turf (with the remainder in natural turf), and is used for formal intramural and community sports practices and competitions, as well as informal physical activity. The margins of Cook Field provide faculty/staff parking. As an open space, Cook Field also contributes to campus aesthetics and sense of place.

Prior to the Board's vote, the Administration administered a two-question survey to current students, faculty, and staff about their site preferences for a new arena development—Cook Field vs. Southwest Quad (i.e. Oak & Spring St.).[6] The survey recruited participants through a single email announcement and was open for about a week (1/28/25 - 2/6/25),[7] during which the survey received about 1,500 responses. The *Oxford Free Press* obtained and analyzed the results of the administration's survey.[8] As the article's author, Sean Scott, described, "Through an independent analysis of the more than 1500 survey responses, obtained through a records request, the *Oxford Free Press* found that the community is widely opposed to the Cook Field location. More than 300 respondents explicitly opposed both sites or directly questioned the need for a new arena altogether."[9] Their analysis found that "survey respondents opposed the Cook Field location by more than two to one." Around the same time, an online petition was created demanding that university leadership "Preserve Cook Field at Miami University of Ohio from Basketball Stadium Conversion," collecting over two thousand signatures within weeks of its launch (as of writing, the petition has received 3,564 signatures).

Approximately three weeks after closing the survey, the Board of Trustees approved the Cook Field site for a new arena. In a statement to the *Oxford Free Press*, Miami University's senior director of communications, Seth Bauguess, said, "The committee members were provided with the full set of comments from the public, and they considered the input of the community and other factors in determining their recommendation," and that "Our focus will be to make this a student-centered project first and foremost, and that will drive design and amenity choices."[10]

Over the past year, Miami University students, faculty, staff, and Oxford community members have expressed concerns about and objections to the proposed Arena District project in

---

[6] The survey asked two open-ended questions: "Please share your thoughts about the Cook Field location," and "Please share your thoughts about the Southwest Quad location," in addition to respondents' first and last name and their email address.

[7] Miami University - Campus Life (2024), "Arena exploration project committee seeks feedback." January 28.

[8] The *Oxford Free Press* generously provided us with the administration's survey results and their analysis, which we reviewed and found no substantial disagreements or methodological concerns. Although it is likely that many participants in the administration's survey also participated in this survey, the approximately 1,500 responses to the administration's survey—and *OFP's* analyses of the results—'add' to the 3,347 responses we received, providing a rich collection of community data on this project.

[9] Scott, Sean (2025) "'An egregious affront': Survey results show widespread opposition to arena on Cook Field." *Oxford Free Press*, February 26.

[10] Scott, Sean (2025) "'An egregious affront': Survey results show widespread opposition to arena on Cook Field." *Oxford Free Press*, February 26.

local media outlets. These concerns include impacts to the campus aesthetics and their importance to the Miami identity and experience,[11] traffic congestion and parking issues,[12] construction-related disruptions to the university's core functions and health/safety of its members,[13] compartmentalized campus planning,[14] project costs and the adequacy of Millett Hall for its intended purposes and level of demand,[15] lack of transparency and consideration of stakeholders' perspectives in project planning,[16] neglect of Millett Hall's historical significance,[17] inadequate collaboration with the City of Oxford,[18] and concerns about not investing such a large amount of the university's limited resources in its academic programs and faculty.[19] Notably, in the 30+ local news publications/editorials on the arena project that we reviewed, there were not any expressing outright support for the proposal to build a new arena on Cook Field (see Appendix V).

The total costs of the project are still being determined, but early feasibility studies have estimated the costs to construct the arena at $185 million, with total costs of $220 million when including the cost of the demolition of Millet and replacing/relocating recreational sport fields.[20] Additional improvements will be required, including roadway infrastructure and parking, as well as additional costs to replace or renovate facilities for Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC).

Cost of construction is expected to be financed by a combination of donations (target $75M) and the remainder through borrowing. The administration is considering issuing $100M to $200M of new debt, which would be paid off with annual payments between $6M to $13.9M by redirecting existing student fee revenues.[21] The administration is also considering relocating

[11] MacDonald, Sue (2024), "Letter to the Editor: Plans for a potential arena on a central campus site." *Oxford Free Press*, December 21.

Stanley, Jerome (2024), "Letter to the Editor: Miami's proposed Slant Walk site for a new arena." *Oxford Free Press*, December 6.

[12] Schnabl, Steve (2025), "The Old Townie: Traffic woes and a new arena." *Oxford Free Press*, June 4.

[13] Zawila, Sidney (2025), "Unnecessary movements: Miami's costly construction project" - *The Miami Student*, September 29.

[14] Scott, Sean (2025), "How does Miami plan for campus development, and is it enough?" *Oxford Free Press*, March 16.

[15] Zien, Kathleen (2025), "Letter to the Editor: Miami arena needs are currently met." *The Miami Student*, March 7.

[16] Turman, Kasey (2025), "Survey responses go against committee's recommendations." *The Miami Student*, February 27.

[17] Campbell, Richard (2024), "Save Millett: Arena over troubled water." *Oxford Free Press*, November 15.

[18] Scott, Sean (2025), "Old buildings, new developments and alternative visions." *Oxford Free Press*, March 17.

[19] Faculty Alliance of Miami (2025) "Op-ed: A better Miami, a stronger community…but when?" *Oxford Free Press*, January 17.

[20] For more information that the Miami University Administration has announced regarding its proposed Arena District project slated for Cook Field, see: Campus Announcements (2025), "Board of Trustees approves site for the design phase of an event district with multipurpose arena." *Miami News*, February 28. See also, Fiscal Priorities and Campus Planning Committees (2025), "Report of the Miami University Senate Fiscal Priorities and Campus Planning Committees Regarding the Proposed Arena Entertainment District: Executive Summary." [Draft provided in advance of its formal presentation to the Faculty Senate]

[21] Miami University Board of Trustees (2025) "Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting," February 27th.

the recreational sports fields currently on Cook Field to locations at the edge of campus, including some at the current Millett Hall site and others at Chestnut Fields.

The Board of Trustees approved funding to hire an architecture firm to develop initial designs and cost estimates, and have discussed a range of possible funding/borrowing strategies. However, pending more information about fundraising and borrowing needs, it has not yet committed to proceeding with the project. Officials have identified and begun to work with a possible hotel developer, but given uncertain market conditions and viability, those conversations are currently on hold pending Board of Trustees action on the arena. No market or other empirical analyses have been presented to assess likely visitation to arena events or related economic development, nor the impact of greater centrality on attendance. Given the complexity of the projects, in 2025 the Campus Planning Committee highlighted the critical need for a campus master plan and consultative planning, and recommended that site selection and planning decisions only be reached through shared governance and that capital projects of such a scale should be subject to feasibility and market analysis.

At time of writing, the project is moving forward in the 'exploratory phase,' according to university officials. The Board of Trustees budgeted $3.5M for architectural and engineering services to develop preliminary designs and estimate construction costs for the proposed new arena. The arena is now featured in Miami University's THRIVE strategic plan, although it's not clear if or how it emerged from that process. In an email to *The Miami Student*, David Creamer, vice president for finance and business services and university treasurer, said that the trustees will decide whether to move forward with constructing the design as presented at the next meeting on February 26-27, 2026.[22]

As Professor Emeritus, Jerome Stanley, wrote in the *Oxford Free Press (*when the administration was considering Slant Walk for the arena), "If Miami University is serious about Love and Honor, it would be advisable for it to honor its alumni by giving them the opportunity to vote for or against the proposal to build an arena on the Slant Walk."[23] Although this survey is not a formal "vote" on the proposal, per se, this survey project and report sought to provide a medium for stakeholders to express their perspectives and preferences about the project and compile them in a transparent and useful manner for leadership's consideration in project planning.

Review of Relevant Research

To situate the proposed Arena District project and university leadership's stated goals and objectives for their proposal, a brief review of relevant research on similar projects is provided. This review addresses impacts of constructing large athletics facilities on university applications

[22] Dugan, Evelyn (2026) "Survey findings indicate strong opposition to arena district construction on Cook Field." *The Miami Student*, January 13.

[23] Stanley, Jerome (2024), "Letter to the Editor: Miami's proposed Slant Walk site for a new arena." *Oxford Free Press*, December 6.

and enrollment, event attendance, media exposure, donations, and shared governance. There is not a collective and unified set of peer-reviewed research examining large athletics facility projects across NCAA Division I with rigorous causal identification of enrollment, national prestige and notoriety effects, and growth on event attendance. However, there is a small but growing body of literature that has examined several of these factors independent of one another.

Peer-reviewed work does not find large or consistent enrollment growth in student applications as a result of building new athletics stadiums, arenas, and facilities.[24] New athletics facilities appear to play, at most, an indirect, supportive role in college enrollment and applications.[25] Athletic success (e.g., wins, bowl/playoff experiences, TV exposure) is the main driver of how the athletic brand impacts applications and enrollment rather than facilities themselves.[26]

There is little evidence to support the notion that a new arena will result in more attendance when controlling for variables such as competitive quality and media exposure. Research on lower division college football (NCAA DIII) found that competitiveness, local factors, and scheduling have a far greater impact on event attendance than facility factors.[27] Instead, team quality and event attendance are positively related: better teams generally draw larger crowds, though the size of the effect depends on division, opponent, and context. And although winning is important for attendance, it is not sufficient on its own to guarantee strong crowds in every setting. Higher team quality reliably raises attendance in college athletics, but it operates alongside other demand drivers—and a new sport facility is not identified among them.[28]

---

[24] Chung, Doug J. (2017) "How Much is a Win Worth? An Application to Intercollegiate Athletics," *Management Science* 63(2): 548-65.

[25] June, A. W. (2006), "What does athletics do for colleges?" *Chronicle of Higher Education, 52*(49), A35–A36.

[26] Using data from 2006–2016 and a multiple regression model with corrections for multiple testing, Baumer and Zimbalist (2019) find that while a successful football program is associated with more applicants, there is no effect on the composition of the student body or funding for the school through donations or state appropriations. Baumer, B. S., & Zimbalist, A. S. (2019) "The impact of college athletic success on donations and applicant quality," *International Journal of Sport Finance* 14(2), 85–101.

[27] Natke, P. A., Falls, G. A., & Xiao, L. (2025) "A long-run approach to college American football attendance in Division III," *Atlantic Economic Journal, 53*(3), 295–320.

[28] A study of NCAA Division I men's basketball found that higher recent winning percentage, conference standing, and postseason relevance are associated with increased home attendance (Hwang, 2016). Another study of a restarted Division I FCS program with a new on-campus stadium reports that alumni felt more connected to the university and more satisfied with the game-day experience, and that the new stadium increased alumni likelihood of attending games relative to students (Christiansen, Greene, and Jones, 2019). Research on mid-major college football shows a similar pattern: winning more games, qualifying for bowls, or contending for conference titles significantly boosts home attendance, while sustained losing seasons depress it; the effect is often stronger at mid-majors because success is rarer and more salient to local fans (Padget and Hunt, 2012). The impact of quality is moderated by factors such as opponent quality, time and day, weather, ticket prices, and media options (Leeds, Von Allmen, and Matheson, 2023). See: Hwang, J. C. (2016) *Essays on demand for college sports* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens, GA; Christiansen, L. A., Greene, A., & Jones, C. W. (2019) "College football revival: Analyzing the impact of marketing efforts on key stakeholders at a Division I FCS commuter school," *Journal of Applied Sport Management, 11*(1), Article 6; Padgett, T., & Hunt, C. S. (2012) "The influence of winning on mid-major college football attendance," *Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 13*(2), 129–139;

In professional sports, research finds that a new sport facility can create a short-term increase in event attendance known as the "honeymoon effect" (alternatively referred to as the "stadium novelty effect"), which is followed by a decline toward a more normal attendance level over time.[29] After this initial spike (typically about 3-5 years), attendance usually drops from the first-year peak but often remains above pre-stadium levels, meaning there is a "honeymoon" plateau that is better than the old normal but worse than the first year.[30] While the honeymoon effect reliably boosts attendance in the short to medium term, it does not eliminate the importance of fundamentals such as team quality, pricing, scheduling, and opponent quality. In fact, many teams saw substantial declines after the first year in a new arena, even if they still outperformed the last year in the old facility.[31] Simply put, the academic consensus is that a new sports facility has little to no medium- or long-term impacts on event attendance.[32]

Recent research finds that national television coverage and media exposure matter more than facility improvements for drawing spectators.[33] While research finds a minor increase (6%) in event attendance among NCAA Division I Men's Basketball teams when broadcast on national television,[34] research also finds that national television can increase overall interest in a

---

Leeds, M. A., von Allmen, P., & Matheson, V. A. (2023) *The economics of sports* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

[29] Howard, D. R., & Crompton, J. L. (2003). "An empirical review of the stadium novelty effect," *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 12*(2), 111–116.

[30] Huang, C., & Soebbing, B. P. (2021) "No novelty effect but a honeymoon that lasts: On the attendance effects of new football stadiums," *Global Economy Journal, 21*(4), 1–24. See also Howard & Crompton (2003).

[31] Schreyer, D., & Ansari, P. (2021). Revisiting the novelty effect from new stadiums: An event study of attendance in European football. *Contemporary Economic Policy, 39*(4), 807–826.

[32] Research does support some evidence of intercollegiate athletic competitiveness and impact on admissions and enrollment (Pope and Pope, 2009; McGrady, 2011; Cormier et al., 2023). Commonly dubbed the 'Flutie effect' or 'Cinderella effect' athletic success has been shown to be a windfall, allowing for increased applications and higher yields (Pope and Pope, 2009). Additionally, Cormier et. al. (2023) finds that successful intercollegiate athletic effects are generally positive (e.g., increasing peer rankings, alumni giving, student academic quality). Research also suggests that success in intercollegiate football and basketball has a positive effect on student interest and enrollment decisions (i.e., the number of applications; higher yield rates), but not on the quality of students (i.e., the quality of applications) (Woo, 2017). Although many universities are now pursuing this strategy to mixed effects, a small number of universities have been quite successful in using success at the NCAA Division 1 Men's Basketball Tournament to gain national notoriety and increase student applications (see: Florida Gulf Coast; Butler University; Loyola University Chicago; George Mason University; Virginia Commonwealth, and University of Maryland - Baltimore County). Perhaps notable is Indiana University's recent success in college football that has grown institutional prestige, national recognition, and alumni engagement. This is relevant given that IU is Miami's #1 competitor for students outside of the State of Ohio (#2 overall behind Ohio State). See: Cormier, B. M., Mulholland, S. E., & Price, J. (2023) "The Flutie and Anti-Flutie Effect: The impact of football championships and athletic scandals on universities," *Journal of Sports Economics, 24*(7), 905–934; McGrady, M. (2011) "The Cinderella effect: The impact of NCAA men's basketball success on college applications," Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, CO.; Pope, D. G., & Pope, J. C. (2009), "The impact of college sports success on the quantity and quality of student applications," *Southern Economic Journal, 75*(3), 750–780; Woo, C. K. (2017). Winning at what cost? The impact of NCAA football and basketball success on college applications, enrollment, and student quality. Doctoral dissertation, University of California.

[33] Losak, J., Marteka, S., & Mangos, P. (2023) "National television exposure and college football attendance," *Journal of Sports Economics, 24*(6), 745–771.

[34] McEvoy, C. D., & Morse, A. L. (2007), "An investigation of the relationship between television broadcasting and game attendance at NCAA Division I football games," *The Sport Journal, 10*(1), 1–15.

team but often substitutes for game attendance.[35] Simply put, as more games are available for television viewing, there is less of an incentive to attend the event in-person. Therefore, national television exposure for competitive college sport teams is found to be both a compliment and substitute for event attendance.

Significant investments in collegiate athletics can enhance school brand equity, but mainly through creating successful, competitive, and visible programs rather than because of the spending itself.[36] Winning football and men's basketball programs raise media exposure, which increases how often people see and recall the institution's name and logo, which are key components of brand awareness and national notoriety. However, there is no evidence that spending on the construction of sport facilities alone will generate the national notoriety and brand exposure frequently sought by higher education institutions and university administrators.[37]

Among scholars examining the relationship between athletic spending and alumni donations, there is a relative consensus that alumni giving depends on several variables, such as athletic success and national notoriety.[38] Winning records unto themselves do not often translate into more donations, unlike bowl game appearances and NCAA basketball tournament appearances.[39] While there is evidence to support donor investments in college athletics for growing national exposure and brand equity, it is unclear whether significant investments in college athletic facilities alone yield significant gains in these areas.

Research on decision-making around major collegiate athletics repeatedly highlights its association with weak shared governance, limited faculty oversight, and minimal integration into academic planning or transparent cost-benefit analysis.[40] Athletics facilities can generate long-term financial commitments that constrain academic budgets, yet are frequently advanced

---

[35] Fort, R. (2018) *Sports Economics* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; Losak, J., Marteka, S., & Mangos, P. (2023) "National television exposure and college football attendance," *Journal of Sports Economics, 24*(6), 745–771; Zhang, J. J. (1997) "Development of a spectator decision-making inventory (SDMI)," *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 6*(1), 35–42.

[36] Bozman, C. S., Muthukumarana, S., & Tuli, K. R. (2015). The impact of college football on university brand equity. *Marketing Management Journal, 25*(2), 1–16; Higgins, R. R. (2006). The impact of intercollegiate athletic success on university brand equity and student recruitment. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 16*(1), 1–21. See also Chung (2017).

[37] Athletics success does indeed follow from large-scale investments in supportive elements like facilities, coaching, support, and more recently, athlete compensation. These investments can strengthen perceptions that a school is 'big-time', competitive, and well resourced, which can spill over into generalized impressions of institutional quality. Tripathi (2015) finds that brand equity is enhanced through high-profile university football programs, but only with sustained competitiveness, on-field success, and appearances in bowl games. See: Tripathi, M. (2015). Brand equity development in college football. Working paper, Emory University. Available on SSRN.

[38] Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1996) "Fourth down and gold to go? Assessing the link between athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly, 77*(4), 789–803; Sigelman, L., & Bookheimer, S. (1983) "Is it whether you win or lose? Monetary contributions to big-time college athletic programs," *Social Science Quarterly, 64*(2), 347–359.; Sigelman, L., & Carter, R. (1979) "Win one for the giver? Alumni giving and big-time college sports," *Social Science Quarterly, 60*(2), 284–294.

[39] See Baade and Sundberg (1996).

[40] See Chung (2017).

by presidents and boards as strategic branding projects with little input from stakeholders nor formal *ex ante* evaluation of academic tradeoffs. Even in instances where administrators later wanted to deemphasize intercollegiate athletes, reign in the spending on facilities, and restore shared governance, accountability, and transparency to intercollegiate athletics, they are often subject to corporate demands rather than those of the university community.[41]

In summary, research on similar investments in collegiate athletic arenas find that athletic success matters (for interest, enrollment, and donations), and an arena can (maybe) help create athletic success. But there is no evidence or guarantee that a new arena *causes* athletic success, alumni donations, and national notoriety. In the process, such investments can undermine transparency, shared governance, and institutional autonomy. Simply put, the notion that an arena itself will likely increase attendance, national notoriety, and alumni donations is not supported by research.

Community Survey: Purpose & Research Questions

Because the proposed arena district project would be one of the largest capital investment projects in Miami University's history, an interdisciplinary team of undergraduate students, graduate students, alumni, and faculty came together to ensure all Miami University stakeholders could have their perspectives and preferences heard and compiled about this historic decision in a transparent manner. This survey project sought to collect empirically robust and actionable social scientific data that captured stakeholders' perspectives in a way that, ideally, can help inform project planning and decision-making. (This survey project was independently undertaken and not affiliated with the Miami University administration.)

This project sought to answer four research questions, according to which the findings in this final report are presented:

1. How frequently and in what ways do members of the greater Miami University community use Cook Field and Millett Hall (and how important are they to the Miami experience)?

[41] King-White, Beissel, and Clevenger (2021) conducted a historic analysis of administrative governance, university decision-making, and the shift toward 'big-time college athletics' at one mid-Atlantic institution over the span of three decades. The institution's growing investment in intercollegiate athletics was reflective institutional leadership that ignored core aspects of shared governance and collective decision-making. Instead, it was reflective of the contemporary corporate university that prioritizes using university athletics to create an institutional identity competitively positioned in the educational marketplace. Elsewhere, King-White and Beissel (2018) found that in nearly three decades of university decision-making regarding college athletics, the university lacked any real semblance of accountability, transparency, and shared governance when making major decisions like conference realignment, moving from Division III to Division I, and more than $100 million dollar investments in a new basketball arena. See: King-White, R., & Beissel, A. (2018) "The corporatization of college football and the erosion of shared governance," *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 11*, 1–23; King-White, R., Beissel, A., & Clevenger, S. (2021) "Trust me, don't trust me": Administrative governance and the shift to big-time athletics at Towson University," *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 14*, 627–656.

2. How would significant changes to existing facilities impact their current and future use (and with what tradeoffs/opportunity costs)?

3. What do stakeholders consider Miami University's identity and core values (and to what extent do they align with the proposed Arena District project)?

4. What do members of the greater Miami University community want/prefer for Cook Field and Millett Hall (and how might such decisions impact Miami stakeholders' future relationship to and support for the university)?

A key reason for these questions is that the various stakeholders we surveyed are not only members of the Miami University community but also its potential donors *and* "customers" (for events, as prospective students and hires, etc.). Answering these questions with the perspectives of Miami's various stakeholders is, we believe, essential for ensuring the university most effectively uses its limited resources in ways that reflect and align with its stakeholders' practices, preferences, and values—and Miami's "brand"—while also ensuring their current and future support.

The relevant empirical findings for each question are followed by a summary of findings for answering each question, which are further elaborated upon in the conclusion. In addition to a discussion of findings, the conclusion also contains a summary of community sentiment for project planning based on the findings.

This survey project and report were inspired and guided by the following principles:

1. ***Empirically-Informed Planning*:** To ensure the most effective use of Miami's limited resources, major investment-related decisions involving collective, public resources should be informed by empirically sound, robust data on how stakeholders use existing facilities and campus resources—and how such investments would likely impact Miami's institutional identity and its stakeholders' future facilities use and financial support.

2. ***Interdisciplinarity & the Teacher-Scholar Model*:** This project embodies Miami University's commitment to interdisciplinarity and the "teacher-scholar model" by bringing together a team of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and alumni with diverse interdisciplinary backgrounds, training, and experience to conduct (or learn how to conduct) empirical and actionable research, all in service of the University and greater Miami/Oxford community.

3. ***Transparency & Democratic Participation*:** As a public institution, it is essential that all relevant stakeholders have an opportunity to provide input for major capital investment projects that will inherently have impacts on the financial, academic, and social wellbeing of the greater Miami University community of which they are a part, in the present and in perpetuity. Transparency in decision-making is also essential for ensuring

community-wide support and buy-in from stakeholders for Miami's major investment decisions and strategic direction.

We have intentionally taken several steps throughout this project to uphold the principles of transparency and empirically-informed planning. On December 4th, 2025, we released our initial findings to the public that entrusted us with their data—prior to the end of the Fall semester and the Board of Trustees meeting. This full report provides additional transparency in communicating more nuanced information to the public and stakeholders. As stewards of the community's voices, we have also made the full, de-identified (i.e., not including raw, open-ended responses) dataset available for download on our project website.

Data, Sample, & Quantitative Methods

To best address our research questions in an empirically robust and timely manner, we developed and administered an online Qualtrics survey, which was open for three weeks (10/20/25–11/10/25). We used various outreach strategies to recruit current undergraduate and graduate students (and their parents/guardians), alumni, faculty, staff, and Oxford residents and business owners/employees to participate in the survey in order to ensure that all members of the "greater Miami University community" had the opportunity to share their perspectives.

Using snowball/convenience sampling techniques, these outreach and recruitment efforts included social media posts in Miami University groups, flyers posted around campus (dorms, academic buildings, common areas) and town (business storefronts and message boards), tabling in common areas (e.g., Armstrong Student Center) and at events (e.g., Parents Weekend football tailgates, Uptown Halloween, etc.), advertisements in and interviews for local newspapers (*Oxford Free Press* and *The Miami Student*), various email listservs (shared by, e.g., student groups, departments and programs, community groups/organizations, etc.), and word of mouth. This project was approved for human subjects research by the Miami University Institutional Review Board (#05223e).

Without the use of incentives for recruitment or well-defined population parameters, there is not an adequate methodological basis to determine the representativeness of our final sample. Non-random sampling strategies can produce certain biases, since those who tend to have the strongest opinions and/or personal investment are more likely to self-select into taking a survey. This is known as "self-selection bias." Thus, it is likely that the results of this survey disproportionately reflect the attitudes and sentiments of those who have relatively stronger opinions on the matter, and thus may not accurately reflect (or "represent") the attitudes and sentiments of the broader Miami University community, as a whole. The extent of this bias is impossible to determine without adequate population parameters and additional demographics.

Nonetheless, our final sample size and the distribution of 'respondent connections' (i.e., their affiliations with Miami) indicate a well-rounded sample with substantial statistical power. This means that, although we have statistical confidence in our analyses, we cannot say with

certainty that (or to what extent) these findings accurately reflect the beliefs and sentiments of all members of the greater Miami University/Oxford community. Survey findings presented in this report, therefore, should be interpreted as reflecting the sentiments, attitudes, practices, and beliefs of the respondents, but not necessarily that of the greater Miami University community.

Over a series of meetings, email communications, and rounds of collective input, discussion, and revision, the survey instrument was designed by an interdisciplinary group of undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, and faculty with decades of experience in social science survey development, measurement, and analysis (and who collectively serve on virtually all relevant university committees). Survey questions were designed with the goal of collecting data that could meaningfully inform project planning. We limited the number of survey questions to maximize participation while still capturing robust measures. Each measure was developed to provide empirically rich and nuanced answers to our overarching research questions.

The survey asked respondents about their use of the facilities in question; the potential impacts of proposed changes on their facility use and athletic event attendance; core values and identity of Miami University; preferences for how these facilities and resources should be used; and how the proposed project may impact stakeholders' relationship to Miami. See Appendix IV for the full survey instrument questions, response options, and informed consent.

Over 4,100 unique survey IDs were generated, and, after removing duplicates, resulted in **a final sample of 3,347 respondents.** The criteria for inclusion in the final sample are that a participant: (1) give their informed consent, (2) provide their age (at least 18 years old) and connection to Miami, and (3) answer at least one other survey item. The final, cleaned data set was then subject to analyses by a team of faculty, students, and alumni with expertise in quantitative and qualitative social science research methods.

Analyses include frequencies (i.e., the number of responses to a given question) and cross-tabulations (i.e., the number of responses to a given question based on responses to another question). Cross-tabulations enable us to examine valuable nuances based on respondents' relationship to Miami (e.g., students, alumni, faculty/staff, local residents), their donor status, and relationships with other relevant variables (e.g., factors shaping their decision to attend athletic events, by respondents' athletic event attendance in the past 12 months). The corresponding data tables for each item are provided in Appendix I.

To assess the extent to which responses in two variables are correlated—i.e., the change in one variable is associated with a change in another—we used Pearson chi-square tests for most cross-tabulations (except those by respondent connection), which is generally considered the standard measure of statistical significance for correlations among categorical variables. To interpret the Pearson chi-square test results, we applied the standard social science levels of statistical significance in our reports (i.e., those with probability values of .05 or less are considered statistically significant—meaning, the chance that the correlations across responses are not random is 95% or greater).

To check for relevant variations, notable patterns, and relationships across variables, we also ran a variety of additional cross-tabulations and other correlational analyses that are not included in this report. These were excluded primarily because they confirmed the analyses presented in the report, and thus did not offer new, substantive insights. Moreover, because this report already contains 61 tables (Appendix I), these additional analyses were excluded for the sake of parsimony. In addition to providing the full, deidentified dataset available for download on our project website, these additional analyses can also be provided upon request.

All open-ended responses—including "other, specify" options for each survey item—were coded and analyzed by a team of Miami graduate and undergraduate students (further detailed in the following section). Graduate students helped teach and mentor the undergraduates about how to develop and apply codes to qualitative data, successfully coding thousands of responses in a matter of weeks. With faculty guidance and quality checking, their work was systematically reviewed to ensure consistency. The student team produced a codebook that provides an explanation/definition of each code in the dataset (see Appendix II). A summary analysis of responses to open-ended survey questions are integrated and presented in this report (see 'Summary of Qualitative Findings' section). However, because the "Other, Specify" option was selected by a very small percentage of respondents for the vast majority of survey items, these are not included in this report's analyses. Nonetheless, frequency tables of coded responses for each survey item with open-ended response options are provided in Appendix III.

Qualitative Methods

Given that a primary objective of this project was to provide undergraduate students experience and exposure to research methodology, the qualitative component of the analysis was conducted using a structured, multi-stage thematic approach. Open-ended survey responses were analyzed through inductive coding procedures consistent with established qualitative methodologies. To ensure both analytical accuracy and that the analysis be done in a timely manner, responsibility for coding was distributed among undergraduate and graduate researchers.

Undergraduate students were assigned specific subsets of the open-ended survey questions. Coding assignments were distributed in groups (e.g., two or three undergraduate researchers were assigned to Questions 2 and 3, while additional groups were responsible for subsequent questions). Undergraduate researchers conducted initial coding for open-ended responses to Questions 2 through 14. Meanwhile, graduate researchers conducted qualitative analyses of the two most expansive narrative questions (Questions 15 and 16), which elicited broader reflections on institutional identity, campus space, and administrative decision-making.

The qualitative analysis process began with an initial reading of the data, during which all open-ended responses were reviewed to promote familiarity and gather a broader understanding of what was being said. Graduate researchers then employed inductive coding techniques to identify recurring patterns, salient concepts, and interpretive themes within the data. This process resulted in the identification of three primary thematic categories: Perceived Administrative

Disconnect, Modernization of Miami, and Cook Field as the *Genius Loci* of Oxford. These themes served as overarching analytic frameworks encompassing the multiple subthemes and variations in responses.

Following the completion of undergraduate coding, graduate researchers conducted a secondary review to assess coding consistency, ensure conceptual alignment between responses and assigned codes, and refine thematic groupings. This process functioned as an internal reliability check and facilitated the mentor model that the research project was intended to provide. The final analytical stage synthesized themes across all open-ended responses to produce a cohesive interpretive narrative addressing the perceived utilization, symbolic significance, and institutional meanings associated with Millett Hall, Cook Field, and the broader identity of Miami University among students, alumni, faculty, staff, and community members.

Acknowledgements

We are immensely grateful, humbled, and inspired by the robust participation in this grassroots survey. One of this project's clearest findings is how deeply members of the greater Miami/Oxford community *care* about this university and community. The vast and widespread participation by students (and their parents), faculty, staff, alumni, and local residents, businesses and organizations in support of this survey project demonstrates the immense passion and investment that a diverse range of stakeholders have in the success of Miami University. Through canvassing local businesses and analysis of local residents' survey responses, it is also clear how much the success of Miami University and Oxford are inextricably tied, and how much stakeholders recognize this. Thank you to everyone who took the survey and helped spread the word—it truly took a *community* to realize this community survey. We couldn't have done it without you.

We would also like to thank Miami University's Center for Career Exploration & Success and the Menard Family Center for Democracy for awarding three of the undergraduate research team members with financial support for their work on this project. We would also like to thank all the Oxford businesses and organizations that helped promote the survey by posting flyers and/or spreading the word. There are also dozens of faculty, staff, students, and community members who volunteered, contributed to, and/or provided valuable support and guidance for this project in a variety of ways—many of which preferred to not be publicly named (you know who you are). Thank you for all your help, guidance, and support.

Finally, the amount of project-relevant expertise among faculty—and, for students, the desire to learn—also points to the invaluable internal resources that Miami University already possesses. The willingness of all involved to voluntarily use their time, energy, and expertise in service to the University is but one demonstration of both the desire and capacity for this expertise to be mobilized to ensure the Miami/Oxford community's collective success. In other words, the people who study, live, and work here want to see Miami thrive, and already possess

(or, at the very least, have the desire and capacity to learn) a wide range of relevant expertise and skills that can help realize Miami's full potential. Perhaps one of the greatest lessons learned from this project is that Miami's collection of leadership, faculty, staff, students, alumni, local businesses and organizations constitute the university's most essential and abundant resource/asset that, when brought together in meaningful collaboration and partnership, can be mobilized to make immensely constructive, positive contributions to the greater Miami University community.

Survey Results & Findings

Sample Description

In the final sample (n = 3,347), respondents varied in age from 18 (minimum age allowed) to 94 years. The average age of respondents was 32.5 years and median age of 22 years (standard deviation: 17.15) (Table 1). The sample included a diverse range of stakeholders, many of whom identified as having multiple connections to Miami/Oxford (thus this item's reported percentages exceed 100%). Half (51%) identified as current Miami undergraduate students (and 7% as current graduate students), 21% as alumni, 13% as parents/guardians of current/recent students, 10% as current/former staff, 9% as current/former faculty, and 2% as local business owners/employees, as well as 16% identifying as local residents (an additional 1.5% identified their connection to Miami using the "Other, Specify" option) (Tables 2 & 3). Henceforth, respondents' various connections to Miami University will be referred to as "respondent connections" or "connections."

Analyses of survey results are readily broken down into robust stakeholder categories (i.e., respondents' connection(s) to the greater Miami University community) because of our large and well-rounded (i.e., distribution of connections) sample. Moreover, each respondent's connection(s) to Miami offers distinct temporal (current, prospective, retrospective), institutional, and relational perspectives about not only the proposed Arena District project but also about what makes Miami—and the experience it offers stakeholders—unique and valuable. Because of the rich and varying perspectives each connection offers for project planning, the findings for most survey items are also broken down by respondent connections (i.e., crosstabulations). As reported in Tables 2 and 3, the fact that so many respondents identified with multiple connections to Miami demonstrates how deeply invested people are in Miami, Oxford, and their mutual success—and how intertwined they are. We see this as a valuable asset.

Q1: How frequently and in what ways do members of the greater Miami University community use Cook Field and Millett Hall (and how important are they to the Miami University experience)?

Cook Field

Respondents reported regularly using Cook Field for a variety of activities (Table 4). The most frequently reported uses were "leisure and green space" (49% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 30% occasionally) and "informal physical activity" (39% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 33% occasionally), followed by "parking lot" (32% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 25% occasionally) and "organized sports competitions" (30% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 24% occasionally).

Cook Field usage varied by respondents' connections to Miami (Table 5). For current students, "leisure and green space" were the most frequently reported uses of Cook Field (56% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 26% "occassionally"), their parents/guardians (34% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 39% "occassionally"), alumni (46% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 34% "occassionally"), and local residents (34% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 39% "occassionally"). For these same respondents, informal physical activity was the second most frequent use of Cook Field. Parking was the most frequently reported use of Cook Field among faculty (51% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 26% "occassionally") and staff (49% "somewhat" or "very frequently"; 27% "occassionally"). Organized sports competition was, on average, the least frequently reported use of Cook Field across all respondent connections (53% "never" or "rarely"), followed by parking (37% "never" or "rarely").

More than eight in ten respondents (82%) indicated that Cook Field has been an important aspect of their experience at Miami University/Oxford (Table 6). Although there was expected variation in frequency and type of Cook Field uses, there was also a notable amount of agreement across respondent connections regarding how important they felt Cook Field is to the Miami/Oxford experience (Table 7). This generally held across respondent connections, with a range from 76% (current/former staff) to 85% (students) stating Cook Field is either somewhat or very important to their experience of Miami University/Oxford. Regardless of their connection to Miami, there is a near consensus among respondents that Cook Field is a relatively frequently and variously used resource and an important part of the Miami experience.

Millett Hall

In general, respondents reported using Millett Hall much less than Cook Field, and substantially fewer respondents considered Millett Hall important to their experience of Miami University/Oxford than Cook Field. Specifically, 10% of respondents said Millett Hall has been "very important," 21% said "somewhat important," 36% said "only a little important," and 33% said "not at all important" to their experience of Miami/Oxford (Table 8).

Millett Hall's importance to the Miami/Oxford experience varied by respondents' connection to Miami in notable ways (Table 9). About half of the respondents who identified as alumni (53%), local residents or local business owners/employees (51%), and parents/guardians of current/recent students (46%) reported that Millett Hall was "somewhat" or "very important" to their experience of Miami University/Oxford. Comparatively, students reported the lowest rates of Millett Hall's importance to their experience of Miami University, with only about one in five reporting Millett Hall as "somewhat" or "very important" (Faculty: 36%; Staff: 40%).

The most frequently reported uses of Millett Hall were attending athletic events (20% "somewhat" or "very frequently") and non-athletic events (15%), such as job fairs, dances, concerts, etc. The least frequent uses of Millett Hall were class meetings (3%) and student groups (4%) (Table 10). Millett Hall usage varied in some notable ways across respondent connections (Table 11). Interestingly, current students most reported "never" or "rarely"

attending athletic (65%) and non-athletic events (60%) at Millett Hall. This was followed by faculty (~50% for both) and staff (46% for both). There were virtually no differences in reported use of Millett Hall for class meetings across respondent connections, with over 90% of all respondents "never" or "rarely" using it for that purpose. Surprisingly, 88% of students said they "rarely" or "never" use Millett Hall for student groups, which was a higher rate than for student parents/guardians (84%) and alumni (85%). The low rates with which current students (let alone all respondent connections) use Millett Hall is particularly surprising given their relatively close and consistent proximity to Millett Hall.

As the primary host for Miami University basketball and volleyball games, we asked respondents about their attendance at Miami athletic events in Millett Hall over the past 12 months. Respondents indicated low rates of athletic event attendance at Millett, with 54% attending none in the past 12 months, 27% attending 1-2 athletic events, 12% attending 3-5 athletic events, 4% attending 6-10 athletic events, and 3% attending 10+ athletic events (Table 12). Notably, attendance at athletic events in Millett Hall over the past year were fairly consistent across respondent connections (Table 13), with local residents (12%) attending the most (i.e., 6 or more athletic events), followed by students (8%), staff and alumni (7%), then students' parents/guardians and faculty (6%). Respondents who attended the fewest athletic events (i.e., 0-2 athletic events) were alumni and parents/guardians (84%), followed by faculty, students, and staff (81%), and local residents/businesses (71%). Additionally, there was a positive, statistically significant correlation between frequency of athletic event attendance and the importance to the Miami experience that respondents ascribed to Millett Hall (Table 14). Specifically, 81% of those who did not attend any athletic events at Millett Hall in the past 12 months said it was not important to the Miami experience, 69% of those who attended 1 or 2 games, 39% of those who attended 3 to 5 games, 28% of those who attended 6 to 10 games, and 14% of those who attended more than 10 games.

The most important factors shaping respondents' decisions to attend athletic events at Millett Hall were their overall interest in college sports (74% "somewhat" or "very important"), quality of the teams (62%), and costs of attendance (60%). The least important, though widely shared, factors were the convenience of location (50%) and quality of the facilities (35%) (Table 15). Notably, there was little variation in factors that respondents considered important when deciding whether to attend athletic events at Millett Hall (Table 16). Perhaps most interesting is that alumni had the largest proportion say "somewhat" or "very important" for all five factors asked about on the survey, and faculty had the largest proportion report "not at all" or "only a little important" for all five factors.

Collectively, these findings indicate that respondents take a variety of factors into consideration when deciding whether to attend a Miami University athletic event. Though respondents may give more weight to some factors than others, project planning could benefit from considering a diverse range of factors shaping attendance practices.

Additional Analyses

To account for the number of uses for both Cook Field and Millett Hall with respect to the level of importance respondents attribute to each, we created a variable that counts the number of uses (out of 4) for which respondents indicated "rarely" or "never" as a proxy measure for use (or lack thereof)—what we'll refer to as "non-uses." Zero non-uses indicates they use the facility for all four types at least "occasionally," up to four non-uses, which indicates respondents "rarely" or "never" use the facilities for all four use types. We cross-tabulated these proxy variables with the level of importance respondents attributed to them, using a Pearson chi-square test for statistical significance.

There is a negative and statistically significant correlation between the number of non-uses of both Cook Field and Millett Hall and the level of importance respondents ascribe to each (meaning, the fewer uses respondents report for a facility, the lower level of importance they ascribed to it). However, the range of users reporting either facility as "somewhat" or "very important" differ substantially across the number of non-uses for each.

Specifically, 96% of those who reported zero non-uses of Cook Field described it as important, down to 28% for those who reported four non-uses of Cook Field (Table 17). In comparison, 62% of respondents who had zero non-uses of Millett Hall said it was "somewhat" or "very important," down to 5% of respondents who reported four non-uses (Table 18). Thus, even when accounting for the number of uses of both Millett Hall and Cook Field, respondents indicated substantially higher levels of importance to Cook Field than Millett Hall.

To that end, one might also expect that current students would use both facilities more frequently than non-students, given their relative ease of access to both compared with other respondent connections. When accounting for the number of non-uses, students reported using Cook Field for more use types (and at a higher frequency) than non-students. The opposite was the case for Millett Hall, with students using Millett Hall less than non-students (both in frequency and number of uses) (Table 19).

Last, when crosstabulating the importance of Cook Field and Millett Hall (statistically significant correlation, >99.9% confidence), a majority of the 16% of respondents who said Cook Field is not important to the Miami experience also said the same of Millett Hall (Table 20). Yet, the same does not hold the other way around: Among the 69% of respondents who said Millett Hall is not important to the Miami experience, a clear majority (82%) say Cook Field is important. Moreover, among those who said Millett Hall is important, the majority also indicated that Cook Field is important.

Summary

The data presented in this section helps us to answer the first research question: How frequently and in what ways do members of the Miami community use Cook Field and Millett Hall, and how important are both to the Miami experience? In terms of frequency and types of

uses, respondents indicated that Cook Field is used more frequently than Millett Hall, with leisure/green space and informal activities as the most prevalent uses. Moreover, Cook Field is widely used—for a variety of purposes—and considered important to the Miami experience for more than 8 in 10 (82%) respondents. This contrasts with the view that Cook Field is underutilized.

Unlike Cook Field, Millett Hall is not frequently used by stakeholders, with low athletic event attendance. Most respondents (54%) did not attend *any* athletic events at Millett Hall in the past 12 months, with very few regular attendees (only 7.5% attended 6 or more athletic events). This is further supported by another survey item which found that only 20% of respondents reported attending athletic events either somewhat (13%) or very (7%) frequently. Interest in college sports (74%), quality of the teams (62%), and costs of attendance (60%) were the most important factors shaping respondents' attendance decisions—more so than location convenience (50%) and quality of the facilities (35%).

Based on these responses, improving team quality and reducing costs of attendance are the most likely factors to increase respondents' attendance, whereas improving facility qualities and the convenience of its location are the least likely to do so. The most important factor for respondents' athletic event attendance, interest in college sports (which held stable across frequency of athletic event attendance), may also be the most challenging factor to directly affect through investment of university resources. Though respondents may give more weight to some factors than others, project planning could benefit from considering a diverse range of factors shaping attendance practices rather than just location centrality.

Respondents indicated that both Millett Hall and Cook Field are important to the Miami experience, but at substantially different levels. 82% of respondents indicated that Cook Field is important to their Miami University/Oxford experience, compared to 31% for Millett Hall. When deciding how to use limited university resources, the widespread use and significant amount of importance ascribed to Cook Field, regardless of respondents' connection(s) to Miami, indicates its centrality to the Miami experience. While Millett Hall is important to about 1 in 3 respondents, about triple the number of respondents said that Cook Field is important to the Miami experience, indicating that the latter is an integral, widely used, and valued aspect of what Miami offers to its various stakeholders.

Q2: How would significant changes to existing facilities impact their current and future use (and with what tradeoffs/opportunity costs)?

Cook Field

To understand the potential impacts of the proposed Arena District development at the Cook Field site on respondents' uses of the existing facilities, we asked respondents how their use of Cook Field would change across the same four types of uses (leisure/green space, informal physical activity, organized sports competitions, and parking lot) if Cook Field were moved to the current location of Millet Hall.

A clear majority said they would use Cook Field "a lot less" (range across uses: 67-81%; average: 74%) for all four use types (leisure/green space, informal physical activity, organized sports competitions, and parking lot) (Table 21). Only 2-3% of respondents said they would use it "somewhat" or "a lot more" for any of the uses if it were moved to the current location of Millett Hall—with a range of 10-20% (average of 14%) reporting it wouldn't impact their usage for all four types. This appears to indicate that moving the facilities currently located at Cook Field to the current site of Millett Hall would substantially reduce the likelihood of these stakeholders using it in the future—which is particularly notable given the preceding findings that Cook Field is widely used and highly valued.

This is further supported by crosstabulations of reported uses and impacts of relocation on future use (all of which have statistically significant correlations at >99.9% confidence level):

Formal Sports Competitions: A majority report that they would use Cook Field "a lot less" for formal sports competitions if relocated to the current site of Millett Hall regardless of their current usage, with those who use it most frequently for sports competitions being most likely (73%) to report they would use it "a lot less." Across all use levels, only about 1-2% of respondents reported that, if relocated to the current Millett Hall site, they would use the facilities more frequently for formal sports competitions (Table 22).

Informal Physical Activity: A majority report that they would use Cook Field "a lot less" for informal physical activity regardless of their current usage, with those who use it most frequently for informal physical activity being most likely (91%) to report they would use it "a lot less." Among the 12% of respondents who reported "never" using Cook Field for informal physical activity, only 4% said they would use it more if relocated to Millett Hall (Table 23).

Green Space/Leisure: Moving Cook Field to the current Millet Hall location would have the largest negative impact on its use for leisure/green space, which is respondents' most frequently reported use of Cook Field. Specifically, 95% of respondents who use Cook Field for green space/leisure report they would use it "a lot less" for those purposes if relocated. Among the 8% of respondents who reported "never" using Cook Field for green space/leisure, only 8% said they would use it more if relocated to Millett Hall (Table 24).

Parking Lot: A majority report that they would use the parking lot at Cook Field "a lot less" regardless of current usage, with those who use it most being most likely to say they would use it "a lot less" (89%) if relocated to the current Millett Hall site. Among the 22% of respondents who "never" use Cook Field for parking, only 6% indicated they would use it either somewhat or a lot more frequently for parking if relocated (Table 25).

In short, for the vast majority of respondents, not only is Cook Field widely used and considered an important aspect of the Miami experience, relocating it to the current Millett Hall site likely would dramatically reduce all of its current uses.

Millett Hall

If Millet Hall were moved to the current location of Cook Field, a plurality and/or majority of respondents said they would use it "the same amount" for all four use types ("attending athletic events" was the only use type below 50%, with 47% indicating they would use it the same; the other three types were 50% or greater) (Table 26). Notably, for each of the four use types, the proportion of respondents who indicated that, if Millett Hall were moved to the current Cook Field site they would use Millett Hall either "somewhat" or "a lot less," was larger than the proportion who indicated they would use it either "somewhat" or "a lot more." This seems to indicate that moving Millett Hall to the current Cook Field site would likely either have no impact on or diminish its current uses for most respondents.

This is further supported by crosstabulations of reported uses and impacts of relocation on future use (all of which have statistically significant correlations at >99.9% confidence level):

Athletic Events: A plurality of respondents, regardless of their reported athletic event attendance at Millett Hall, indicated that relocating Millett Hall to the Cook Field site would have no impact on their attendance of athletic events (Table 27). Moreover, relocating Millett Hall to the Cook Field site would most likely result in lower attendance at athletic events among respondents who reported "never" attending athletic events (41% would use somewhat or a lot less), "rarely" (32% would use somewhat or a lot less), and "occasionally" (35% would use somewhat or a lot less). Thus, not only would relocating Millett Hall facilities to the Cook Field site likely have no impact for a plurality of respondents, it also would not likely attract those who do not currently attend many (or any) athletic events; in fact, they said they would be less likely to attend athletic events.

Non-Athletic Events: A plurality/majority of respondents indicated that relocating Millett Hall to the Cook Field site would likely have no impact on their use of the facilities for non-athletic events (e.g., job fairs, dances, concerts, etc.) regardless of their current use (Table 28). Interestingly, the largest impacts of relocation on current uses would be for respondents who reported using Millett Hall for non-athletic events "very frequently" (52% would use it less), "somewhat frequently" (44% would use it less), and "never" (40% would use it less). The group of respondents with the largest proportion indicating they would use

Millett Hall more frequently for non-athletic events if it were relocated to the Cook Field site were those who indicated they "rarely" use Millett Hall for non-athletic events (16%). Taken together, this indicates that relocating Millett Hall to the Cook Field site would either have no impact on or reduce these stakeholders' use of Millett Hall for non-athletic events.

Class Meetings: Respondents reported using Millett Hall for class meetings the least of the four uses asked about on the survey ("Never" = 82%; "Rarely" = 11%). Almost all respondents, regardless of current use levels, said that relocating Millett Hall to Cook Field would either have no impact on or reduce their use of Millett Hall for class meetings (Table 29).

Student Groups: Respondents reported using Millett Hall for student groups (e.g., ROTC, clubs, etc.) very infrequently (second only to class meetings), with 77% "never" using it and 11% "rarely" using it. Almost all respondents, regardless of current use practices, said that relocating Millett Hall to the Cook Field site would either have no impact or reduce their future use of Millett Hall for student groups (Table 30).

Together, these data indicate that, among respondents, relocating Millett Hall to the current Cook Field site would likely either have no impact on or substantially reduce all uses.

Impacts of New Arena Proposals on Future Attendance

If relocating Millett Hall to Cook Field would likely reduce or have no impact on most respondents' current uses of Millett Hall's facilities, then how would different arena locations and development proposals impact attendance at the athletic events that it would host? The survey asked respondents about how four different proposed options—(1) renovation of Millett Hall; (2) new arena at/near current Millett Hall location; (3) new arena at the Cook Field location; and (4) new arena at Oak and Spring Street—would impact their likelihood of attending athletic events in the future.

A majority/plurality of respondents (average: 55%; range: 48-60%) indicated that all of the options *except* a new arena at the Cook Field location—i.e., the plan approved by the Board of Trustees—would have no impact on their attendance (Table 31). Building a new arena at the current Cook Field location would most likely (meaning, the greatest likelihood reported by respondents *and* the most number of respondents indicating that likelihood) reduce attendance among respondents, with 41% saying they would attend "a lot less," 9% saying they would attend "somewhat less," and 37% saying it would not impact their attendance either way. According to respondents, renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at/near Millett Hall's current location would most likely increase future athletic event attendance, with 35% of respondents saying they would attend "somewhat" or "a lot more" for both options. In comparison, 13% of respondents said that, with a new arena at Cook Field, they would attend "somewhat" (9%) or "a lot more" (4%), and 23% said the same for a new arena at Oak Street and Spring Street (i.e., Southwest Quad).

This remained fairly consistent regardless of respondents' connection to Miami and the frequency at which they attended Millett Hall athletic events in the past 12 months (Table 32). For both renovating Millett Hall and building a new arena at/near Millett Hall, there is a positive correlation between respondents' attendance rates over the past 12 months and the likelihood that they would use the facilities somewhat or a lot more in the future (Table 33). For example, about 53% of respondents who attended 3-5 athletic events at Millett Hall last year said they would do so somewhat or a lot more for both options (compared to about 27% for those who did not attend any events). However, the extent of this impact does not hold for a new arena at Cook Field, with 21% of those who attended 3-5 athletic events saying they would attend somewhat or a lot more (compared to 9% of those who did not attend any events). In fact, among the 16% of respondents who attended 3-10 events at Millett Hall in the past 12 months, about 56% indicated they would use a new arena on Cook Field either somewhat (~11%) or a lot less (~45%). Notably, these figures are similar among those who did not attend any events in the past 12 months, though this group had a larger proportion say they would use it the same amount (41% compared to ~25%).

There was little substantive variation in future athletic event attendance across respondents' connections to Miami, indicating a general consensus that, among the proposals, building a new arena on the Cook Field site is the most likely to reduce (or have no impact on) future attendance for the greatest number of respondents; whereas renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at its current site is the most likely to increase attendance.

Summary

In summary, most respondents reported that moving the facilities currently located at Cook Field—an important resource for a clear majority—to the Millett Hall site would substantially reduce their use. Moreover, building a new arena on the current Cook Field site would likely either ***reduce*** or have no impact on most respondents' attendance at athletic events and use of the facility—both of which are notably low. Renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at/near Millett Hall's current location are the most likely options to increase respondents' future attendance, and a majority say that all arena proposals would have no impact on their attendance.

The plan approved by the Board of Trustees—to build an Arena District at the Cook Field site—would most likely reduce the use of Cook Field's facilities (which are used far more often and for more uses than Millett Hall) for a majority of respondents for all use types, while simultaneously reducing their likelihood of attending the athletic (and other) events that the new "Arena District" would host. In other words, the plan approved by the Board of Trustees would likely have the greatest ***negative*** impacts on respondents' current and future uses of all facilities in question. Conversely, renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at its current site would likely have the greatest ***positive*** impacts on their current and future uses of both Millett Hall and Cook Field.

Q3: What do stakeholders consider Miami's identity and core values (and to what extent do they align with the Arena District proposal)?

Values, Qualities, and Factors that Make Miami Unique & Attractive

We used two different measures to assess respondents' ideas about what makes Miami University unique and attractive—in other words, its identity, value(s), and "brand." The first asked about the most important factors for respondents when deciding to attend or work at Miami University (and/or live in Oxford). 95% of respondents said the campus beauty/aesthetics were either "somewhat" or "very important," followed by 90% indicating the same for Miami University's academic reputation/prestige, 85% for the college town experience (Oxford), and 68% for Miami University non-athletic events/activities. By far, the least important factors were Miami University athletics and the quality of its athletic facilities (25% of respondents said that both factors were either "somewhat" or "very important") (Table 34).

In general, there was little substantive variation in responses for most items across respondents' connections to Miami (Table 35). The most notable variations included the importance of Miami athletics when deciding to attend/work at Miami, with 33% of both alumni and students' parents/guardians indicating it was somewhat (24%) or very (9%) important. Comparatively, 26% of local residents/businesses, 23% of students, 21% of staff, and 12% of faculty said the same. There was also little variation in responses for most items between donors and non-donors. Among those who have donated to Miami, 96% said campus beauty/aesthetics was an important factor when deciding to attend/work at Miami, followed closely by the college town experience (88%), academic reputation/prestige (75%), and non-athletic events (71%). The least important factors for donors (and non-donors, alike) was collegiate athletics (28%) and the quality of athletic facilities (27%) (Table 36). Among those who have never donated (i.e. potential donors), campus beauty (94%), academic reputation/prestigue (88%), and the college town experience (82%) were the most important factors they considered when choosing to attend/work at Miami. Conversely, collegiate athletics and the quality of athletic facilities had, by far, the fewest respondents (21%) say they were important when choosing Miami.

The second measure asked about the qualities and values respondents most associate with Miami University. Respondents ranked the importance of six qualities/values: quality of education, campus beauty/aesthetics, institutional reputation/prestige, college town experience, professional/career preparedness, and collegiate athletics (Table 37). 9 in 10 respondents described all of these qualities/values, *except* collegiate athletics, as "somewhat" or "very important" (average: 94%; range: 88-99%). Conversely, 31% of respondents said collegiate athletics were "somewhat" or "very important" (with 32% of respondents saying collegiate athletics were "not at all important," and 36% "only a little important"). To put this in perspective, nearly triple the number of respondents most associate Miami with its academic reputation, beautiful (open, green) campus, and the college town experience of Oxford than those who most associate Miami University with its athletics and athletic facilities.

With respect to qualities/values most associated with Miami, there was little variation for most qualities/values across respondents' connections. However, there were some notable variations in the importance of collegiate athletics across respondents' connections to Miami. Specifically, 46% of students' parents/guardians indicated they were somewhat (39%) or very important (7%); 43% of alumni said they were somewhat (33%) or very important (10%); and 38% of local residents/businesses indicated they were somewhat (32%) or very important (6%). Comparatively, 27% of students, 25% of staff, and 18% of faculty said the same (Table 38).

There was also little substantive variation in the qualities/values that donors and non-donors most associate with Miami (Table 39). The most important qualities/values that respondents who have donated in the past most associate with Miami University are quality of education and teaching (99.5%), campus beauty/aesthetics (98.4%), professional/career preparation (95.5%), institutional reputation/prestige (94.5%), and the college town experience (90.8%). By far, the least important quality/value of Miami among Miami donors was collegiate athletics, with only 37.6% indicating it was somewhat (29.4%) or very important (8.2%). Similarly, non-donors (i.e. potential donors) most associate Miami with its educational quality/teaching (98%), professional/career preparation (96%), campus beauty (95%), institutional reputation/prestige (85%), and the college town experience (85%), whereas only 25% of non-donors said the same about collegiate athletics.

With little variation in the qualities/values respondents—across all connections and donor statuses—most associate with Miami *and* the factors they considered important when deciding to attend/work at Miami, there appears to be a relatively clear consensus among stakeholders about what makes Miami unique and attractive: Academic prestige, campus beauty, and the college town experience. Conversely, for all stakeholders in this survey, collegiate athletics and quality of athletic facilities are, by far, the least important to the Miami brand/identity.

Strategic Investment Preferences

To assess how those values translate into priorities and preferences about Miami's strategic investments and use of resources, we asked respondents to select and rank their top three investment priorities from a list of 13 items (plus an open-ended "Other, specify" option).[42] The following is based on the proportion of respondents who included each strategic priority item in their top three (Table 40). The most popular strategic priorities among respondents include investing in "the student experience and campus culture" (69%), "career preparation and experiential learning" (63%), "reducing costs of attendance" (62%), "instructional quality and facilities" (61%), and "research facilities and support" (54%). The least popular strategic priorities among respondents are investing in "marketing/branding and communication" (13%), "athletic programs and facilities" (14%), and "digital technology infrastructure and online learning" (17%). In the middle were "campus safety and accessibility" (46%), "campus

[42] Open-ended (or 'qualitative') responses—for the four open-ended survey questions and write-in ("Other, specify") responses to close-ended questions—were thematically coded and will be included in the full report's analyses.

sustainability" (45%), "expand offerings and facilities in high-growth fields" (35%), "a robust humanities and creative arts curriculum" (35%), and "community programming and events" (32%).

There were some noteworthy variations in strategic investment priority areas across respondents' connections to Miami (Table 41). Among students, the most frequently selected strategic priority areas were student experience/campus culture and reducing costs of attendance (both 49%), followed by career preparation (37%). For the parents/guardians of students, the most popular were instructional quality/facilities (63%), career preparation (51%), and student experience/campus culture (49%). Like parents/guardians, the most popular strategic investment priorities among alumni were instructional quality/facilities (54%), student experience/campus culture (51%), and career preparation (43%). Among faculty, the most popular investment priorities were instructional quality/facilities (72%), reducing costs of attendance (42%), and research facilities/support (38%). Among staff, the most popular investment priorities were instructional quality/facilities (62%), reducing costs of attendance (38%), and student experience/campus culture (37%). Similarly, for local residents/businesses, the most popular strategic investment priorities were instructional quality/facilities (50%), student experience/campus culture (42%), and reducing costs of attendance (37%). Instructional quality/facilities and student experience/campus culture were a top-3 strategic investment priority for 5 of the 6 connection groups, and reducing costs of attendance were a top-3 strategic investment priority for 4 of the 6 groups. Thus there appears to be a relative consensus among respondents about these strategic investment priority areas.

There were also notable, statistically significant variations in strategic investment priority areas based on respondents' donor status (Table 42). About 3 in 4 donors said instructional quality and facilities are a top strategic priority, compared to about 6 in 10 non-donors. About 4 in 10 donors said expanding offerings in high-growth fields are a top strategic priority compared to 1 in 3 non-donors. About 7 in 10 non-donors said reducing cost of attendance is a top strategic priority, compared to 56% of donors. About half of non-donors said campus sustainability is a top strategic priority compared to 4 in 10 donors. Notably, donors and non-donors had near consensus that athletic programs and facilities were the lowest strategic investment priority (second only to marketing/brand communication).

While there are some notable variations in strategic priority areas across respondent connections and donor status, there was a relative consensus about which investment areas are most prioritized—with instructional qualities/facilities, student experience/campus culture, career preparation/experiential learning, reducing costs of attendance, and research facilities/support as the overwhelming top strategic priorities. By far, athletic programs/facilities—along with marketing/brand communication and online learning—had the fewest respondents identify as (top-three) strategic investment priorities.

Summary

Among a clear majority of respondents, the aesthetic beauty of Miami's campus, its academic reputation/prestige, high-quality education, career preparation, and the college town experience that Oxford offers are highly valued and considered integral to Miami's identity. Conversely, very few respondents see collegiate athletics and the quality of athletic facilities as important to the institution's identity (or "brand") and values. For the most part, this remained consistent across respondents' connections to Miami and donor status. As detailed in the Qualitative Findings section below, many participants noted in open-ended responses that students seeking a predominantly athletics-centered collegiate experience would have selected institutions with established athletic identities, such as the University of Cincinnati or Ohio State University. Thus, these respondents' opposition to the arena was framed as a defense of Miami University's academic identity rather than a critique of Miami athletics.

In short, most stakeholders in this survey do not regard athletic programs/facilities as an important area to strategically invest the university's limited resources, and instead advocate for investing in areas they most associate with Miami's identity and value: high-quality education, beautiful campus, and an engaging college town experience.

Q4: What do members of the greater Miami University community want/prefer for Cook Field and Millett Hall (and how might such decisions impact stakeholders' future support for the university)?

Vision for Cook Field

Respondents' strategic investment priorities are reflected in their preferences for the future of Cook Field, with about 8 in 10 respondents (79%) preferring to preserve Cook Field as an open/green space (Table 43). Conversely, only 4% preferred to redevelop Cook Field as an Arena District. (11% preferred redeveloping Cook Field with a mix of academic and open spaces, 5% preferred redeveloping Cook Field as an Arena District with some academic uses, 1% preferred redeveloping it as an academic quad, and 2% selected "Other"). With 82% of respondents indicating that Cook Field has been important to their experience of Miami University (Table 6), and nearly the same percentage (79%) preferring to preserve it as an open/green space, it appears that respondents greatly value Cook Field and prefer that it be preserved.

This is reinforced by crosstabulation analyses, which show a clear consensus for preserving Cook Field as an open/green space across respondents' connections to Miami (Table 44). Specifically, 82% of students, 78% of local residents, 76% of faculty, and 74% of alumni, student's parents/guardians, and staff report they prefer to preserve Cook Field. There was some minor support for redeveloping Cook Field with a mix of academic and open spaces (ranging between 10-14% across respondent connections). Support for the plan approved by the Board of

Trustees—redeveloping Cook Field as an Arena District—also showed very little support across stakeholder groups, with a range of 1.8-6.4% across connections (average: 3.6%).

Similarly, there was a general consensus across respondents who have and have not donated to Miami, with 73% of donors and 82% of non-donors preferring to preserve Cook Field as an open/green space (Table 45). With considerably lower support, redeveloping Cook Field with a mix of academic and open spaces was the second most popular option for donors (12.5%) and non-donors (9.6%). Notably, only 5% of respondents who have donated to Miami and 3% of those who have not donated prefer the plan approved by the Board of Trustees to redevelop Cook Field as an Arena District. This appears to contradict the view that donors prefer to develop a new arena at Cook Field (or that it may attract potential donors).

Moreover, the frequency of athletic event attendance at Millett Hall over the past 12 months had very little impact on respondents' preferred vision for the future of Cook Field (Table 46). Among the 97% of respondents who attended between 0-10 athletic events at Millett Hall, approximately 8 in 10 preferred to preserve Cook Field as open/green space. Even a majority (60%) of the 3% of respondents who reported attending more than 10 athletic events at Millett Hall preferred to preserve Cook Field as an open/green space. Regardless of athletic event attendance, there was very little support for redeveloping Cook Field as an Arena District—i.e., the plan approved by the Board of Trustees. Only among the 3% of respondents who attended more than ten athletic events at Millett Hall in the past year was there double-digit support for the Arena District on Cook Field, with 15% of this group supporting it (0 events: 1.4%; 1-2 events: 4.6%; 3-5 events: 7.7%; 6-10 events: 5.8%). In other words, a clear majority prefer to preserve Cook Field regardless of how often they attend relevant athletic events.

In short, the vast majority of respondents prefer to preserve Cook Field as an open/green space regardless of their connections to Miami, their donor status, and the frequency with which they use both Cook Field and Millett Hall (including athletic event attendance). If the Cook Field facilities are relocated to/near the current Millett Hall site, the most popular facilities/amenities that respondents said they would like to see at this new location are open air/green space (81%), walking/running paths (66%), turfed sports fields (54%), and changing rooms/bathrooms (44%)—in other words, all the facilities that currently exist at Cook Field (Table 47). Other popular amenities included pickleball courts (39%), outdoor basketball courts (28%), and outdoor fitness equipment (27%).

Support/Opposition to Arena District on Cook Field

Respondents' overwhelming preference to preserve Cook Field in its current form and location is reflected in their overall degree of support for/opposition to the plan to develop an Arena District on Cook Field, as approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2025 (Table 48). About 9 in 10 respondents oppose the Board-approved plan (78% "strongly oppose;" 11% "somewhat oppose). Only 7% of respondents support the plan (3.5% "strongly support;" 3.7% "somewhat support"), and 4% "neither oppose nor support."

There was little variation in opposition/support for an Arena District on Cook Field between those who have and have not donated to Miami, as well as by respondent connections. 91% of those who have not donated oppose the project (only 6% expressed support), and 86% of those who have donated oppose the project—with only 10% of donors expressing support (Table 49). Thus, about 9 in 10 respondents oppose the project regardless of their donor status. The same largely held across respondent connections, with every connection type reporting no less than 86% opposing the plan (range: 86-91%) and no more than 11% supporting it (range: 5-11%) (Table 50).

Moreover, the clear majority of respondents oppose an Arena District on Cook Field regardless of their reported athletic event attendance rates (Table 51). Opposition to the project by athletic event attendance ranges from 93% for those who did not attend any events to 70% for those attending 10+ events. Similarly, support for the project ranges from 5% among the 55% of respondents who did not attend any events, up to 26% for the 3.3% of respondents who attended 10+ events.

There was greater variation in support for the Arena District project on Cook Field by the number of "non-uses" respondents reported for Cook Field (Table 52). Among the 31% of respondents who reported zero non-uses, 97% oppose the project, 2% support, and 1% neither support nor oppose it. Among the 32% of respondents who reported one non-use of Cook Field, 95% oppose the project, 3% support, and 2% neither support nor oppose it. Among the 17% of respondents who reported two non-uses, 91% oppose the project, 6% support, and 3% neither support nor oppose it. Among the 11% of respondents who reported three non-uses, 71% oppose the project, 19% support, and 11% neither support nor oppose it. Among the 8% of respondents who reported four non-uses, 55% oppose the project, 34% support, and 11% neither support nor oppose it. In other words, for the 80% of respondents who reported using Cook Field for at least two activities, over 9 in 10 oppose the project—and a majority of those who never use Cook Field still oppose the project.

There was an even clearer consensus of opposition to the Arena District project on Cook Field when accounting for respondents' reported number of "non-uses" of Millett Hall (Table 53). From zero to four non-uses, an average of 88% of respondents (range: 86-95%) opposed the project, and an average of 9% supported it (range: 2-13%). Those who reported four non-uses of Millett Hall (i.e. did not report using Millett Hall for any of the four activities asked about on the survey) had the largest proportion opposing the project (95%), and those who reported two non-uses had the smallest proportion oppose the project (82%). The smaller range of opposition/support across Millett Hall uses compared to that of Cook Field indicates that use of Millett Hall has little impact on respondents' support for/opposition to the project.

When accounting for the various values/qualities respondents most associate with Miami and the factors that were most important to them when deciding to attend/work at Miami, opposition to the proposed Arena District development on Cook Field does not drop below about 8 in 10 respondents, including those who said Miami athletics and its athletic facilities were

important. The only notable exceptions being: Among the 6.5% of respondents who said that collegiate athletics were "very important" quality/characteristic associated with Miami, 61% opposed the project and 34% supported it; similarly, among the 5% of respondents who said the quality of athletic facilities were "very important" when deciding to attend/work at Miami, 68% oppose the project and 28% support it.[43]

Opposition to the project approved by the Board of Trustees is near consensus, regardless of respondents' connections to Miami, their ideas about Miami's identity, the factors that drew them to Miami, their donor status, their uses of both Cook Field and Millett Hall, and the number of athletic events they attended at Millett Hall over the past 12 months.

Project-related Concerns

To understand this opposition, respondents were asked about the extent to which six different items concerned them about the prospect of an arena being constructed on Cook Field (Table 54). Respondents were asked to describe their level of concern (on a 4-point likert scale from "not at all a concern" to "very significant concern") about parking/traffic congestion, loss of campus green space, construction-related noise/congestion/pollution/disturbance, inadequate demand for sporting event attendance, impacts on campus aesthetics/beauty, and use of university resources/opportunity costs (i.e., not investing in other important amenities and campus resources, financial aid, research funding, etc.).

93% of respondents said that loss of campus green space is a somewhat (11%) or very (82%) significant concern. 90% of respondents indicated that both parking/traffic congestion (15% "somewhat" + 75% "very") and use of university resources/opportunity costs are (18% "somewhat" + 72% "very") significant concerns. This was followed by 87% of respondents who said impacts on campus aesthetics/beauty are either a somewhat (15.6%) or very (71.8%) significant concern, and 80% indicating that construction-related noise/pollution/disturbances are somewhat (23%) or very (57%) significant concerns. Last, 71% of respondents said that inadequate demand for sporting event attendance is a somewhat (26%) or very (45%) significant concern.

For all six areas of concern respondents were asked about on the survey, there is very little variation across respondent connections (Table 55). This level of consensus about project-related concerns across respondent connections is surprising, given the substantial amount of variation in each connection's relative proximity to these potential disruptions and the regularity of encounters with and use of the facilities asked about on the survey. In general, the variation in degree of concerns by donor status was minimal, for which only half of the concerns had a statistically significant difference by donor status (Table 56). The concerns for which differences varied in a statistically significant way by donor status were loss of campus green

[43] Tables for these analyses are not included in the Appendix due to their size (i.e. six crosstabulation tables) and relative ease with which they are summarized. These tables can be provided upon request.

space, construction-related disturbances, and opportunity costs/tradeoffs. Yet, for each of these concern areas, there was no greater than 5% difference in the proportion of donors and non-donors who described them as "somewhat" or "very significant concerns."

In short, all six project-related concerns that were asked about in the survey were described by the vast majority of respondents as (very) significant concerns. There was very little notable variation in project-related concerns across respondent connections and donor status, demonstrating a near consensus about the wide range of significant concerns this project raises across Miami stakeholders.

Impacts on Future Donations

In addition to respondents' strong opposition to and wide range of concerns about the plan approved by the Board of Trustees, most respondents indicated that moving forward with this plan would undermine their future financial support for Miami University. For context: 38% of respondents indicated they have donated to Miami in the past, 51% have never donated to Miami, and 11% were not sure if they have donated (Tables 57 and 58). When asked how might a decision to construct an Arena District on Cook Field affect their likelihood of donating to Miami University in the future, about 7 in 10 respondents said they would be less likely to donate to Miami (50% "A lot less likely;" 19% "Somewhat less likely"), and 1 in 4 (25%) said it would have no impact (Table 59). Only 6.5% of respondents indicated they would be more likely to donate to Miami in the future (3.2% "A lot more likely;" 3.3% "Somewhat more likely").

There was little variation across respondent connections (Table 60). About 7 in 10 respondents said they would be less likely to donate to Miami in the future if the administration moves forward with the plan to build a new Arena District on Cook Field, regardless of their connection to Miami (average: 68%; range: 64-71%). Although a clear minority across all respondent connections, there was *some* variation across respondent connections with respect to increased likelihood of donating to Miami: 2% of faculty, 4% of staff and local residents/businesses, 6% of current students and their parents/guardians, and 10% of alumni said they would be somewhat or a lot more likely to donate to Miami if they move forward with the plan approved by the Board of Trustees. Moreover, respondents who reported it would have no impact on their future donations ranged from 23% (current students and alumni) to 32% (staff).

Notably, there are no statistically significant differences in responses to this question between respondents who have and have not previously donated to Miami, with donors and non-donors reporting nearly identical responses (Table 61)—meaning that the plan approved by the Board of Trustees will reduce respondents' likelihood of donating to Miami University in the future for about 7 in 10 stakeholders, donors and non-donors alike (and, in both groups, only 6-7% reported being somewhat or a lore more likely to donate).

Altogether, for almost all respondents, moving forward with the project approved by the Board of Trustees would likely result in a net loss on future donations, with virtually all

respondents (~94%) indicating it would either reduce their likelihood of donating to Miami in the future (69%) or have no impact (25%), regardless of their connection to Miami and their donor status.

Summary

Respondents overwhelmingly oppose the plan (89%) approved by the Board of Trustees to build an Arena District at the Cook Field site. Opposition to the Board-approved plan was near consensus, regardless of respondents' connections to Miami, their ideas about Miami's identity, the factors that drew them to Miami, their donor status, their uses of both Cook Field and Millett Hall, and the number of athletic events they attended at Millett Hall over the past 12 months.

Instead, about 8 in 10 respondents (79%) prefer preserving Cook Field as an open/green space. This aligns with previously presented data (in Question #2 section above) which indicated that building an Arena District on Cook Field would most likely reduce athletic event attendance among respondents, whereas renovating Millett Hall and building a new arena at its current location would most increase future attendance.

Not only do respondents overwhelmingly oppose the plan approved by the Board of Trustees—regardless of their connection to Miami, their donor status, and their attendance at athletic events—nearly all respondents (94%) indicated that moving forward with the plan to construct an Arena District on Cook Field would decrease (69%) or have no impact (25%) on their likelihood of donating to Miami University in the future. In short, the plan approved by the Board of Trustees to build a new Arena District on Cook Field is, among respondents, the most likely to result in the worst outcomes with respect to stakeholders' support for the project, their future attendance at athletic events, and their future donations. Conversely, preserving Cook Field as an open/green space and either renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at its current site would most align with respondents' preferences, is most likely to increase their attendance at athletic events, and less likely to reduce their future donations.

Summary of Qualitative Findings

The following summary comes from responses to the survey's four explicitly open-ended items: (1) In a few words, please explain the importance of Cook Field for your experience of Miami University; (2) In a few words, please explain the importance of Millett Hall for your experience of Miami University; (3) What, if any, thoughts or feelings do you have about decision-making and/or communications, to date, regarding the multipurpose arena/entertainment district project?; and (4) What, if any, other thoughts or comments would you like to share?

Responses to these questions were organized into thematic codes, whose description and analysis are summarized below.[44] Analysis of thematic codes are informed by their qualitative content—and the range of material included in each code—and their quantitative appearance. Collectively, they provide additional nuances to (and support) the results discussed above.

Perceived Administrative Disconnect

The theme *Perceived Administrative Disconnect* emerged prominently across responses from multiple stakeholder groups, including students, parents, alumni, faculty, staff, and local community members. Responses categorized under this theme articulated the perception that the proposed arena project was misaligned with Miami University's stated mission and academic priorities. Participants frequently framed the project as an example of institutional misuse of resources, particularly emphasizing concerns regarding the use of student fees and recent diversion of funds from academic programming and infrastructure. Calls for increased transparency and clearer communication from the Board of Trustees were also prevalent, particularly regarding the long-term financial, academic, and community impacts of the project.

Additionally, respondents expressed apprehension regarding issues of accessibility, campus safety, and residential proximity. Concerns about increased traffic, crowd management, student safety, and disruption to the learning environment were commonly raised, mainly from parents whose children resided in nearby housing or students themselves who resided in the same area. Respondents within this theme emphasized that institutional efforts should prioritize academic investment, student dorm-residential quality, and research opportunities over large-scale athletic development.

Importantly, critiques articulated under this theme did not reflect a complete rejection of athletics within higher education. Rather, respondents positioned their concerns within the context of institutional differentiation and mission alignment. Several participants noted that students seeking a predominantly athletics-centered collegiate experience would have selected institutions with established athletic identities, such as the University of Cincinnati or Ohio State University. Therefore, opposition to the arena was framed as a defense of Miami University's academic identity rather than a critique of athletics as a component of university life.

Modernization of Miami

The theme *Modernization of Miami* captured a more conditional and pragmatic set of perspectives among respondents who acknowledged the potential value of updating university

[44] To protect participants' confidentiality/anonymity—in accordance with our agreement with Miami University's Institutional Review Board (#05223e)—we do not include any direct quotations from participants' responses. Considering the similarities in open-ended survey responses we received with those provided for the administration's two-question survey, see the article written by the *Oxford Free Press* which provides direct quotes: Scott, Sean (2025) "'An egregious affront': Survey results show widespread opposition to arena on Cook Field." *Oxford Free Press*, February 26.

facilities and enhancing institutional competitiveness. Participants within this category generally expressed conditional support for modernization initiatives while simultaneously emphasizing the importance of preserving campus green space, student well-being, and Miami University's academic ethos.

Several respondents proposed renovating Millett Hall as an alternative to new construction, framing renovation as a compromise that could modernize athletic infrastructure without fundamentally altering campus space or student life. While respondents frequently expressed enjoyment of athletic events, they emphasized that athletics should remain a "fun" option, rather than a dominant focus, within the institutional identity of Miami University.

Moreover, participants commonly contested the assumption that declining attendance at athletic events could be resolved through facility upgrades or relocation. Instead, respondents attributed attendance patterns to broader structural and cultural factors, including academic workload, student engagement priorities, and the perceived unimportance of athletics to the Miami collegiate experience. As such, the efficacy of a new, centrally located arena as a solution to attendance-related concerns was frequently questioned.

Cook Field as the *Genius Loci* of Oxford

The theme *Cook Field as the Genius Loci of Oxford* reflects respondents' articulation of Cook Field as a culturally, symbolically, and emotionally significant space within the Miami University campus and the surrounding community (*genius loci* means the prevailing character or atmosphere of a place). Responses within this category emphasized Cook Field's role as a site of core-memory formation, social interaction, and psychological restoration. Participants frequently referenced personal experiences, including the development of friendships, romantic relationships, and informal community connections facilitated by the field.

Beyond its instrumental value as recreational green space, Cook Field was described as central to the overall appeal of Miami. Respondents emphasized the accessibility of Cook Field as a space where students can hang out with friends, traverse between classes, observe recreational activities, or use for brief restorative breaks. These narratives positioned Cook Field as a spatial manifestation of belonging and collective identity within Oxford, thereby reinforcing its designation as the *genius loci* of the campus environment.

Summary

Overall, the qualitative findings indicate that respondents perceived a substantive lack of communication and meaningful engagement between university administration and key stakeholder groups, contributing to broader feelings of institutional disconnect. Furthermore, participants expressed concern that Miami University's prioritization of athletic development risked undermining its longstanding academic reputation as the "Ivy League of the Midwest."

Although perspectives varied regarding the proposed arena, a notable convergence emerged across respondent groups: both supporters and opponents questioned the assumption that facility location or modernization alone would address challenges related to athletic event attendance. Even respondents supportive of the project frequently advocated for alternative sites or the renovation of Millett Hall. Collectively, these findings suggest that future institutional planning efforts would benefit from enhanced transparency, proactive stakeholder engagement, and clearer alignment between proposed developments and Miami University's academic mission and student-body values.

Conclusion

Discussion of Findings, Recommendations, and Final Remarks

This report sought to answer four research questions related to Miami stakeholders' use and perceived importance of Cook Field and Millett Hall, the impacts of relocating both facilities on their current uses, the qualities/values they most associate with Miami University (including the factors they considered important when deciding to attend or work at Miami), and their preferences for the use of University resources and the future of Cook Field, Millett Hall, and their financial support for Miami. This section brings together the insights derived from the preceding analyses to answer those questions and, on that basis, summarizes (or 'extrapolates') community sentiments for project planning.

Discussion of Findings

First, Cook Field is widely and frequently used by a variety of stakeholders for a variety of purposes. This contrasts with the view that Cook Field is an underutilized resource and an ideal development site. Moreover, the clear majority of respondents—regardless of their connection to Miami—described Cook Field as important to the Miami experience. In other words, Cook Field is integral to the Miami "brand" and a valuable resource it offers stakeholders. In addition, for most respondents, relocating the Cook Field facilities to the current Millett Hall location is likely to reduce their use of those facilities for all uses, especially so for those who use it the most. In that respect, the plan approved by the Board of Trustees to relocate Cook Field's facilities to the current Millett Hall location would be an inefficient and ineffective use of a highly valued and widely used resource for respondents.

Second, moving Millett Hall to the current Cook Field site would likely either *reduce* or have no impact on its use for a majority of respondents across use types. While 31% respondents described Millett Hall as an important aspect of the Miami experience, far fewer respondents use Millett Hall and consider it important to the Miami experience than they do for Cook Field (82%). Across respondents, athletic event attendance at Millett Hall (i.e. basketball and/or volleyball games) was considerably low—54% did not attend *any* athletic events at Millett Hall in the past 12 months, and only 7.5% attended 6 or more athletic events. Considering that respondents' overall interest in college sports was the most important factor when deciding to attend athletic events—and the quality of athletic facilities and convenience of location were the least important factors—building a new arena on Cook Field is unlikely to increase their attendance. In fact, for most respondents, this would achieve the opposite: Building a new arena on the Cook Field site is most likely to *reduce* their attendance at future athletic events, regardless of respondents' current attendance practices and their connection to Miami—while renovating Millett Hall or building a new arena at its current location is most likely to *increase*

attendance. This is reinforced by record-setting attendance at Miami men's basketball games this season at Millett Hall—indicating that arena location and quality are not inhibiting attendance.[45]

In alignment with the various concerns raised by students, faculty, and community members in *The Miami Student* and *Oxford Free Press*, virtually all (~ 9 in 10) respondents expressed significant concerns about the Arena District proposal, including the loss of campus green space, impacts on the campus beauty/aesthetics, parking/traffic congestion, and significant concerns about not investing these resources in other key areas (i.e. opportunity costs). 8 in 10 respondents expressed significant concerns about construction-related noise and pollution that would disrupt the core functions of the university: teaching/learning, studying, and research/scholarship (and, for many, *living*)—much of which occurs in buildings/facilities that are either adjacent to or nearby the Cook Field site. Respondents' concerns about inadequate demand for athletic event attendance (71%) that the new arena would host is directly supported by respondents' general lack of attendance at sporting events, lack of consideration for and identification of Miami with collegiate athletics, and its lack of priority for strategic investment.

Third, considering that the proposed new arena development would be one of (if not *the*) largest capital investment projects in Miami's long history—with the estimated project's cost ($220 million) roughly equating to over one-fourth of the University's endowment ($812 million)[46]—it is important to determine the extent to which this use of university resources reflects the values, "brand," and preferences of its various stakeholders. In that respect, collegiate athletics and the quality of athletic facilities consistently ranked the least important qualities that respondents associate with Miami and considered least important when deciding to attend/work at Miami. It also had the fewest respondents say it was a strategic priority, alongside marketing/brand development and online learning/digital technology (both of which, notably, the administration currently sees as high priority areas for strategic investment).

Instead, respondents overwhelmingly preferred to invest in instructional quality and facilities, the student experience/campus culture, research facilities and support, career preparation/experiential learning, and reducing costs of attendance. This is reflected in what qualities respondents most associated with Miami and considered most important when deciding to attend/work at Miami: Campus beauty/green spaces, academic prestige/high-quality education, and the college town experience that Oxford offers. Collegiate athletics and the quality of athletic facilities were, by far, the least important qualities/values associated with Miami and the least important factors when deciding to attend/work at Miami. To invest the equivalent of a quarter of Miami's endowment—perhaps the largest facilities investment in its

[45] Medcalf, Myron (2026), "Sweets, socks, shoes: The superstitions behind the unbeaten run for Miami (Ohio)," *ESPN*, February 3; Miami University (2026), "Miami Pulls Away from NIU at Sold-Out Millett, 85-61," January 31; Miami News (2025), "One Miami Weekend brings nearly 8,000 fans to Millett Hall." Campus Life, February 6. See also Babu, Kethan (2025), "Is Miami's attendance issue really about where the arena is?" *The Miami Student*, February 28.

[46] Miami University Advancement. "2023-2024 Endowment Report: Miami University Endowment and Miami University Foundation - Investment Report for Donors, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2024."

history—in a new athletics arena would be the exact opposite of what nearly all stakeholders who participated in this survey believe would be the best use of resources, and thus the least aligned with what respondents consider core to Miami's identity, value(s), and "brand."

Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, investing Miami's limited resources in a new "Arena District" on Cook Field would not only be detrimental to most respondents' current use practices and preferences, but would also undermine their likelihood of donating to Miami. About 7 in 10 respondents said they would be less likely to donate to Miami in the future if the administration moves forward with the plan approved by the Board of Trustees this past February, with another quarter of respondents indicating it would not make a difference. Only 6.5% of respondents said the plan would make them more likely to donate in the future. Thus, not only would the plan likely reduce future athletic event attendance among respondents, it would also reduce most respondents' likelihood of donating to Miami in the future. Considering the potential reductions in attendance and future donations, alongside most respondents' reported misalignment of this project with the factors that were most important for them when "choosing" Miami, this collectively seems to indicate that this project could reduce multiple revenue streams that Miami University and the proposed Arena District project rely upon—from athletic event ticket sales to enrollment and donations—while undermining the availability/accessibility of a highly valued and frequently used resource at the heart of campus: Cook Field.

With this in mind, it is not surprising that about 9 in 10 respondents oppose the project approved by the Board of Trustees. This opposition remained relatively consistent across respondent connections, donor status, and athletic event attendance. Instead, a clear majority of respondents prefer to preserve Cook Field as it is—an open/green space with a variety of uses—and either renovate Millett Hall or build a new arena at/near its current location.

Public Sentiment & Project Planning

We extrapolate from these findings to summarize public sentiment for project planning. Such extrapolations, however, are subject to the limitations of this survey, which lacks an adequate methodological basis for generalizing findings to the broader population of the Miami University community. Thus, results are best interpreted as pertaining solely to the survey sample, which makes all project-planning extrapolations derived therefrom subject to the same limitations. Nonetheless, the collection of 3,347 stakeholders' perspectives, practices, sentiments, and preferences about the proposed arena district project are, unto itself, significant and valuable. The following is guided by these assumptions:

1. Miami University has finite resources and, thus, investing in some areas inherently means not investing in others—and such tradeoffs or "opportunity costs" should be given careful consideration when making strategic investment decisions;

2. Miami University seeks to use its existing resources and future investments in ways that best reflect and align with its various stakeholders' preferences and practices in order to ensure their buy-in, use, and ongoing support;

3. Miami University's strategic investments seek to promote/uphold its institutional identity (or "brand") while also ensuring 'returns on investment' (e.g. tuition/enrollment, donations, research funding, reputation/prestige, ticket sales, licensing/branding deals, sponsorships, etc.).

Based on the empirical findings presented above—and with these assumptions in mind—we extrapolate and summarize the following sentiments of the Miami University community for arena-related project planning that may be useful for Miami University leadership to consider:

Preserve Cook Field as an open/green space

Regardless of their connections to Miami, the majority of respondents said they frequently use Cook Field for a variety of purposes/activities, with near consensus that it is an important aspect of the Miami experience. Relocating Cook Field to Millett Hall would likely dramatically reduce its use among respondents. Moreover, qualitative responses indicate that many consider Cook Field's open green space at the "entrance" to campus as a key component of its aesthetic beauty and character—which is the most important factor for respondents when choosing Miami.

This is an easy "win" for the University: Cook Field is a cherished, frequently used, and relatively low cost facility on campus. In that respect, survey responses indicate that the simplest, most effective, and most "efficient" use of this highly valued resource is to preserve it.

Renovate Millett Hall or build a new arena at/near its current location

If an updated athletic arena is necessary, respondents' overwhelming preference is to either renovate Millett Hall or build a new arena at/near the current Millett Hall site. Doing so is most likely to increase their future attendance at athletic events and use of the facilities. According to public reports, statements, and Board of Trustees documents—and frequently highlighted in open-ended responses—renovating Millett Hall is also the least expensive option.

Renovating or building a new arena at Millet Hall thus presents an opportunity to (1) maximize future attendance at the athletic events that the facility would host, (2) best align with the preferences of stakeholders in this survey, (3) preserve the widely used and highly valued Cook Field, (4) potentially have lower project costs, and (5) pose the least amount of disturbance to campus life and its core functions.

Invest University Resources in What Makes Miami Unique

In an increasingly competitive and homogeneous higher education market,[47] respondents want Miami to invest its limited resources in its unique (and historic) institutional identity, rather than try to become something else (e.g. a major "sports school"). In fact, the results of this survey point to an important asset that Miami possesses: There is a relative *consensus* across Miami's various stakeholders (who participated in the survey) about what exactly are Miami's institutional value(s) and identity (i.e. its "brand"), *and* fairly widespread agreement about the kinds of strategic investments that Miami can make to uphold and advance those values and identity.

For respondents, that's investing in instructional quality and facilities, the student experience/campus culture, research facilities and support, career preparation/experiential learning, and reducing costs of attendance, not athletic facilities. In fact, collegiate athletics and athletic facilities are among the least prioritized strategic investment areas. In that respect, respondents provided clear and actionable information for guiding Miami's strategic direction(s), as well as a valuable, nuanced description of Miami's rich identity (academics, beauty, college town) and how much they value it. This is also a relatively "easy win" for the university—in terms of ensuring stakeholder buy-in and support—because stakeholders in this survey made clear what investment areas and strategic directions they believe would most "make it Miami."

Mobilize Miami's Richest and Most Abundant Resource: The People

A substantial number of respondents raised concerns about what they perceive as a lack of transparency involved with project planning to date and perceived lack of interest in stakeholders' input by the administration. When possible, respondents indicate a desire for leadership to collaboratively partner and transparently communicate with faculty, staff, students, alumni, and local businesses/organizations when making important University-related decisions. Transparency and inclusion not only maximize the university's existing expertise, passion, and resources—and reinforce its mission to innovate through research and teaching—but also help ensure stakeholder buy-in, use, and ongoing support.

Proactive and transparent collaboration across university stakeholders can also be an effective strategy to maximize the university's use of resources by tapping into its richest and most abundant resource: its people—and their expertise, passion to learn, and (relatively unique) collective desire to see this institution and community thrive. Empowering stakeholders in identifying and helping devise solutions to problems and opportunities is a particularly valuable practice as stewards of the public resources

[47] Rosowsky, David (2024), "Go Your Own Way: The Excessive Homogenization Of US Higher Education," *Forbes Magazine*, July 22.

invested in Miami and the experiences and services it provides. As former Miami University President, John D. Millett (after whom the arena in question was named), wrote in his 1963 greeting to students:

> "Because higher education is a social utility, it is also a social cost. No student can afford to be indifferent to the financial sacrifice of society which permits [their] enrollment at Miami University. These are serious times. They call for serious students. But college should also be a period of pleasant experiences, personal friendships, social maturity, and broadening intellectual horizons. This can be your experience at Miami University if you wish to make it so."[48]

In this case, President Millett's guidance for students is useful to consider for project planning: By appreciating the social costs associated with the public resources afforded to Miami University, using them in ways that most effectively create "pleasant experiences, personal friendships, social maturity, and broadening intellectual horizons" can be Miami stakeholders' experience if we "wish to make it so." After all, "these are serious times."

Final Remarks

We conclude this report by reflecting on Miami's history and its relevant lessons for the current Arena District proposal. We then reflect on this survey project and its findings in light of the University's Mission Statement. Given Miami's status as one of the oldest public universities in the US and its rich institutional legacy, the planning and decision-making involved with the current arena proposal may also benefit from considering the experiences and voices from the university's past.

The proposed Arena District development on Cook Field is remarkably reminiscent of a 1965 proposal in which university leadership considered building an Assembly Hall on Cook Field. In a letter prepared for the Board of Trustees by then Dean of the School of Education, C. Neale Bogner—on behalf of concerned faculty, staff, and alumni—Bogner expressed a variety of concerns about developing Cook Field and raised doubts about the value of location centrality for a large, event-centered facility on campus. "It is only fair to say that we believe the importance of a central location is exaggerated," he wrote. "Student attendance at any event, unless required, depends on the nature of the program and not the location."[49]

The concerns raised by Dean Bogner about using Cook Field as a site for facility development are identical to those currently being raised by Miami's stakeholders about the Arena District proposal. Bogner's letter addressed congestion along Patterson Avenue and the safety concerns it presented to students, especially during events; the negative impacts that constructing adequate event parking would have on the campus's scenic beauty ("spoiling the

[48] John D. Millett, President of Miami University, "The President's greeting," *M Book, 1963-1964*, p. 2.
[49] Special Meeting. Board of Trustees. Miami University. April 17, 1965. Attachment A. Memorandum from C. Neale Bogner to J. Paul McNamara.

whole scene"); the height of the building not architecturally blending well with adjacent buildings; and the additional costs involved in developing the necessary infrastructure for a large facility (e.g. plumbing, electric power, etc.) which doesn't currently exist at Cook Field compared to a site where it is already developed.

In light of those concerns, Dean Bogner argued that it would be "unwise to select Cook Field, a 14-acre area serving large numbers of students throughout the year, for one structure which will, as a special purpose building, be used fewer than forty times each year by a large audience." As he pointed out, "Cook Field has been a recreation area for many years…and cannot be duplicated anywhere on University holdings sufficiently close to be of value for student play or intramural activities." Instead, choosing another site would "preserve the beauty of the Bishop Gate entrance to the campus and architectural conformity of the main campus. The equivalent of an eight to ten story building, as viewed from Route 73, will destroy the first impression of beauty now seen by people coming into Oxford." He then concluded his case for preserving Cook Field by arguing that selecting a different site location would "preserve Cook Field for purposes mentioned for some years to come and perhaps always."

Steven Gordon (Miami alum and former Director of the McGuffey House and Museum) wrote a letter to the Board of Trustees in May 2025 describing the significance of Dean Bogner's 1965 letter for the current arena district proposal:

> Today, many staff, faculty, students, townspeople and alums share the same concerns the letter writers had 60 years ago. They, like us, were not opposed to building new facilities, in fact, they witnessed the greatest building boom in Miami's history. They, like us, cared deeply about Miami. They loved the visual harmony of the campus and its human scale feeling. They, like us, followed and supported Miami athletics and they, too, enjoyed concerts, lectures and special events that make a college campus vibrant…
>
> It is the scale, massing, function and footprint of the proposed arena district that form the same concerns as were expressed in 1965. Cook Field has consciously been preserved as a student and outdoor event gathering space for over a century. Having students engaged in pickup sports and play on Cook Field on a warm spring night is right out of central casting. Imagine a high school student arriving on campus seeing throngs of students playing soccer and softball, throwing frisbees or simply hanging out on Cook Field. This imagery is an indelible part of the look, feel and human scale of our campus, indeed, it is an integral part of our brand.[50]

The results of this survey support Gordon's read on stakeholders' sentiments about Cook Field and its potential development. As Dean Bogner's letter and this survey's findings make clear,

[50] Stephen Gordon, "Proposed Arena and Cook Field Site," Letter to the Miami University Board of Trustees, 16 May 2025, p. 2.

Cook Field is—and, for over a century, has been—an integral part of what makes Miami a unique and cherished institution. An investment as historically significant as the proposed Arena District renders apparent the stakes involved for this long-storied institution's legacy and future:

> "Thy elms, thy hills, thy skies of azure hue,
> To them is deepest inspiration due,
> Thy stately towers upon the hilltop fair,
> To them do we our grateful homage bear."
>
> – – "Miami March Song" by R. H. Burke (Miami University faculty 1906-1914, 1949-1950).

> "Old Miami, New Miami,
> Days of old and days to be
> Weave the story of thy glory—
> Our Miami, here's to thee."
>
> – – "The Alma Mater" by Alfred H. Upham (Class of 1897, President of Miami University 1928-1945).[51]

---------- ~ ~ ~ ----------

This project has been a remarkable, inspiring, and humbling experience. We are proud to share our work with the *great*(er) Miami University community that entrusted us with their voices and made it all possible (while relying entirely on a volunteer, grassroots campaign with virtually no funding—and in heroic time). We sincerely hope that the results of this study are as valuable to its readers as the experience was for all of us involved.

We conclude this report by reflecting on this project and its findings in light of the University's Mission Statement—which is intended to define and guide, among other things, the university's use of resources and strategic investments, and for which the Board is responsible for determining and governing[52]—which states:

> Miami University is a student-centered, public university, guided by the principles of Love and Honor. Leading with integrity, compassion, and respect, we pursue growth and excellence in a transformative learning environment. We embrace a holistic and personalized approach to education, infused with the humanities and liberal arts, to empower lifelong learners who use leadership, creativity, and innovation to shape the future. Our teacher-scholars and highly engaged staff inspire curiosity, intellectual depth, and career preparation across our

[51] *M Book, 1963-1964*, p. 3.
[52] *The Board of Trustees Regulations*, Article 1 (Section 3). Miami University Policy Library.

> communities through instruction, research, scholarship, experiential learning, co-curricular experiences, and civic engagement. We foster a diverse, inclusive, and welcoming community where each individual is valued, respected, and appreciated. Our students, faculty, staff, and alumni develop the skills and knowledge to lead with confidence and courage and to provide solutions for local and global challenges now and in the future.

In many respects, we would similarly describe this community survey project and its findings:

> Using interdisciplinary, liberal arts education and expertise to collaboratively create a medium for community stakeholders to share their experiences, values, preferences, and sentiments—not only about the arena project but also about Miami University and the Miami/Oxford community—to help "provide solutions for local challenges" and "shape the future."
>
> Doing so with a genuine commitment to the teacher-scholar model and inspiring "curiosity, intellectual depth, and career preparation across our communities through instruction, research, scholarship, experiential learning, co-curricular experiences, and civic engagement." All in an effort to facilitate and bring together the voices and perspectives of our "diverse, inclusive, and welcoming community," using interdisciplinary collaboration, civic engagement, and social scientific research methods to ensure that "each individual is valued, respected, and appreciated."
>
> As a result of our collaborative efforts, the dozens of "students, faculty, staff, and alumni" that worked together on this project refined and "develop[ed] the skills and knowledge to lead with confidence and courage and to provide solutions for local and global challenges now and in the future." All of us, students, faculty, and alumni, alike, developed and refined the skills, courage, and confidence necessary for using our education, training, expertise, and passion to bring a community together around a shared desire to learn and thrive—thereby doing and demonstrating exactly what respondents said they most *value* about Miami.

Most of all, this project was driven by a deep sense of Love and Honor: a *love* of and for this university and community, and a collective desire to *honor* it and the people that make it a source of admiration, pride, and affection. More broadly, "Love and Honor" also perfectly encapsulates this community's commitment to the work that makes Miami and Oxford great. Being a part of Miami is something its members are genuinely proud of, which is realized in the sincere *love* they share for this university community and the mission that drives it. It is truly an honor to be a part of this beloved university and community.

It is our sincerest hope that this report provides meaningful, actionable, empirical information—and that it is received by its various audiences as an act of service to the greater Miami University and Oxford community. We were intentionally transparent with those who

entrusted us with their voices at each step in the process, mobilizing a 'teacher-scholar' collaborative project to produce empirically useful findings on stakeholders' preferences, practices, and perspectives for project-planning. As such, this project provides a model for tackling other problems and exploring opportunities together as a university community. In this way, we sought to Love and Honor this exceptional community—all those who truly *make it Miami*.

Love and Honor.

For Additional Resources & Community Survey Project Information:

Check out our project website for the "initial findings" announcement and report documents, as well as accessing/downloading the deidentified dataset.

Appendix I: Data Tables

Table 1: Respondent Age Distribution
(Return to Reading)

Age	
Observations	3,347
Mean	32.49
Median	22
Range	18 – 94
Std. Dev.	17.15
Variance	294.23

Table 2: Connection to Miami University
(Return to Reading)

Connection Type	Count	% (n)	% (Count)	Multiple Connections
Current Faculty	229	6.84%	5.27%	129
Former Faculty	65	1.94%	1.50%	100
Current Undergraduate Student	1711	51.12%	39.41%	138
Current Graduate Student	227	6.78%	5.23%	83
Alumnus/Alumna	709	21.18%	16.33%	559
Current Staff	248	7.41%	5.71%	245
Former Staff	80	2.39%	1.84%	135
Parent/Guardian of Student	435	13.00%	10.02%	413
Local Resident	522	15.60%	12.02%	667
Local Business Owner/Employee	66	1.97%	1.52%	135
Other	50	1.49%	1.15%	52
TOTAL	4342	129.73%	100.00%	2656
Sample (n)	3347	100.00%	77.08%	---

Table 3: Connections to Miami University Matrix
(Return to Reading)

Connection Type	Current Faculty	Former Faculty	Current Undergraduate Student	Current Graduate Student	Alumnus/Alumna	Current Staff	Former Staff	Parent/Guardian of Student	Local Resident	Local Business Owner/Employee	Other	TOTAL (count)	TOTAL (difference)
Current Faculty	**229**											229	0
Former Faculty	0	**65**										65	0
Current Undergraduate Student	6	4	**1711**									1721	10
Current Graduate Student	10	2	0	**227**								239	12
Alumnus/Alumna	23	23	0	0	**709**							755	46
Current Staff	6	7	43	33	51	**248**						388	140
Former Staff	1	5	1	1	42	0	**80**					130	50
Parent/Guardian of Student	24	16	6	3	190	25	22	**435**				721	286
Local Resident	57	38	64	25	186	71	53	107	**522**			1123	601
Local Business Owner/Employee	2	3	8	3	32	7	8	15	53	**66**		197	131
Other	0	2	6	6	12	2	2	5	13	4	**50**	102	52
TOTAL (count)	358	165	1839	298	1222	353	165	562	588	70	50	5670	
TOTAL (difference)	129	100	128	71	513	105	85	127	66	4	0		

Table 4: Cook Field Uses
(Return to Reading)

In your time at Miami/Oxford, how have you used Cook Field and how often?	Organized sports competition	Informal physical activity	Leisure and green space	Parking lot
Never	32.8%	14.42%	10.18%	25.55%
Rarely	13.9%	13.56%	11.82%	17.49%
Occasionally	23.8%	32.7%	29.51%	24.88%
Somewhat frequently	16.8%	23.39%	24.86%	14.08%
Very frequently	12.7%	15.93%	23.64%	18%
TOTAL (n)	3,091	3,113	3,114	3,111

Table 5: Cook Field Uses by Connection (Return to Reading)

Organized sport competition	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Never	30.16%	35.11%	21.19%	58.85%	49.28%	37.8%
Rarely	13.8%	12.98%	14.78%	11.92%	14.75%	15.2%
Occasionally	23.04%	26.46%	30.3%	19.23%	20.32%	27.4%
Somewhat frequently	18.03%	16.03%	20%	6.54%	10.07%	14.8%
Very frequently	14.97%	9.41%	13.73%	3.46%	5.58%	4.8%
TOTAL (n)	1797	393	670	260	509	500
Informal physical activity						
Never	12.82%	20.05%	9.47%	20.59%	18.39%	13.32%
Rarely	12.21%	14.47%	14.64%	15.81%	14.89%	18.29%
Occasionally	30.85%	38.58%	35.21%	34.56%	33.63%	36.58%
Somewhat frequently	24.81%	17.77%	25.3%	19.495	20.84%	21.67%
Very frequently	19.31%	9.14%	15.38%	9.56%	12.26%	10.14%
TOTAL (n)	1802	394	676	272	571	503
Leisure and green space						
Never	8.31%	11.7%	7.95%	15.02%	15.7%	10.69%
Rarely	9.98%	15.27%	12.67%	14.29%	12.17%	16.44%
Occasionally	25.72%	39.44%	33.73%	37.36%	34.92%	39.21%
Somewhat frequently	27%	18.83%	24.01%	20.15%	23.1%	19.21%
Very frequently	28.99%	14.76%	21.65%	13.19%	14.11%	14.46%
TOTAL (n)	1804	393	679	273	567	505
Parking lot						
Never	29.32%	23.6%	22.44%	9.93%	10.46%	17.45%
Rarely	16.95%	17.77%	22.29%	13.12%	13.72%	21.96%
Occasionally	20.62%	35.28%	28.97%	25.89%	27.1%	31.18%
Somewhat frequently	15.27%	12.94%	13.37%	14.54%	14.58%	10.78%
Very frequently	17.84%	10.41%	12.93%	36.52%	34.13%	18.63%
TOTAL (n)	1794	394	673	282	583	525

Table 6: Importance of Cook Field
(Return to Reading)

How important has Cook Field been to your experience at Miami University/Oxford?	n	%
Not at all important	182	6.15%
Only a little important	360	12.16%
Somewhat important	1,093	36.91%
Very important	1,326	44.78%
TOTAL	2,961	100%

Table 7: Importance of Cook Field by Connection
(Return to Reading)

How important has Cook Field been to your experience at Miami University/Oxford?	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Not at all important	4.99%	7.24%	5.84%	7.25%	8.11%	5.97%
Only a little important	10.45%	12.33%	15.05%	15.94%	16.23%	15.02%
Somewhat important	37.79%	35.92%	33.95%	42.39%	37.39%	39.71%
Very important	46.77%	44.5%	45.16%	34.42%	38.27%	39.3%
TOTAL (n)	1704	373	651	276	567	486

Table 8: Importance of Millett Hall
(Return to Reading)

How important has Millett Hall been to your experience at Miami University/Oxford?	n	%
Not at all important	869	32.55%
Only a little important	960	35.96%
Somewhat important	566	21.2%
Very important	275	10.3%
TOTAL	2,670	100%

Table 9: Importance of Millett Hall by Connection
(Return to Reading)

How important has Millett Hall been to your experience at Miami University/Oxford?	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Not at all important	39.75%	20.06%	17.94%	27.14%	25.6%	17.71%
Only a little important	39.03%	34.26%	29.4%	37.17%	34.25%	31.61%
Somewhat important	14.26%	30.25%	34.05%	27.51%	28.55%	31.61%

Very important	6.96%	15.43%	18.6%	8.18%	11.6%	19.06%
TOTAL (n)	1522	324	602	269	543	446

Table 10: Millett Hall Uses
(Return to Reading)

In your time at Miami/Oxford, how have you used Millett Hall and how often?	Attending athletic events	Attending non-athletic events (e.g. job fairs, dances, concerts)	Class meetings	Student groups (e.g. ROTC, clubs)
Never	24.42%	20.96%	81.88%	77.02%
Rarely	28.67%	31.96%	11.07%	11.29%
Occasionally	27.05%	31.96%	4.53%	7.33%
Somewhat frequently	12.64%	10.82%	1.35%	1.87%
Very frequently	7.2%	4.31%	1.17%	2.49%
TOTAL (n)	2,776	2,763	2,738	2,728

Table 11: Millett Hall Uses by Connection
(Return to Reading)

Athletic Events	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Never	31.33%	14.45%	9.32%	23.42%	20.58%	13.7%
Rarely	33.23%	17.7%	20.26%	27.51%	25.87%	19.49%
Occasionally	20.66%	41.89%	35.53%	33.83%	34.06%	39.19%
Somewhat frequently	9.85%	19.17%	19.94%	9.67%	12.57%	18.63%
Very frequently	4.93%	6.78%	14.95%	5.58%	6.92%	8.99%
TOTAL (n)	1583	339	622	269	549	467
Non-Athletic Events						
Never	26.24%	13.81%	5.64%	19.33%	17.88%	13.89%
Rarely	33.97%	26.43%	29.15%	30.48%	28.28%	29.06%
Occasionally	25.79%	41.14%	43.16%	36.43%	38.14%	39.96%
Somewhat frequently	9.7%	15.62%	16.43%	10.41%	11.5%	12.61%
Very frequently	4.31%	3%	5.64%	3.35%	4.2%	4.49%
TOTAL (n)	1578	333	621	269	548	468

Class Meetings						
Never	83.79%	77.85%	73.5%	85.34%	83.24%	80.35%
Rarely	9.35%	13.85%	17.24%	9.4%	10.87%	12.23%
Occasionally	4.26%	5.23%	6.18%	3.38%	3.5%	5.68%
Somewhat frequently	1.46%	2.15%	1.46%	0.75%	0.92%	1.09%
Very frequently	1.14%	0.92%	1.63%	1.13%	1.47%	0.66%
TOTAL (n)	1573	325	615	266	543	458
Student Groups						
Never	78.64%	68.83%	67.16%	84.59%	79.85%	75.27%
Rarely	9.76%	15.43%	17.65%	9.02%	11.28%	13.88%
Occasionally	6.89%	11.42%	9.8%	3.76%	6.1%	8.46%
Somewhat frequently	2.1%	1.54%	2.12%	0.75%	1.29%	1.3%
Very frequently	2.61%	2.78%	3.27%	1.88%	1.48%	1.08%
TOTAL (n)	1568	324	612	266	541	461

Table 12: Athletic Event Attendance at Millett Hall (past 12 months)
(Return to Reading)

In the last 12 months, approximately how many Miami University athletic events have you attended at Millett Hall?	n	%
0	1,421	54.13%
1-2	706	26.9%
3-5	302	11.5%
6-10	109	4.15%
10+	87	3.31%
TOTAL	2,625	100%

Table 13: Athletic Event Attendance at Millett Hall (past 12 months) by Connection
(Return to Reading)

In the last 12 months, approximately how many Miami University athletic events have you attended at Millett Hall?	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
0	51.81%	56.19%	58.15%	56.72%	55.35%	47.96%
1-2	28.35%	27.62%	26.22%	24.25%	24.35%	23.53%
3-5	12.27%	9.84%	9.08%	13.06%	13.28%	16.74%
6-10	4.36%	2.86%	3.36%	3.36%	3.69%	6.56%
10+	3.22%	3.49%	3.19%	2.61%	3.32%	5.2%
TOTAL (n)	1492	315	595	268	542	442

Table 14: Importance of Millett Hall by Athletic Event Attendance (past 12 months)
(Return to Reading)

How important has Millett Hall been to your experience at Miami University/Oxford?	*0 games*	*1-2 games*	*3-5 games*	*6-10 games*	*10+ games*	*TOTAL*
Not at all important	648	161	28	4	3	844
	76.78%	**19.08%**	**3.32%**	**0.47%**	**0.36%**	**100%**
	45.96%	*22.84%*	*9.36%*	*3.67%*	*3.49%*	*32.35%*
Only a little important	497	323	89	27	9	945
	52.59%	**34.18%**	**9.42%**	**2.86%**	**0.95%**	**100%**
	35.25%	*45.82%*	*29.77%*	*24.77%*	*10.47%*	*36.22%*
Somewhat important	196	161	123	46	24	550
	35.64%	**29.27%**	**22.36%**	**8.36%**	**4.36%**	**100%**
	13.9%	*22.84%*	*41.14%*	*42.2%*	*27.91%*	*21.08%*
Very important	69	60	59	32	50	270
	25.56%	**22.22%**	**21.85%**	**11.85%**	**18.52%**	**100%**
	4.89%	*8.51%*	*19.73%*	*29.36%*	*58.14%*	*10.35%*
TOTAL	1,410	705	299	109	86	2,609
	54.04%	**27.02%**	**11.46%**	**4.18%**	**3.3%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(12) = 654.2240; Pr = 0.000

Table 15: Factors Shaping Athletic Event Attendance at Millett Hall
(Return to Reading)

How important are the following factors for you when deciding whether to attend sporting events at Millet Hall?	Quality of facilities	Quality of teams	Convenience of location	Costs of attendance	Overall interest in college sports
Not at all important	37.07%	22.35%	27.88%	24.04%	13.4%
Only a little important	27.58%	15.98%	22.12%	15.67%	13.11%
Somewhat important	26.68%	33.71%	26.98%	31.43%	39.66%
Very important	8.67%	27.95%	23.02%	28.86%	33.84%
TOTAL (n)	2,444	2,447	2,450	2,450	2,441

Table 16: Factors Shaping Athletic Event Attendance at Millett Hall by Connection
(Return to Reading)

Quality of the facilities	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Not at all important	36.47%	38.1%	31.61%	48.03%	43.99%	38.35%
Only a little important	28.58%	26.19%	27.86%	27.17%	26.36%	28.71%
Somewhat important	25.11%	31.63%	30.89%	21.65%	24.22%	25.88%
Very important	9.84%	4.08%	9.64%	3.15%	5.43%	7.06%
TOTAL (n)	1382	294	560	254	516	425
Quality of the teams						
Not at all important	21.73%	19.05%	15.69%	31.64%	27.36%	23%
Only a little important	15.52%	19.73%	17.47%	17.19%	17.53%	21.36%
Somewhat important	31.55%	38.44%	38.86%	31.64%	32.18%	34.27%
Very important	31.19%	22.79%	27.99%	19.53%	22.93%	21.36%
TOTAL (n)	1385	294	561	256	519	426
Convenience of the location						
Not at all important	25.94%	27.89%	22.42%	43.19%	36.54%	29.31%
Only a little important	22.76%	25.17%	23.49%	21.4%	19.81%	17.02%
Somewhat important	26.66%	30.61%	31.32%	23.74%	23.27%	25.3%
Very important	24.64%	16.33%	22.78%	11.67%	20.38%	28.37%

TOTAL (n)	1384	294	562	257	520	423
Cost of attendance						
Not at all important	25.38%	21.02%	18.78%	27.63%	23.27%	19.34%
Only a little important	14.2%	18.98%	19.32%	15.95%	15.38%	16.51%
Somewhat important	26.24%	45.76%	39.36%	35.02%	35.58%	34.67%
Very important	34.17%	14.24%	22.54%	21.4%	25.77%	29.48%
TOTAL (n)	1387	295	559	257	520	424
Overall interest in college sports						
Not at all important	12.82%	9.83%	10.38%	17.65%	15.41%	14.32%
Only a little important	12.89%	17.63%	14.31%	12.55%	14.64%	14.55%
Somewhat important	37.8%	45.76%	43.29%	41.96%	40.27%	42.49%
Very important	36.5%	26.78%	32.02%	27.84%	29.67%	28.64%
TOTAL (n)	1381	295	559	255	519	426

Table 17: Importance of Cook Field by Non-Uses of Cook Field
(Return to Reading)

How important has Cook Field been to your experience of Miami?	*# of Non-Uses of Cook Field*					
	0 non-uses	*1 non-use*	*2 non-uses*	*3 non-uses*	*4 non-uses*	Total
Not at all important	5	7	13	49	108	182
	2.75%	**3.85%**	**7.14%**	**26.92%**	**59.34%**	**100%**
	0.54%	*0.74%*	*2.53%*	*15.17%*	*41.22%*	*6.15%*
Only a little important	36	55	82	105	82	360
	10%	**15.28%**	**22.78%**	**29.17%**	**22.78%**	**100%**
	3.92%	*5.83%*	*15.95%*	*32.51%*	*31.3%*	*12.16%*
Somewhat important	270	399	248	123	53	1,093
	24.7%	**36.51%**	**22.69%**	**11.25%**	**4.85%**	**100%**
	29.38%	*42.31%*	*48.25%*	*38.08%*	*20.23%*	*36.91%*
Very important	608	482	171	46	19	1,326

	45.85%	**36.35%**	**12.9%**	**3.47%**	**1.43%**	**100%**
	66.16%	*51.11%*	*33.27%*	*14.24%*	*7.25%*	*44.78%*
Total	919	943	514	323	262	2,961
	31.04%	**31.85%**	**17.36%**	**10.91%**	**8.85%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(12) = 1.3e+03; Pr = 0.000

Table 18: Importance of Millett Hall by Non-Uses of Millett Hall
(Return to Reading)

How important has Millett Hall been to your experience of Miami?	*# of Non-Uses of Millett Hall*					
	0 non-uses	*1 non-use*	*2 non-uses*	*3 non-uses*	*4 non-uses*	Total
Not at all important	16	15	44	156	638	869
	1.84%	**1.73%**	**5.06%**	**17.95%**	**73.42%**	**100%**
	12.12%	*8.2%*	*6.67%*	*21.94%*	*64.84%*	*32.55%*
Only a little important	34	44	232	358	292	960
	3.54%	**4.58%**	**24.17%**	**37.29%**	**30.42%**	**100%**
	25.76%	*24.04%*	*35.15%*	*50.35%*	*29.67%*	*35.96%*
Somewhat important	35	65	274	149	43	566
	6.18%	**11.48%**	**48.41%**	**26.33%**	**7.6%**	**100%**
	26.52%	*35.52%*	*41.52%*	*20.96%*	*4.37%*	*21.2%*
Very important	47	59	110	48	11	275
	17.09%	**21.45%**	**40%**	**17.45%**	**4%**	**100%**
	35.61%	*32.24%*	*16.67%*	*6.75%*	*1.12%*	*10.3%*
Total	132	183	660	711	984	2,670
	4.94%	**6.85**	**24.72%**	**26.63%**	**36.85%**	**100%**
	100%	*100*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(12) = 1.2e+03; Pr = 0.000

Table 19: Non-uses of Millett Hall and Cook Field by Current Student Status
(Return to Reading)

Non-uses of Millett Hall	Current Students	Non-Students	Total (n)	
0 non-uses	21.62%	19.52%	694	
1 non-use	4.8%	7.74%	202	
2 non-uses	13.88%	29.81%	689	
3 non-uses	22.5%	21.43%	738	
4 non-uses	37.2%	21.5%	1,024	
Total (n)	1,938	1,409	3,347	Pearson chi2(4) = 180.0879; Pr = 0.000
Non-uses of Cook Field				
0 non-uses	36.07%	32.36%	1,155	
1 non-use	29.57%	29.88%	994	
2 non-uses	16.82%	15.68%	547	
3 non-uses	9.49%	12.07%	354	
4 non-uses	8.05%	10.01%	297	
Total (n)	1,938	1,409	3,347	Pearson chi2(4) = 12.5385; Pr = 0.014

Table 20: Importance of Cook Field by Importance of Millett Hall Importance
(Return to Reading)

How important has Cook Field been to your experience at Miami University/Oxford?	*Importance of Millett Hall to the Miami Experience*				
	Not at all important	*Only a little important*	*Somewhat important*	*Very important*	*TOTAL*
Not at all important	53	46	33	22	154
	34.42%	**29.87%**	**21.43%**	**14.29%**	**100%**
	6.13%	*4.81%*	*5.86%*	*8.09%*	*5.8%*
Only a little important	83	119	88	28	318
	26.1%	**37.42%**	**27.67%**	**8.81%**	**100%**
	9.61%	*12.43%*	*15.63%*	*10.29%*	*11.97%*
Somewhat important	313	367	208	73	961
	32.57%	**38.19%**	**21.64%**	**7.6%**	**100%**
	36.23%	*38.35%*	*36.94%*	*26.84%*	*36.18%*
Very important	415	425	234	149	1,223

	33.93%	**34.75%**	**19.13%**	**12.18%**	**100%**
	48.03%	*44.41%*	*41.56%*	*54.78%*	*46.05%*
TOTAL	864	957	563	272	2,656
	32.53%	**36.03%**	**21.2%**	**10.24%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(9) = 31.5535; Pr = 0.000

Table 21: Impacts of Relocating Cook Field on Uses
(Return to Reading)

Based on your last response, if the facilities currently located on Cook Field were relocated to the current location of Millett Hall, to what extent would your use of those facilities change?	Organized sports competition	Informal physical activity	Leisure & green space	Parking lot
I would use it a lot less	66.55%	76.46%	80.74%	74.83%
I would use it somewhat less	11.6%	9.59%	6.84%	7.4%
would use it the same amount	19.47%	11.56%	10.03%	14.69%
I would use it somewhat more	1.39%	1.62%	1.52%	1.95%
I would use it a lot more	0.99%	0.77%	0.87%	1.13%
TOTAL (n)	2,517	2,596	2,633	2,567

Table 22: Cook Field Uses and Impacts of Relocation on Uses - Formal Sports Competitions
(Return to Reading)

	Use a lot less	*Use somewhat less*	*Use the same amount*	*Use somewhat more*	*Use a lot more*	*TOTAL*
Never	451	29	248	10	8	746
	60.46%	**3.89%**	**33.24%**	**1.34%**	**1.07%**	**100%**
	26.93%	*9.93%*	*50.61%*	*28.57%*	*32%*	*29.64%*
Rarely	223	40	88	7	4	362
	61.60%	**11.05%**	**24.31%**	**1.93%**	**1.10%**	**100%**
	13.31%	*13.70%*	*17.96%*	*20%*	*16%*	*14.38%*
Occasionally	427	90	78	9	5	609
	70.11%	**14.78%**	**12.81%**	**1.48%**	**0.82%**	**100%**
	25.49%	*30.82%*	*15.92%*	*25.71%*	*20%*	*24.20%*
Somewhat frequently	323	81	40	7	4	455
	70.99%	**17.80%**	**8.79%**	**1.54%**	**0.88%**	**100%**
	19.28%	*27.74%*	*8.16%*	*20%*	*16%*	*18.08%*
Very	251	52	36	2	4	345

frequently	**72.75%**	**15.07%**	**10.43%**	**0.58%**	**1.16%**	**100%**
	14.99%	*17.81%*	*7.35%*	*5.71%*	*16%*	*13.71%*
TOTAL	1,675	292	490	35	25	2,517
	66.55%	**11.60%**	**19.47%**	**1.39%**	**0.99%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 207.3301; Pr = 0.000

Table 23: Cook Field Uses and Impacts of Relocation on Uses - Informal Physical Activity (Return to Reading)

	Use a lot less	*Use somewhat less*	*Use the same amount*	*Use somewhat more*	*Use a lot more*	*Total*
Never	151	9	131	10	2	303
	49.83%	**2.97%**	**43.23%**	**3.30%**	**0.66%**	**100%**
	7.61%	*3.61%*	*43.67%*	*23.81%*	*10%*	*11.67%*
Rarely	206	52	73	6	5	342
	60.23%	**15.20%**	**21.35%**	**1.75%**	**1.46%**	**100%**
	10.38%	*20.88%*	*24.33%*	*14.29%*	*25%*	*13.17%*
Occasionally	688	97	65	16	5	871
	78.99%	**11.14%**	**7.46%**	**1.84%**	**0.57%**	**100%**
	34.66%	*38.96%*	*21.67%*	*38.10%*	*25%*	*33.55%*
Somewhat frequently	538	62	24	9	4	637
	84.46%	**9.73%**	**3.77%**	**1.41%**	**0.63%**	**100%**
	27.10%	*24.90%*	*8%*	*21.43%*	*20%*	*24.54%*
Very frequently	402	29	7	1	4	443
	90.74%	**6.55%**	**1.58%**	**0.23%**	**0.90%**	**100%**
	20.25%	*11.65%*	*2.33%*	*2.38%*	*20%*	*17.06%*
Total	1,985	249	300	42	20	2,596
	76.46%	**9.59%**	**11.56%**	**1.62%**	**0.77%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 478.9332; Pr = 0.000

Table 24: Cook Field Uses and Impacts of Relocation on Uses - Leisure and Green Space (Return to Reading)

	Use a lot less	*Use somewhat less*	*Use the same amount*	*Use somewhat more*	*Use a lot more*	*Total*
Never	75	10	104	12	4	205
	36.59%	**4.88%**	**50.73%**	**5.85%**	**1.95%**	**100%**
	3.53%	*5.56%*	*39.39%*	*30%*	*17.39%*	*7.79%*
Rarely	166	40	78	14	4	302
	54.97%	**13.25%**	**25.83%**	**4.64%**	**1.32%**	**100%**
	7.81%	*22.22%*	*29.55%*	*35%*	*17.39%*	*11.47%*
Occasionally	624	73	62	9	6	774
	80.62%	**9.43%**	**8.01%**	**1.16%**	**0.78%**	**100%**
	29.35%	*40.56%*	*23.48%*	*22.50%*	*26.09%*	*29.40%*
Somewhat frequently	635	33	17	4	5	694
	91.50%	**4.76%**	**2.45%**	**0.58%**	**0.72%**	**100%**
	29.87%	*18.33%*	*6.44%*	*10%*	*21.74%*	*26.36%*
Very frequently	626	24	3	1	4	658
	95.14%	**3.65%**	**0.46%**	**0.15%**	**0.61%**	**100%**
	29.44%	*13.33%*	*1.14%*	*2.50%*	*17.39%*	*24.99%*
Total	2,126	180	264	40	23	2,633
	80.74%	**6.84%**	**10.03%**	**1.52%**	**0.87%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 720.9407; Pr = 0.000

Table 25: Cook Field Uses and Impacts of Relocation on Uses - Parking Lot (Return to Reading)

	Use a lot less	*Use somewhat less*	*Use the same amount*	*Use somewhat more*	*Use a lot more*	*Total*
Never	353	20	150	16	15	554
	63.72%	**3.61%**	**27.08%**	**2.89%**	**2.71%**	**100%**
	18.38%	*10.53%*	*39.79%*	*32%*	*51.72%*	*21.58%*
Rarely	279	43	110	17	5	454
	61.45%	**9.47%**	**24.23%**	**3.74%**	**1.10%**	**100%**
	14.52%	*22.63%*	*29.18%*	*34%*	*17.24%*	*17.69%*
Occasionally	510	63	66	10	8	657
	77.63%	**9.59%**	**10.05%**	**1.52%**	**1.22%**	**100%**
	26.55%	*33.16%*	*17.51%*	*20%*	*27.59%*	*25.59%*
Somewhat	317	37	23	6	1	384

frequently	**82.55%**	**9.64%**	**5.99%**	**1.56%**	**0.26%**	**100%**
	16.50%	*19.47%*	*6.10%*	*12%*	*3.45%*	*14.96%*
Very frequently	462	27	28	1	0	518
	89.19%	**5.21%**	**5.41%**	**0.19%**	**0%**	**100%**
	24.05%	*14.21%*	*7.43%*	*2%*	*0%*	*20.18%*
Total	1,921	190	377	50	29	2,567
	74.83%	**7.40%**	**14.69%**	**1.95%**	**1.13%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 247.2440; Pr = 0.000

Table 26: Impacts of Relocating Millett Hall on Current Uses
(Return to Reading)

If the type of facilities currently located on Millet Hall were relocated to the current location of Cook Field, to what extent would your use of those facilities change?	Athletic events	Non-athletic events	Class meetings	Student groups
I would use it a lot less	29.34%	27.98%	34.28%	34.73%
I would use it somewhat less	7.3%	7.84%	4.29%	4.76%
would use it the same amount	46.68%	49.94%	53.6%	52.96%
I would use it somewhat more	11.66%	10.28%	4.94%	4.9%
I would use it a lot more	5.02%	3.96%	2.91%	2.66%
TOTAL (n)	2,410	2,373	2,168	2,145

Table 27: Millett Hall Uses and Impacts of Relocation on Uses - Attending Athletic Events
(Return to Reading)

	Use a lot less	*Use somewhat less*	*Use the same amount*	*Use somewhat more*	*Use a lot more*	*Total*
Never	216	22	272	58	18	586
	36.86%	**3.75%**	**46.42%**	**9.90%**	**3.07%**	**100%**
	30.73%	*12.64%*	*24.20%*	*20.79%*	*15%*	*24.42%*
Rarely	181	47	349	101	29	707
	25.60%	**6.65%**	**49.36%**	**14.29%**	**4.10%**	**100%**
	25.75%	*27.01%*	*31.05%*	*36.20%*	*24.17%*	*29.46%*
Occasionally	177	54	322	72	33	658
	26.90%	**8.21%**	**48.94%**	**10.94%**	**5.02%**	**100%**
	25.18%	*31.03%*	*28.65%*	*25.81%*	*27.50%*	*27.42%*
Somewhat frequently	85	34	116	32	26	293
	29.01%	**11.60%**	**39.59%**	**10.92%**	**8.87%**	**100%**
	12.09%	*19.54%*	*10.32%*	*11.47%*	*21.67%*	*12.21%*

Very frequently	44	17	65	16	14	156
	28.21%	**10.90%**	**41.67%**	**10.26%**	**8.97%**	**100%**
	6.26%	*9.77%*	*5.78%*	*5.73%*	*11.67%*	*6.50%*
Total	703	174	1,124	279	120	2,400
	29.29%	**7.25%**	**46.83%**	**11.62%**	**5%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 69.1395; Pr = 0.000

Table 28: Millett Hall Uses and Impacts of Relocation on Uses - Attending Non-Athletic Events (Return to Reading)

	Use a lot less	*Use somewhat less*	*Use the same amount*	*Use somewhat more*	*Use a lot more*	*Total*
Never	178	17	234	47	18	494
	36.03%	**3.44%**	**47.37%**	**9.51%**	**3.64%**	**100%**
	26.89%	*9.19%*	*19.76%*	*19.42%*	*19.15%*	*20.87%*
Rarely	182	57	409	94	32	774
	23.51%	**7.36%**	**52.84%**	**12.14%**	**4.13%**	**100%**
	27.49%	*30.81%*	*34.54%*	*38.84%*	*34.04%*	*32.70%*
Occasionally	184	66	399	73	23	745
	24.70%	**8.86%**	**53.56%**	**9.80%**	**3.09%**	**100%**
	27.79%	*35.68%*	*33.70%*	*30.17%*	*24.47%*	*31.47%*
Somewhat frequently	74	36	109	22	11	252
	29.37%	**14.29%**	**43.25%**	**8.73%**	**4.37%**	**100%**
	11.18%	*19.46%*	*9.21%*	*9.09%*	*11.70%*	*10.65%*
Very frequently	44	9	33	6	10	102
	43.14%	**8.82%**	**32.35%**	**5.88%**	**9.80%**	**100%**
	6.65%	*4.86%*	*2.79%*	*2.48%*	*10.64%*	*4.31%*
Total	662	185	1,184	242	94	2,367
	27.97%	**7.82%**	**50.02%**	**10.22%**	**3.97%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 83.9041; Pr = 0.000

Table 29: Millett Hall Uses and Impacts of Relocation on Uses - Class Meetings
(Return to Reading)

	Use a lot less	*Use somewhat less*	*Use the same amount*	*Use somewhat more*	*Use a lot more*	*Total*
Never	576	57	992	92	48	1,765
	32.63%	**3.23%**	**56.20%**	**5.21%**	**2.72%**	**100%**
	77.84%	*61.96%*	*85.89%*	*85.98%*	*76.19%*	*81.83%*
Rarely	90	18	108	13	7	236
	38.14%	**7.63%**	**45.76%**	**5.51%**	**2.97%**	**100%**
	12.16%	*19.57%*	*9.35%*	*12.15%*	*11.11%*	*10.94%*
Occasionally	50	12	33	2	5	102
	49.02%	**11.76%**	**32.35%**	**1.96%**	**4.90%**	**100%**
	6.76%	*13.04%*	*2.86%*	*1.87%*	*7.94%*	*4.73%*
Somewhat frequently	12	4	12	0	1	29
	41.38%	**13.79%**	**41.38%**	**0%**	**3.45%**	**100%**
	1.62%	*4.35%*	*1.04%*	*0%*	*1.59%*	*1.34%*
Very frequently	12	1	10	0	2	25
	48%	**4%**	**40%**	**0%**	**8%**	**100%**
	1.62%	*1.09%*	*0.87%*	*0%*	*3.17%*	*1.16%*
Total	740	92	1,155	107	63	2,157
	34.31%	**4.27%**	**53.55%**	**4.96%**	**2.92%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 64.9554; Pr = 0.000

Table 30: Millett Hall Uses and Impacts of Relocation on Uses - Student Groups
(Return to Reading)

	Use a lot less	*Use somewhat less*	*Use the same amount*	*Use somewhat more*	*Use a lot more*	*Total*
Never	559	58	897	76	44	1,634
	34.21%	**3.55%**	**54.9%**	**4.65%**	**2.69%**	**100%**
	75.75%	*56.86%*	*79.59%*	*72.38%*	*77.19%*	*76.75%*
Rarely	82	18	122	16	3	241
	34.02%	**7.47%**	**50.62%**	**6.64%**	**1.24%**	**100%**
	11.11%	*17.65%*	*10.83%*	*15.24%*	*5.26%*	*11.32%*
Occasionally	62	18	68	7	4	159
	38.99%	**11.32%**	**42.77%**	**4.4%**	**2.52%**	**100%**
	8.4%	*17.65%*	*6.03%*	*6.67%*	*7.02%*	*7.47%*
Somewhat frequently	18	3	15	3	2	41
	43.9%	**7.32%**	**36.59%**	**7.32%**	**4.88%**	**100%**

	2.44%	*2.94%*	*1.33%*	*2.86%*	*3.51%*	*1.93%*
Very frequently	17	5	25	3	4	54
	31.48%	**9.26%**	**46.3%**	**5.56%**	**7.41%**	**100%**
	2.3%	*4.9%*	*2.22%*	*2.86%*	*7.02%*	*2.54%*
Total	738	102	1,127	105	57	2,129
	34.66%	**4.79%**	**52.94%**	**4.93%**	**2.68%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 44.4278; Pr = 0.000

Table 31: Impacts of Arena Proposals on Athletic Event Attendance
(Return to Reading)

To what extent would the following changes impact your attendance at athletic events at Miami University?	Renovation of Millett Hall	New arena, at/near current Millet Hall	New arena, at Cook Field location	New arena, at corner of Oak & Spring Street
I would attend a lot less	4.04%	5.42%	40.65%	22.05%
I would attend somewhat less	1.33%	2.42%	9.18%	6.62%
My attendance would not be impacted either way	59.88%	57.61%	36.77%	48.4%
I would attend somewhat more	25.75%	24.89%	9.27%	16.65%
I would attend a lot more	9%	9.67%	4.13%	6.28%
TOTAL (n)	2,400	2,399	2,396	2,372

Table 32: Impacts of Arena Proposals on Athletic Event Attendance by Connection
(Return to Reading)

Renovation of Millett Hall	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
I would attend a lot less	4.46%	2.7%	1.99%	3.56%	3.71%	4.03%
I would attend somewhat less	1.49%	0%	1.81%	0.79%	0.59%	0.71%
I would attend the same amount	56.7%	68.24%	60.11%	71.94%	66.8%	57.82%
I would attend somewhat more	27.08%	21.62%	28.52%	17.79%	21.88%	27.96%
I would attend a lot more	10.27%	7.43%	7.58%	5.93%	7.03%	9.48%
TOTAL (n)	1344	296	554	253	512	422
New area at/near Millett Hall location						
I would attend a lot less	6.41%	2.03%	3.59%	5.14%	4.67%	4.76%
I would attend somewhat less	2.68%	1.35%	2.15%	1.58%	1.95%	3.57%

I would attend the same amount	55.07%	63.85%	55.83%	71.54%	66.54%	54.29%
I would attend somewhat more	25.41%	25%	28.55%	16.21%	20.43%	28.33%
I would attend a lot more	10.43%	7.77%	9.87%	5.53%	6.42%	9.05%
TOTAL (n)	1342	296	557	253	514	420
New area at Cook Field location						
I would attend a lot less	41.77%	40%	41.08%	31.75%	37.43%	48.1%
I would attend somewhat less	8.56%	12.41%	10.63%	12.3%	9.75%	11.9%
I would attend the same amount	34.4%	40%	35.14%	48.02%	42.88%	30.71%
I would attend somewhat more	11.17%	4.83%	8.29%	4.76%	6.04%	6.43%
I would attend a lot more	4.1%	2.76%	4.86%	3.17%	3.9%	2.86%
TOTAL (n)	1343	290	555	252	513	420
New area at Oak/Spring Street						
I would attend a lot less	18.5%	25%	26.63%	23.11%	27.11%	38.76%
I would attend somewhat less	5.56%	8.9%	8.33%	8.37%	7.66%	7.89%
I would attend the same amount	47.37%	52.74%	45.83%	56.57%	50.49%	39.23%
I would attend somewhat more	20.75%	9.25%	13.59%	9.16%	11.39%	10.77%
I would attend a lot more	7.82%	4.11%	5.62%	2.79%	3.34%	3.35%
TOTAL (n)	1330	292	552	251	509	418

Table 33: Impacts of Arena Proposals on Athletic Event Attendance by Athletic Event attendance (past 12 months) (Return to Reading)

	Athletic Event Attendance (past 12 months)					
Renovate Millett Hall	*0 events*	*1-2 events*	*3-5 events*	*6-10 events*	*10+ events*	*Total*
I would use it a lot less frequently	**63.92%**	**18.56%**	**8.25%**	**4.12%**	**5.15%**	**100%**
	4.8%	*2.78%*	*2.88%*	*4%*	*6.1%*	*4.05%*
I would use it somewhat less frequently	**43.75%**	**34.38%**	**18.75%**	**0%**	**3.12%**	**100%**
	1.08%	*1.7%*	*2.16%*	*0%*	*1.22%*	*1.33%*
I would use it the same amount	**59.57%**	**26.1%**	**8.21%**	**3.34%**	**2.78%**	**100%**

	66.31%	*57.96%*	*42.45%*	*48%*	*48.78%*	*59.92%*
I would use it somewhat more frequently	**45.79%**	**30.42%**	**16.67%**	**4.21%**	**2.91%**	**100%**
	21.92%	*29.06%*	*37.05%*	*26%*	*21.95%*	*25.77%*
I would use it a lot more frequently	**35.51%**	**25.7%**	**20.09%**	**10.28%**	**8.41%**	**100%**
	5.89%	*8.5%*	*15.47%*	*22%*	*21.95%*	*8.92%*
Total	**53.84%**	**26.98%**	**11.59%**	**4.17%**	**3.42%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*
New arena at/near Millett Hall						
I would use it a lot less frequently	**65.38%**	**17.69%**	**9.23%**	**3.85%**	**3.85%**	**100%**
	6.58%	*3.56%*	*4.32%*	*5.05%*	*6.1%*	*5.42%*
I would use it somewhat less frequently	**36.21%**	**39.66%**	**17.24%**	**3.45%**	**3.45%**	**100%**
	1.63%	*3.56%*	*3.6%*	*2.02%*	*2.44%*	*2.42%*
I would use it the same amount	**60.71%**	**25.76%**	**7.96%**	**2.75%**	**2.82%**	**100%**
	64.94%	*55.11%*	*39.57%*	*38.38%*	*47.56%*	*57.66%*
I would use it somewhat more frequently	**45.73%**	**29.82%**	**16.08%**	**5.7%**	**2.68%**	**100%**
	21.13%	*27.55%*	*34.53%*	*34.34%*	*19.51%*	*24.91%*
I would use it a lot more frequently	**32.17%**	**28.7%**	**21.74%**	**8.7%**	**8.7%**	**100%**
	5.73%	*10.22%*	*17.99%*	*20.2%*	*24.39%*	*9.6%*
Total	**53.9%**	**26.95%**	**11.6%**	**4.13%**	**3.42%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*
New arena on Cook Field						
I would use it a lot less frequently	**55.5%**	**24.67%**	**12.64%**	**4.52%**	**2.67%**	**100%**
	41.73%	*37.21%*	*44.73%*	*44.44%*	*32.1%*	*40.64%*
I would use it somewhat less frequently	**46.82%**	**30.91%**	**13.18%**	**5.45%**	**3.64%**	**100%**
	7.96%	*10.54%*	*10.55%*	*12.12%*	*9.88%*	*9.19%*
I would use it the same amount	**60.5%**	**26.33%**	**7.49%**	**2.84%**	**2.84%**	**100%**
	41.19%	*35.97%*	*24%*	*25.25%*	*30.86%*	*36.8%*
I would use it somewhat more frequently	**39.64%**	**37.39%**	**15.32%**	**4.95%**	**2.7%**	**100%**

	6.8%	*12.87%*	*12.36%*	*11.11%*	*7.41%*	*9.27%*
I would use it a lot more frequently	**30.61%**	**22.45%**	**23.47%**	**7.14%**	**16.33%**	**100%**
	2.32%	*3.41%*	*8.36%*	*7.07%*	*19.75%*	*4.09%*
Total	**54.05%**	**26.94%**	**11.49%**	**4.14%**	**3.38%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*
New arena at Oak & Spring St.						
I would use it a lot less frequently	**51.92%**	**22.99%**	**15.13%**	**5.75%**	**4.21%**	**100%**
	21.21%	*18.81%*	*28.83%*	*30.61%*	*26.83%*	*22.03%*
I would use it somewhat less frequently	**39.49%**	**37.58%**	**14.01%**	**4.46%**	**4.46%**	**100%**
	4.85%	*9.25%*	*8.03%*	*7.14%*	*8.54%*	*6.62%*
I would use it the same amount	**60.8%**	**25.17%**	**8.28%**	**3.22%**	**2.53%**	**100%**
	54.62%	*45.3%*	*34.67%*	*37.76%*	*35.37%*	*48.44%*
I would use it somewhat more frequently	**47.59%**	**32.41%**	**13.92%**	**3.29%**	**2.78%**	**100%**
	14.71%	*20.06%*	*20.07%*	*13.27%*	*13.41%*	*16.67%*
I would use it a lot more frequently	**39.86%**	**28.38%**	**15.54%**	**7.43%**	**8.78%**	**100%**
	4.62%	*6.58%*	*8.39%*	*11.22%*	*15.85%*	*6.24%*
Total	**53.92%**	**26.92%**	**11.56%**	**4.14%**	**3.46%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

*All of these crosstabulations have a Pearson chi-square that is statistically significant at >99.9% confidence level.

Table 34: Importance of Factors when Deciding to Attend/Work at Miami (and/or live in Oxford) (Return to Reading)

When you decided to attend/work at Miami (and/or live in Oxford), how important were the following factors in your decision?	Academic reputation/ prestige	Campus beauty/green spaces	Miami University Athletics	Non-athletic events/ activities	Quality of athletic facilities	College town experience (Oxford)
Not at all important	3.45%	1.39%	40.74%	9.31%	42.07%	4.56%
Only a little important	6.6%	3.74%	34.34%	22.33%	33.05%	10.01%
Somewhat important	32.93%	20.42%	19.15%	50.15%	19.81%	30.11%
Very important	57.02%	74.45%	5.77%	18.2%	5.06%	55.32%
TOTAL (n)	2,378	2,380	2,376	2,373	2,372	2,368

Table 35: Importance of Factors when Deciding to Attend/Work at Miami by Connection (Return to Reading)

Academic Reputation/ Prestige	Current Students	Parent/ Guardian	Alumni	Faculty (current/ former)	Staff (current/ former)	Local resident/ business
Not at all important	2.73%	1.03%	2.15%	3.89%	6.91%	8.11%
Only a little important	7.5%	3.42%	4.3%	2.72%	10.18%	9.55%
Somewhat important	36.67%	16.44%	24.91%	28.02%	39.27%	35.32%
Very important	53.11%	79.11%	68.64%	65.37%	43.64%	47.02%
TOTAL (n)	1320	292	558	257	275	419
Campus Beauty/ Green Spaces						
Not at all important	0.76%	0.68%	0.71%	1.95%	4.73%	2.37%
Only a little important	2.96%	2.72%	2.86%	7%	9.09%	4.98%
Somewhat important	18.44%	13.95%	14.64%	37.35%	25.45%	25.12%
Very important	77.85%	82.65%	81.79%	53.7%	60.73%	67.54%
TOTAL (n)	1318	294	560	257	275	422
Collegiate Athletics						
Not at all important	41.73%	26.12%	30.18%	61.48%	50.18%	40.86%
Only a little important	35.51%	40.89%	36.43%	26.85%	28.73%	33.49%
Somewhat important	18.21%	24.74%	24.29%	9.73%	15.27%	19.24%
Very important	4.55%	8.25%	9.11%	1.95%	5.82%	6.41%
TOTAL (n)	1318	291	560	257	275	421
Non-Athletic Events/ Activities						
Not at all important	7.13%	5.84%	4.85%	21.88%	15.27%	12.65%
Only a little important	22.53%	18.9%	18.49%	29.3%	24%	21.48%
Somewhat important	49.77%	56.36%	58.35%	40.63%	45.82%	51.79%
Very important	20.56%	18.9%	18.31%	8.2%	14.91%	14.08%
TOTAL (n)	1318	291	557	256	275	419

Quality of Athletic Facilities						
Not at all important	43.47%	28.77%	31.66%	62.89%	47.27%	38.66%
Only a little important	33.51%	36.99%	36.67%	23.83%	28.36%	34.13%
Somewhat important	18.09%	29.45%	25.22%	12.11%	20%	23.15%
Very important	4.94%	4.79%	6.44%	1.17%	4.36%	4.06%
TOTAL (n)	1316	292	559	256	275	419
College Town Experience						
Not at all important	4.04%	0.68%	2.15%	6.67%	8.76%	6.44%
Only a little important	10.3%	7.19%	4.84%	17.65%	12.77%	10.5%
Somewhat important	30.21%	25.68%	27.78%	39.22%	33.58%	31.5%
Very important	55.45%	66.44%	65.23%	36.47%	44.89%	51.55%
TOTAL (n)	1311	292	558	255	274	419

Table 36: Importance of Factors when Deciding to Attend/Work at Miami by Donor Status (Return to Reading)

Academic Reputation / Prestige	Donated	Never Donated	Don't Know/ Unsure
Not at all important	33.78%	3.94%	5.41%
Only a little important	25.17%	7.62%	15.65%
Somewhat important	29.41%	37.04%	14.04%
Very important	45.09%	51.40%	8.80%
TOTAL (n)	856	1142	244
Campus Beauty/ Green Spaces			
Not at all important	1.63%	1.14%	0.82%
Only a little important	2.21%	4.74%	4.92%
Somewhat important	18.16%	22.21%	18.44%
Very important	78%	71.91%	75.82%
TOTAL (n)	859	1139	244

Collegiate Athletics			
Not at all important	36.20%	47.05%	33.88%
Only a little important	35.74%	32.37%	36.73%
Somewhat important	20.02%	16.18%	25.71%
Very important	8.03%	4.40%	3.67%
TOTAL (n)	859	1137	245
Non-Athletic Events/ Activities			
Not at all important	8.91%	9.48%	10.61%
Only a little important	20.28%	25.20%	19.18%
Somewhat important	52.40%	47.32%	52.24%
Very important	18.41%	18%	17.96%
TOTAL (n)	853	1139	245
Quality of Athletic Facilities			
Not at all important	37.03%	48.46%	36.73%
Only a little important	35.75%	30.75%	33.88%
Somewhat important	21.96%	16.48%	23.67%
Very important	5.26%	4.32%	5.71%
TOTAL (n)	856	1135	245
College Town Experience			
Not at all important	3.50%	5.81%	2.47%
Only a little important	8.06%	11.71%	8.23%
Somewhat important	29.56%	30.81%	30.86%
Very important	58.88%	51.67%	58.44%
TOTAL (n)	856	1136	243

*All crosstabulations are statistically significant (≥99% confidence) except for non-athletic events.

Table 37: Values/Qualities Most Associated with Miami University
(Return to Reading)

Please rank the importance of the following qualities/values you most associate with Miami University	Quality of education/ teaching	Campus beauty/ aesthetics	Collegiate athletics	Institutional reputation/ prestige	College town experience (Oxford)	Professional/ career preparedness
Not at all important	0.47%	0.3%	32.18%	2.1%	3.11%	1%
Only a little important	0.98%	3.2%	36.41%	8.8%	8.83%	3.43%
Somewhat important	14.44%	25.44%	24.78%	40.21%	31.98%	25.02%
Very important	84.1%	71.06%	6.63%	48.88%	56.08%	70.55%
TOTAL (n)	2,340	2,343	2,337	2,330	2,345	2,302

Table 38: Qualities/Values Most Associated with Miami by Connection
(Return to Reading)

Quality of Education/Teaching	Current Students	Parent/ Guardian	Alumni	Faculty (current/ former)	Staff (current/ former)	Local resident/ business
Not at all important	0.31%	0.35%	0%	1.18%	0.99%	0.49%
Only a little important	1.24%	0.35%	0.18%	0.39%	0.99%	1.46%
Somewhat important	17.16%	5.21%	10.33%	9.02%	13.44%	16.3%
Very important	81.3%	94.1%	89.49%	89.41%	84.58%	81.75%
TOTAL (n)	1294	288	552	255	506	411
Campus Beauty/ Aesthetics						
Not at all important	0.31%	0%	0%	0%	0.59%	0.24%
Only a little important	3.4%	2.08%	1.81%	4.71%	4.14%	3.88%
Somewhat important	25.25%	17.01%	16.82%	40.78%	35.11%	28.64%
Very important	71.04%	80.9%	81.37%	54.51%	60.16%	67.23%
TOTAL (n)	1295	288	553	255	507	412
Collegiate Athletics						
Not at all important	35.48%	21.11%	21.2%	46.3%	38.19%	25.85%
Only a little important	37.57%	32.53%	35.87%	35.41%	37.01%	36.34%

Somewhat important	20.99%	39.45%	32.61%	17.12%	19.69%	31.95%
Very important	5.96%	6.92%	10.33%	1.17%	5.12%	5.85%
TOTAL (n)	1291	289	552	257	508	410
Institutional Reputation/ Prestige						
Not at all important	2.88%	0.35%	0.36%	0.39%	1.77%	1.22%
Only a little important	11.43%	2.78%	4.74%	6.27%	6.89%	9.51%
Somewhat important	43.16%	28.82%	32.24%	40.78%	41.54%	42.68%
Very important	42.53%	68.06%	62.66%	52.55%	49.8%	46.59%
TOTAL (n)	1286	288	549	255	508	410
College Town Experience						
Not at all important	3.01%	1.04%	1.63%	3.89%	4.51%	3.15%
Only a little important	9.8%	4.15%	3.62%	14.01%	12.35%	7.75%
Somewhat important	32.02%	29.76%	26.94%	41.63%	38.04%	32.69%
Very important	55.17%	65.05%	67.81%	40.47%	45.1%	56.42%
TOTAL (n)	1296	289	553	257	510	413
Professional/Career Preparation						
Not at all important	0.86%	0%	0%	2.4%	1.61%	1.24%
Only a little important	2.51%	1.06%	2.77%	8%	7.03%	6.7%
Somewhat important	25.73%	13.73%	21.07%	34%	30.72%	27.79%
Very important	70.9%	85.21%	76.16%	55.6%	60.64%	64.27%
TOTAL (n)	1275	284	541	250	498	403

Table 39: Qualities/Values Most Associated with Miami by Donor Status
(Return to Reading)

Quality of Education/Teaching	Donated	Never Donated	Unsure/ Don't Know
Not at all important	0.12%	0.79%	0%
Only a little important	0.35%	1.58%	0.82%
Somewhat important	9.58%	18.13%	12.30%
Very important	89.95%	79.49%	86.89%
TOTAL (n)	856	1136	244
Campus Beauty/ Aesthetics			
Not at all important	0.12%	0.35%	0.41%
Only a little important	1.52%	4.22%	4.08%
Somewhat important	21.64%	28.38%	24.49%
Very important	76.73%	67.05%	71.02%
TOTAL (n)	855	1138	245
Collegiate Athletics			
Not at all important	26.90%	38.66%	26.53%
Only a little important	35.56%	36.28%	37.96%
Somewhat important	29.36%	19.86%	28.57%
Very important	8.19%	5.21%	6.94%
TOTAL (n)	855	1133	245
Institutional Reputation/ Prestige			
Not at all important	1.06%	3.19%	1.63%
Only a little important	4.46%	11.42%	11.02%
Somewhat important	35.21%	42.74%	45.71%
Very important	59.27%	42.65%	41.63%
TOTAL (n)	852	1130	245

College Town Experience			
Not at all important	1.98%	4.40%	2.05%
Only a little important	7.23%	10.73%	7.38%
Somewhat important	31.59%	31.66%	33.61%
Very important	59.21%	53.21%	56.97%
TOTAL (n)	858	1137	244
Professional/Career Preparation			
Not at all important	0.83%	1.08%	0.41%
Only a little important	3.69%	3.41%	3.29%
Somewhat important	21.76%	27.44%	25.51%
Very important	73.72%	68.07%	70.78%
TOTAL (n)	841	1115	243

*All crosstabulations are statistically significant (≥99% confidence) except for professional/career preparation.

Table 40: Top-Three Strategic Investment Priorities
(Return to Reading)

If you were a university leader, which of the following strategic priorities would you focus investment on to remain competitive? Please indicate your top-three priorities	n	% of Selections	Calc. %
Student experience and campus culture	1,670	49.9%	69%
Research facilities and support	1,296	38.72%	54%
Athletic programs and facilities	333	9.95%	14%
Campus safety and accessibility	1,119	33.43%	46%
Reduce cost of attendance	1,494	44.64%	62%
Instructional quality and facilities	1,477	44.13%	61%
Expand offerings and facilities in high-growth fields	854	25.52%	35%
Digital technology infrastructure and online learning	416	12.43%	17%
A robust humanities and creative arts curriculum	835	24.95%	35%
Career preparation and experiential learning	1,514	45.23%	63%
Community programming and events	763	22.8%	32%
Marketing/branding and communication	309	9.23%	13%
Campus sustainability	1,084	32.39%	45%
TOTAL	2,407	3,347 (selections)	

Table 41: Top-Three Strategic Investment Priorities by Connection
(Return to Reading)

Investment Priorities (% ranked in top 3, active N)	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Student experience & campus culture	**48.88%**	**49.34%**	**50.51%**	34.43%	**36.85%**	**41.94%**
Research facilities/support	24.94%	17.94%	16.78%	**37.95%**	30.58%	24.59%
Athletic programs/facilities	7.06%	4.83%	10.28%	3.13%	5.10%	6.75%
Campus safety & accessibility	19.80%	15.53%	13.53%	6.65%	13.52%	18.32%
Reduce cost of attendance	**48.80%**	33.81%	33.73%	**41.47%**	**37.63%**	**36.64%**
Instructional quality/facilities	31.54%	**62.45%**	**53.58%**	**71.60%**	**61.55%**	**50.14%**
Expand offerings in high-growth fields	10.05%	19.32%	18.40%	12.52%	15.09%	17.36%
Online learning & Digital technology infrastructure	3.53%	2.42%	3.61%	4.30%	4.12%	4.34%
Robust humanities & creative arts curriculum	16.65%	13.11%	16.78%	36.78%	29.79%	23.62%
Community programming/ events	7.14%	4.14%	6.13%	3.52%	4.70%	6.99%
Marketing/brand communication	2.84%	0.69%	3.07%	1.57%	2.35%	1.45%
Campus sustainability	16.27%	8.28%	9.38%	10.17%	13.52%	13.74%
Career Preparation & experiential learning	**37.14%**	**50.72%**	**43.11%**	26.21%	14.51%	31.10%

* The “active N” that provides the denominator used in this table was derived from the average number of responses per connection type in the two preceding sets of survey items (Q8s & Q9s; 12 total questions) to get an accurate estimate of the number of respondents still participating in the survey. These figures were then checked to make sure they did not exceed those for all subsequent questions. The top three most frequently selected investment areas for each connection group are bolded.

Table 42: Top-Three Strategic Investment Priorities by Donor Status
(Return to Reading)

Investment Priorities (% ranked in top 3)	Never Donated	Have Donated	Don't Know/ Unsure	TOTAL	Chi-square Significance Level
Student experience & campus culture	70.53%	71.25%	74.09%	71.19%	
Research facilities/support	57.65%	52.31%	56.68%	55.51%	*
Athletic programs/facilities	11.84%	15.36%	19.43%	14.01%	**
Campus safety & accessibility	50.73%	43.07%	49.39%	47.67%	**
Reduce cost of attendance	68.97%	56.24%	65.18%	63.70%	***
Instructional quality/facilities	57.91%	72.25%	54.25%	63.17%	***

Expand offerings in high-growth fields	33.45%	41.22%	35.22%	36.61%	***
Online learning & Digital technology infrastructure	17.37%	18.01%	19.84%	17.89%	
Robust humanities & creative arts curriculum	34.55%	37.52%	33.20%	35.99%	
Career Preparation & experiential learning	64.65%	64.20%	66.40%	64.47%	
Community programming/ events	34.40%	28.87%	34.82%	32.33%	*
Marketing/brand communication	12.53%	12.47%	17.41%	13.04%	
Campus sustainability	50.13%	40.30%	50.61%	46.43%	***
TOTAL (n)	1,157	866	247	2,270	

* $p \leq 0.05$ (significant); ** $p \leq 0.01$ (highly significant); *** $p \leq 0.001$ (very highly significant)

Table 43: Best Use of Cook Field
(Return to Reading)

As Miami plans for the future, what do you believe would be the best use of Cook Field?	n	%
Preserve as open/green space	1,743	78.66%
Redevelop as an Arena District	79	3.56%
Redevelop as an academic quad	11	0.5%
Redevelop with a mix of academic and open spaces	239	10.79%
Redevelop as an Arena District with some academic uses	102	4.6%
Other	42	1.9%
TOTAL (n)	2,216	100%

Table 44: Best Use of Cook Field by Connection
(Return to Reading)

As Miami plans for the future, what do you believe would be the best use of Cook Field?	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Preserve as open/green space	82.2%	73.5%	73.83%	76.34%	74.39%	78.39%
Redevelop as an Arena District	2.6%	2.83%	6.36%	1.79%	4.42%	3.52%
Redevelop as an academic quad	0.49%	0.35%	0.19%	1.34%	0.88%	0.5%
Redevelop with a mix of academic and open spaces	9.84%	14.49%	11.03%	14.29%	11.92%	10.8%
Redevelop as an Arena District with academic uses	3.5%	5.3%	6.36%	4.46%	5.74%	5.03%
Other	1.38%	3.53%	2.24%	1.79%	2.65%	1.76%
TOTAL (n)	1230	283	535	224	453	398

Table 45: Best Use of Cook Field by Donor Status
(Return to Reading)

As Miami plans for the future, what do you believe would be the best use of Cook Field?	Never Donated	Have Donated	Unsure/ Don't know	TOTAL
Preserve as open/green space	82.2%	72.96%	80.5%	78.56%
Redevelop as an Arena District	2.5%	5.43%	2.07%	3.55%
Redevelop as an academic quad	0.45%	0.62%	0.41%	0.51%
Redevelop with a mix of academic and open spaces	9.57%	12.47%	12.03%	10.93%
Redevelop as an Arena District with academic uses	4.03%	5.8%	2.9%	4.56%
Other	1.25%	2.72%	2.07%	1.89%
TOTAL (n)	1,118	810	241	100%

Pearson chi2(10) = 32.7226; Pr = 0.000

Table 46: Best Use of Cook Field by Athletic Event Attendance at Millett Hall (past 12 months)
(Return to Reading)

As Miami plans for the future, what do you believe would be the best use of Cook Field?	*Athletic Event Attendance at Millett Hall (past 12 months)*					
	None	*1-2 events*	*3-5 events*	*6-10 events*	*10+ events*	*TOTAL*
Preserve as open/green space	976	457	189	72	45	1,739
	56.12%	**26.28%**	**10.87%**	**4.14%**	**2.59%**	**100%**
	80.33%	*77.85%*	*76.52%*	*82.76%*	*59.21%*	*78.62%*
Redevelop as an Arena District	17	27	19	5	11	79
	21.52%	**34.18%**	**24.05%**	**6.33%**	**13.92%**	**100%**
	1.40%	*4.60%*	*7.69%*	*5.75%*	*14.47%*	*3.57%*
Redevelop as an academic quad	5	3	2	1	0	11
	45.45%	**27.27%**	**18.18%**	**9.09%**	**0%**	**100%**
	0.41%	*0.51%*	*0.81%*	*1.15%*	*0%*	*0.50%*
Redevelop with a mix of academic and open spaces	146	63	20	4	6	239
	61.09%	**26.36%**	**8.37%**	**1.67%**	**2.51%**	**100%**
	12.02%	*10.73%*	*8.10%*	*4.60%*	*7.89%*	*10.80%*
Redevelop as an Arena District with some academic uses	45	26	14	4	13	102
	44.12%	**25.49%**	**13.73%**	**3.92%**	**12.75%**	**100%**

	3.70%	*4.43%*	*5.67%*	*4.60%*	*17.11%*	*4.61%*
Other	26	11	3	1	1	42
	61.90%	**26.19%**	**7.14%**	**2.38%**	**2.38%**	**100%**
	2.14%	*1.87%*	*1.21%*	*1.15%*	*1.32%*	*1.90%*
TOTAL	1,215	587	247	87	76	2,212
	54.93%	**26.54%**	**11.17%**	**3.93%**	**3.44%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(20) = 99.1782; Pr = 0.000

Table 47: Preferred Amenities if Cook Field relocated to Millett Hall Site
(Return to Reading)

If the MU Administration moves forward with plans to build a replacement recreation space on the current Millet Hall location (i.e., a new Cook Field), what types of facilities and amenities would you like to see in this facility?	n	% of selections	% of n
Open air green space	1,818	54.32%	81%
Walking/ running paths	1,470	43.92%	66%
Turfed sports fields (e.g., soccer, football)	1,196	35.73%	54%
Changing rooms and bathrooms	980	29.28%	44%
Pickleball courts	873	26.08%	39%
Outdoor basketball courts	615	18.37%	28%
Outdoor fitness equipment	605	18.08%	27%
Baseball/ softball field(s)	491	14.67%	22%
Volleyball courts	438	13.09%	20%
High ropes course	395	11.80%	18%
Concession stand	342	10.22%	15%
TOTAL (n)	2,232	3,347 selections	100%

Table 48: Support for Arena District Project on Cook Field Site
(Return to Reading)

The MU Administration and Board of Trustees voted to locate a multipurpose arena and entertainment district (including hotels, parking, and other potential amenities) on the current Cook Field site, and is currently in the project planning phase. Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose this project?	n	% (n)

Strongly oppose	1,778	78.09%
Somewhat oppose	251	11.02%
Neither oppose nor support	82	3.6%
Somewhat support	85	3.73%
Strongly support	81	3.56%
TOTAL (n)	2,277	100%

Table 49: Support for Arena District Project by Donor Status
(Return to Reading)

Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose this project?	*Have you ever donated to Miami?*			
	No	*Yes*	*Unsure/ Don't know*	*TOTAL (n)*
Strongly oppose	911	644	206	1,761
	51.73%	**36.57%**	**11.7%**	**100%**
	79.36%	*74.8%*	*84.08%*	*78.13%*
Somewhat oppose	133	98	19	250
	53.2%	**39.2%**	**7.6%**	**100%**
	11.59%	*11.38%*	*7.76%*	*11.09%*
Neither oppose nor support	38	31	9	78
	48.72%	**39.74%**	**11.54%**	**100%**
	3.31%	*3.6%*	*3.67%*	*3.46%*
Somewhat support	40	37	7	84
	47.62%	**44.05%**	**8.33%**	**100%**
	3.48%	*4.3%*	*2.86%*	*3.73%*
Strongly support	26	51	4	81
	32.1%	**62.96%**	**4.94%**	**100%**
	2.26%	*5.92%*	*1.63%*	*3.59%*
TOTAL (n)	1,148	861	245	2,254
	50.93%	**38.2%**	**10.87%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(8) = 28.1855; Pr = 0.000

Table 50: Support for Arena District Project by Connection
(Return to Reading)

Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose this project?	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Strongly oppose	80.9%	76.41%	75%	76.77%	73.75%	80.15%
Somewhat oppose	10.15%	11.97%	11.09%	12.99%	12.63%	9.55%
Neither oppose nor support	3.52%	3.17%	2.44%	4.33%	5.41%	3.27%

Somewhat support	3.6%	3.87%	4.14%	4.33%	4.41%	2.76%
Strongly support	1.84%	4.58%	7.33%	1.57%	3.81%	4.27%
TOTAL (n)	1251	284	532	254	499	398

Table 51: Support for Arena District Project by Athletic Event Attendance
(Return to Reading)

Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose this project?	*None*	*1-2 events*	*3-5 events*	*6-10 events*	*10+ events*	*TOTAL (n)*
Strongly oppose	1,007	459	190	73	43	1,772
	56.83%	**25.9%**	**10.72%**	**4.12%**	**2.43%**	**100%**
	80.95%	*76.25%*	*73.36%*	*81.11%*	*56.58%*	*78.03%*
Somewhat oppose	144	69	24	4	10	251
	57.37%	**27.49%**	**9.56%**	**1.59%**	**3.98%**	**100%**
	11.58%	*11.46%*	*9.27%*	*4.44%*	*13.16%*	*11.05%*
Neither oppose nor support	35	27	13	4	3	82
	42.68%	**32.93%**	**15.85%**	**4.88%**	**3.66%**	**100%**
	2.81%	*4.49%*	*5.02%*	*4.44%*	*3.95%*	*3.61%*
Somewhat support	36	25	15	2	7	85
	42.35%	**29.41%**	**17.65%**	**2.35%**	**8.24%**	**100%**
	2.89%	*4.15%*	*5.79%*	*2.22%*	*9.21%*	*3.74%*
Strongly support	22	22	17	7	13	81
	27.16%	**27.16%**	**20.99%**	**8.64%**	**16.05%**	**100%**
	1.77%	*3.65%*	*6.56%*	*7.78%*	*17.11%*	*3.57%*
TOTAL (n)	1,244	602	259	90	76	2,271
	54.78%	**26.51%**	**11.4%**	**3.96%**	**3.35%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 90.5520; Pr = 0.000

Table 52: Support for Arena District Project by "Non-Uses" of Cook Field
(Return to Reading)

Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose this project?	*Number of "Non-Uses" of Cook Field*					
	0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*Total*
Strongly oppose	636	625	312	132	73	1,778
	35.77%	**35.15%**	**17.55%**	**7.42%**	**4.11%**	**100%**

	89.2%	*85.15%*	*78.99%*	*53.23%*	*39.04%*	*78.09%*
Somewhat oppose	56	72	49	44	30	251
	22.31%	**28.69%**	**19.52%**	**17.53%**	**11.95%**	**100%**
	7.85%	*9.81%*	*12.41%*	*17.74%*	*16.04%*	*11.02%*
Neither oppose nor support	7	16	12	26	21	82
	8.54%	**19.51%**	**14.63%**	**31.71%**	**25.61%**	**100%**
	0.98%	*2.18%*	*3.04%*	*10.48%*	*11.23%*	*3.6%*
Somewhat support	6	13	9	22	35	85
	7.06%	**15.29%**	**10.59%**	**25.88%**	**41.18%**	**100%**
	0.84%	*1.77%*	*2.28%*	*8.87%*	*18.72%*	*3.73%*
Strongly support	8	8	13	24	28	81
	9.88%	**9.88%**	**16.05%**	**29.63%**	**34.57%**	**100%**
	1.12%	*1.09%*	*3.29%*	*9.68%*	*14.97%*	*3.56%*
Total	713	734	395	248	187	2,277
	31.31%	**32.24%**	**17.35%**	**10.89%**	**8.21%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 450.5673; Pr = 0.000

Table 53: Support for Arena District Project by "Non-Uses" of Millett Hall
(Return to Reading)

Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose this project?	*Number of "Non-Uses" of Cook Field*					
	0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*Total*
Strongly oppose	85	122	412	447	712	1,778
	4.78%	**6.86%**	**23.17%**	**25.14%**	**40.04%**	**100%**
	78.7%	*78.71%*	*71.03%*	*74.87%*	*85.07%*	*78.09%*
Somewhat oppose	8	14	65	83	81	251
	3.19%	**5.58%**	**25.9%**	**33.07%**	**32.27%**	**100%**
	7.41%	*9.03%*	*11.21%*	*13.9%*	*9.68%*	*11.02%*
Neither oppose nor support	4	1	26	27	24	82
	4.88%	**1.22%**	**31.71%**	**32.93%**	**29.27%**	**100%**
	3.7%	*0.65%*	*4.48%*	*4.52%*	*2.87%*	*3.6%*
Somewhat support	4	8	32	27	14	85
	4.71%	**9.41%**	**37.65%**	**31.76%**	**16.47%**	**100%**
	3.7%	*5.16%*	*5.52%*	*4.52%*	*1.67%*	*3.73%*
Strongly support	7	10	45	13	6	81
	8.64%	**12.35%**	**55.56%**	**16.05%**	**7.41%**	**100%**
	6.48%	*6.45%*	*7.76%*	*2.18%*	*0.72%*	*3.56%*
Total	108	155	580	597	837	2,277

	4.74%	**6.81%**	**25.47%**	**26.22%**	**36.76%**	**100%**
	100%	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*	*100%*

Pearson chi2(16) = 98.6265; Pr = 0.000

Table 54: Concerns about Constructing an Arena on Cook Field
(Return to Reading)

When considering the prospect of an arena being constructed on Cook Field, please describe the extent to which the following items are a concern for you	Parking/ traffic congestion	Loss of campus green space	Construction noise/ congestion/ pollution/ disturbance	Inadequate demand for sporting event attendance	Impacts on campus aesthetics/ beauty	Use of resources/ opportunity costs (i.e. not investing in other areas)
Not at all a concern	3.83%	2.51%	4.65%	11.86%	3.75%	2.8%
Minor concern	6.12%	4.19%	15.14%	17.43%	8.87%	7.42%
Somewhat significant concern	15.15%	10.98%	23.2%	25.44%	15.58%	17.9%
Very significant concern	74.89%	82.32%	57.02%	45.27%	71.79%	71.88%
TOTAL (n)	2,270	2,268	2,259	2,260	2,265	2,251

Table 55: Concerns about Constructing an Arena on Cook Field by Connection
(Return to Reading)

Parking & Traffic Congestion	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
Not at all a concern	4.65%	0.7%	4.7%	0%	1.81%	1.75%
Minor concern	6.09%	6.67%	6.02%	7.6%	7.03%	5.24%
Somewhat significant concern	18.19%	13.33%	11.09%	13.6%	10.84%	7.73%
Very significant concern	71.07%	79.3%	78.2%	78.8%	80.32%	85.29%
TOTAL (n)	1248	285	532	250	498	401
Loss of campus green space						
Not at all a concern	2.17%	1.41%	3.38%	1.6%	3.41%	2.01%
Minor concern	2.81%	5.63%	5.26%	6%	7.43%	4.26%
Somewhat significant concern	9.62%	10.21%	10.71%	16.8%	16.27%	13.28%
Very significant concern	85.4%	82.75%	80.64%	75.6%	72.89%	80.45%
TOTAL (n)	1247	284	532	250	498	399

Construction noise, pollution, disturbance						
Not at all a concern	3.29%	3.56%	9.04%	3.23%	5.23%	4.53%
Minor concern	12.93%	14.95%	17.33%	16.53%	18.31%	16.12%
Somewhat significant concern	23.29%	25.98%	23.16%	26.21%	23.14%	21.91%
Very significant concern	60.48%	55.52%	50.47%	54.03%	53.32%	57.43%
TOTAL (n)	1245	281	531	248	497	397
Inadequate demand for sporting events						
Not at all a concern	13.4%	6.41%	11.99%	8.06%	10.28%	9.05%
Minor concern	17.98%	14.95%	16.67%	14.52%	15.52%	16.33%
Somewhat significant concern	25.52%	32.38%	23.97%	21.77%	22.78%	25.38%
Very significant concern	43.1%	46.26%	47.38%	55.65%	51.41%	49.25%
TOTAL (n)	1246	281	534	248	496	398
Impacts of campus aesthetics/beauty						
Not at all a concern	3.05%	3.51%	4.14%	3.61%	5.44%	3.54%
Minor concern	7.79%	5.61%	9.21%	15.66%	14.11%	8.33%
Somewhat significant concern	15.5%	12.63%	12.59%	22.09%	18.35%	15.15%
Very significant concern	73.65%	78.25%	74.06%	58.63%	62.1%	72.98%
TOTAL (n)	1245	285	532	249	496	396
Resource uses/ Opportunity costs						
Not at all a concern	2.19%	1.4%	4.5%	0.8%	3.41%	2.27%
Minor concern	6.98%	7.37%	10.13%	3.6%	5.62%	7.07%
Somewhat significant concern	17.61%	23.86%	21.2%	8.8%	13.25%	16.67%
Very significant concern	73.21%	67.37%	64.17%	86.8%	77.71%	73.99%
TOTAL (n)	1232	285	533	250	498	396

Table 56: Concerns about Constructing an Arena on Cook Field by Donor Status
(Return to Reading)

Parking/Traffic Congestion	Never Donated	Has Donated	Don't Know/ Unsure	TOTAL	
Not at all a concern	3.77%	3.73%	4.53%	3.83%	
Minor concern	6.13%	6.06%	5.35%	6.02%	
Somewhat significant concern	16.02%	12.24%	18.93%	14.89%	
Very significant concern	74.08%	77.97%	71.19%	75.26%	
TOTAL (n)	1,142	858	243	2,243	Pearson chi2(6) = 9.8365 Pr = 0.132
Loss of Campus Green Space					
Not at all a concern	1.66%	3.86%	1.65%	2.5%	
Minor concern	3.32%	5.74%	2.48%	4.15%	
Somewhat significant concern	11.34%	10.54%	10.33%	10.93%	
Very significant concern	83.68%	79.86%	85.54%	82.43%	
TOTAL (n)	1146	854	242	2242	Pearson chi2(6) = 20.6164 Pr = 0.002
Construction-related Disturbances (noise, congestion, pollution)					
Not at all a concern	3.94%	6.1%	2.9%	4.66%	
Minor concern	13.15%	18.66%	11.2%	15.04%	
Somewhat significant concern	23.49%	22.07%	25.73%	23.19%	
Very significant concern	59.42%	53.17%	60.17%	57.12%	
TOTAL (n)	1141	852	241	2234	Pearson chi2(6) = 24.1298 Pr = 0.000
Impacts on Campus Aesthetics/Beauty					
Not at all a concern	3.14%	4.82%	2.48%	3.71%	
Minor concern	8.21%	9.99%	8.26%	8.89%	
Somewhat significant concern	16.94%	13.28%	16.53%	15.5%	
Very significant concern	71.7%	71.92%	72.73%	71.89%	
TOTAL (n)	1145	851	242	2238	Pearson chi2(6) = 11.0915 Pr = 0.086
Inadequate Demand for Sporting Event Attendance					
Not at all a concern	12.87%	11.03%	9.96%	11.86%	
Minor concern	16.2%	17.61%	21.58%	17.32%	
Somewhat significant concern	25.57%	24.53%	27.8%	25.41%	
Very significant concern	45.36%	46.83%	40.66%	45.41%	

TOTAL (n)	1142	852	241	2235	Pearson chi2(6) = 7.9907; Pr = 0.239
Opportunity Costs (i.e. not investing resources in other areas)					
Not at all a concern	1.76%	4.24%	1.24%	2.65%	
Minor concern	6.08%	8.71%	9.5%	7.46%	
Somewhat significant concern	18.17%	18.12%	16.12%	17.92%	
Very significant concern	73.99%	68.94%	73.14%	71.97%	
TOTAL (n)	1134	850	242	2226	Pearson chi2(6) = 21.5045 Pr = 0.001

Table 57: Donor Status
(Return to Reading)

Have you ever donated money to Miami University?	n	% (n)
No	1,157	50.97%
Yes	866	38.15%
Unsure/Don't know	247	10.88%
TOTAL (n)	2,259	100%

Table 58: Donor Status by Connection
(Return to Reading)

Have you ever donated money to Miami University?	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
No	69.37%	16.73%	21.99%	30.68%	31.46%	30.5%
Yes	16.12%	75.8%	72.18%	65.34%	62.12%	61.5%
Unsure/Don't Know	14.51%	7.47%	5.83%	3.98%	6.41%	8%
TOTAL (n)	1247	281	532	251	499	400

Table 59: Impact of Arena District on Future Donations (Return to Reading)

How might a decision to construct an Arena District on Cook Field affect your likelihood to donate to Miami University in the future?	n	% (n)
A lot less likely	1,119	49.54%
Somewhat less likely	429	18.99%
The same likelihood (i.e. no impact)	564	24.97%
Somewhat more likely	74	3.28%
A lot more likely	73	3.23%

TOTAL (n)	2,259	100%

Table 60: Impact of Arena District Project on Future Donations by Connection
(Return to Reading)

How might a decision to construct an Arena District on Cook Field affect your likelihood to donate to Miami University in the future?	Current Students	Parents/ Guardians	Alumni	Faculty (Current/ Former)	Staff (Current/ Former)	Local Residents/ Businesses
A lot less likely	51.46%	48.59%	46.15%	51.2%	47.79%	56.31%
Somewhat less likely	19.74%	19.01%	21.39%	16%	16.47%	14.14%
Same likelihood (no impact)	22.65%	26.76%	22.51%	30.8%	31.73%	25.51%
Somewhat more likely	3.64%	2.82%	4.13%	0.8%	1.81%	2.27%
A lot more likely	2.51%	2.82%	5.82%	1.2%	2.21%	1.77%
TOTAL (n)	1236	284	533	250	498	396

Table 61: Impact of Arena District Project on Future Donations by Donor Status
(Return to Reading)

How might a decision to construct an Arena District on Cook Field affect your likelihood to donate to Miami University in the future?	*Have you ever donated money to Miami University?*			
	No	*Yes*	*Unsure/ Don't Know*	*TOTAL*
A lot less likely	48.99%	50.41%	47.97%	49.42%
Somewhat less likely	17.85%	19.35%	23.58%	19.05%
Same likelihood	26.77%	23.41%	22.36%	25%
Somewhat more likely	3.59%	3.13%	2.44%	3.29%
A lot more likely	2.80%	3.71%	3.66%	3.24%
TOTAL (n)	1143	863	246	2252

Pearson chi2(8) = 9.1871; Pr = 0.327

Appendix II: Qualitative Codebook

CODE	DESCRIPTION
Academic Prioritization>Project	Participants mention the lack of prioritization of what makes Miami the "Ivy League of the Midwest" Participants mention that they would like to see more funding in research, faculty, and academic programs. Participants mention the decline of Miami as an academic institution
Accessibility Concern	Participants mention their concern about the loss of an accessible field Participants mention their concern about the ADL accessibility issues this project will cause Participants mention their concern about accessibility of new location, either Cook moving to Millett or arena on Cook Field.
Amenities_Basketball	If the project goes forward, participants would like to see basketball courts at the replacement recreation facility if the project goes forward
Amenities_Greenspace/ Nature	If the project goes forward, participants would like to see green/space or nature at the replacement recreation facility
Amenities_ROTC	If the project goes forward, the participants would like to see updated ROTC amenities at the replacement recreation facility
Amenities_Tennis	If the project goes forward, participants would like to see Tennis courts at the replacement recreation facility
Amenities_Volleyball	If the project goes forward, participants would like to see Volleyball courts indoor and outdoor at the replacement recreation facility
Amenities_Walking_Biking	If the project goes forward, participants would like to see running, biking, or walking paths at the replacement recreation facility
Amennities_Fitness	If the project goes forward, participants would like to see outdoor or indoor fitness facilities such as dance, marching band, weight room, playground equipment, etc.
Associate_Athletics	Participants respond that the values they most associate with Miami University is Athletics
Associate_Career Development/Work	Participants respond that the values they most associate with Miami University are anything to do with work, career development, and career connections
Associate_Livability/Cost	Participants respond that they associate the livability due to the safety and the proximity to work. As well as the cost and tuition wavers that are offered at Miami

Associate_Student Activities	Participants respond that they associate the student life and activities offered with Miami Identity
Associate_Town_Experience	Participants respond that they associate the small-town feel and experiences with Miami Identity
Associate_Tradition_History	Participants respond that they associate their family attendance tradition and institutional history with Miami Identity
Associatiate_GreenSpace/ Aesthetics	Participants respond that they associate the greenspace and aesthetic of campus to Miami Identity
Best Use_Academic	Participants believe that the best use of Cook Field would be for academic quad buildings
Best Use_Develop	Participants believe that the best use of Cook Field would be to develop into something other than arena or code mentioned
Best Use_Dorms	Participants believe that the best use of Cook Field would be to develop into dorms
Best Use_Parking	Participants believe that the best use of Cook Field would be to develop more parking options
Best Use_Preserve	Participants believe that the best use of Cook Field would be to actually preserve the area
Best Use_Preserve_Develop	Participants believe that the best use of Cook Field would be to preserve part of the field and develop other part
Better_Facilities	Participants respond that the best use of Cook Field would be to develop into facilities that could support physical activities
Cook_Accessibility_Good Location	Participants emphasize the importance of the accessibility and benefits of Cook Field
Cook_Greenspace/Aesthetic	Participants mention how the aesthetics and greenspace of Cook is what is important about the field
Cook_Leisure	Participants mention leisure activities such as tiktok, sunbathing that they do at Cook Field
Cook_Less_use	Participants report that if the project would happen they would use the field and participate in the activities on the field a lot less
Cook_Low_Importance	Expresses indifference about Cook Field and it being moved
Cook_Mental/Physical/ Social Wellness	Participants mention the break/connection/healing feeling that Cook Field brings to their life. Also mention the ability to walk, run, or exercise in the field.
Cook_Multi-transportation/ utilization purposes	Emphasizes the number of uses Cook has: parking, mutli-usage from respondent, cut_through
Cook_ROTC	Any mention of ROTC
Cook_Social Connectivity/Community Engagement	Experiences and events that bring the community & students together, or the sense of connection that people mention when they see people playing on the field

Cook_Sport Activities	Organized sports practice other club practices
Cook_Student life/experiences	Participants report that Cook Field is a vital organ to the student body's experience and life at Miami. Responses include mention of student activities such as: intramurals, greek events, hangouts, etc.,
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	Participants believe that Cook Field is the heart of the community and campus. Participants mention their personal experiences, or memory, formal or informal that seems to have left an impact on a person, story about impact, discusses community
Cost_Concern	Participants report concern regarding tuition raising, how will this be paid for
FactorAttend_Academics	Participants report that specific academic programs such as the Western program or music program factored into their decision to attend/work at Miami
FactorAttend_Athletics	Participants mention that athletic programs offered at Miami impacted their decision to attend/work at Miami
FactorAttend_Cost	Participants mention that the financial aid, tuition waiver or cost benefits Miami offers factored into their decision to attend/work at Miami
FactorAttend_Green_Space/ Aesthetics	Participants mention that the existing green space on campus or nature impacted their decision to attend/work at Miami
FactorAttend_Legacy & Tradition	Participants mentioned that upholding the tradition of Oxford, legacy of Miami, or personal history impacted their decision to attend/work at Miami
FactorAttend_Location/ Parking	Participants mentioned that the proximity to home or easy to commute impacted their decision to attend/work at Miami
FactorAttend_Student life_Experiences	Participants mention that the existing student life and experiences at Miami impacted their decision to attend
For Project_Build Elsewhere	Participants want the project to go forward but want the building of the project to happen in another location
For Project_If	Participants respond they agree with the project if it doesn't impact some other topic they include Ex: "I think the project should go forward if it's right for the students" or "I think the project should go forward if they do x,y or z"
Good Communication/Updates	Participants believe that there has been good communication and updates about this project
Institutional Detraction	The project or institutional focus is perceived as detracting from, minimizing, or ignoring the distinct cultural or geographic elements that make the location unique.

	Participants mention that the new arena will make Miami uglier either in it's vibes or in its aesthetic
Institutional Incongruence	Participants suggest the project is fundamentally out of step with the mission of serving the student body. Additionally, they believe that this project further distances the student body from administration, and this will impact further student admissions.
Invest_Academic Prioritization>Project	Both future and current improvements and enhancements to departments and programs currently at the university. Any improvements to academics at Miami Anything to do with current acceptance rates/who is accepted Staff retention, increasing staff salary
Invest_Nature	Maintaining green space, nature, preserving Miami history, health, and well-being
Invest_Parking	Anything to do with parking
Invest_Student_Recourse	Res life, dining hall, upgrading the rec
Invest_Town_Relations	Anything about the schools relationship with the residents who live in the area
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	Remain as it is currently
Lack of Communication &/or Inclusion of Stakeholders	Participants mention that they don't feel their needs and voices were heard, nor was the project communicated well to the community, faculty, alumni or students
Living/Learning Disruption:	Participants mention the traffic disruption that this project will cause. Participants mention the noise pollution and it's impact on students learning experiences
Loss of Donor Support	Participants state they will not continue to financially support Miami if the project goes through
Miami NonAthletic Identity	Participants mention that Miami is not an athletic school, nor did they come to this school for athletics. Additionally, comments that mention that the relocation of the arena will have no impact on their decision to attend events there.
Milett_Social/Community Event	Attending high school graduation ceremonies, and anytime the respondent mentions "events" without any further expansion on the kind and feeling it brought to them.
Millett_Accessibile/Good Location	Millett is accessible and/or in a good location

Millett_Career Development/work	Working at Millett Going to Career Fair at Millett Participants mention that they met and were able to develop their skills specific to their career field at Millett Hall.
Millett_Good_Impact	Personal event, or memory, formal or informal that seems to have left an impact on a person, story about impact
Millett_Institutional Importance/Nostalgia	Positive Impression or reaction, often on tours, factor when deciding on college, important aspect of university, says something about Miami or its values Mentions memories from 1978, 1992, and other specific memories that make Millett important
Millett_Leisure	Leisure Activities that don't specifically say they do with others
Millett_Loss of Support	Avoidance of area, going to events less, boycotting events, lack of appreciation for the new structure
Millett_Low Alignment/Salience	Expresses indifference of using Millett either not using it or stating it is not important Mentions not going there often
Millett_Low Convenience	Either stating not to build it or showing no interest without stating to keep cook
Millett_Low Importance	Millett ranks low in importance to respondent
Millett_Mental/Physical/ Social Wellness	Participants mention that they get physical exercise Participants mention that their experience at Millett Hall helped their social and mental wellness or feeling of belonging at Miami.
Millett_multi-transportation/ utilization purpose	Participants mention utilizing Millett Hall for parking purposes, getting the COVID vaccine, or voting.
Millett_Not Accessible	Millett is not accessible due to traffic, amenities offered, cost, students aren't allowed in unless they are in sports
Millett_ROTC	Mentions ROTC programs, being apart of ROTC
Millett_Shows/Concerts/ Lecture	Participants mention that they have gone to concerts, fashion shows, comedian shows, and guest lecturers
Millett_social/community events	Highschool Ceremonies Participants mention “events” without any further expansion
Millett_Social/Event gathering	Activities including social and events
Millett_Sport Events	Attending athletic games and sporting events including basketball, volleyball, football, band events, & tailgating.

Millett_Student Events/Experiences	Greek Events, Hangouts, Parents weekend
MillettFactor_Accessibility/ Time Availability	Participants state that the factors that impact their decision to attend is: Parking, Time Availability etc.,
MillettFactor_Amenities/ Cost	Participants state that a factor in their decision to attend events at Millett includes comfortability of seats, cost of attendance, and what quality or type of food that is offered
MillettFactor_Atmosphere/ Vibes	Participants state that the factors that impact their decision to attend have to do with the atmosphere, vibes, and feeling they get when attending events at Millett
MillettFactor_Friend/Family on Team	Participants report that their family is on the team and that is the driving factor as to why they go to events at Millett
MillettFactor_Institutional Identity/Miami Identity	Participants respond that the factor that influences their willingness to attend is due to the institutional importance of Millett & or their Miami Pride
MillettFactor_Location	Participants respond that the factor that influences their willingness to attend events at Millett has to do with Location
MillettFactor_Low Alignment and Salience	Participants respond that the factor that influences their lack willingness to attend is due to their disinterest in events at Millett
MillettFactor_Popularity/ Peer Interest	Participants respond that the factors that impact their decision to attend have to do with their peer interest and popularity of the event
MillettFactor_Stats	Participants respond that the factor that influences their willingness to attend is based on how well Miami sports teams are doing
Other	Does not fall within other codes, threats, or open ended questions
Other_Idea	Participants offer up a variety of other solutions to the new project and where it can be developed. Participants mention, if they do not want the project to happen, in depth ideas on how to spend the money.
Perceived Disconnect from Admin	Participants mention their concern that the Board of Trustees or Administration is not connected to the community, students, or faculty. Participants mention that the Administration is not being transparent with their community, students, or faculty.
Renovate Millett	Renovate the current building or place the new arena in the parking lot of Millett
Resource Prioritization Concern	Participants believe that the way Miami has portrayed their current funding situation does not align with the need for a new arena.
Safety Concern	Participants reporting they would not feel safe having their children's dorm be next to the arena.
Waste of Money/No Need	Participants mention that they don't believe the project is a good use of money and funds and offer no other explanation

Appendix III: Qualitative Response Tables

This appendix contains frequency tables of counts for each code applied to each qualitative response for each survey item. This includes responses for those who selected "Other, Specify" options on survey questions, as well as open-ended questions (and are labeled as such). Some questions required multiple codes, and thus are reported separately for each question and are labeled as such in the data table (e.g. "Code 1," "Code 2," etc.). For a description of each code, see Appendix II for the codebook and the methodology section of the report for a description of the procedures used to generate and apply codes.

"Other, Specify": In your time at Miami/Oxford, how have you used Cook Field and how often?

Code 1

Code_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Cook=Core memory/Miami Identity	3	0.80	3	0.80
Cook_Leisure	12	3.19	15	3.99
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	92	24.47	107	28.46
Cook_ROTC	8	2.13	115	30.59
Cook_Social Connectivity/Community Engagement	65	17.29	180	47.87
Cook_Sports Activities	42	11.17	222	59.04
Cook_Student Life/Experience	58	15.43	280	74.47
Cook_greenspace/aesthetic	33	8.78	313	83.24
Cook_multi-transportation/utilization purposes	61	16.22	374	99.47
keepCook Field/greenspace	2	0.53	376	100.00

"Other, Specify": If the facilities currently located on Cook Field were relocated to the current location of Millett Hall, to what extent would your use of those facilities change?

Code 1

Code_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	1	0.92	1	0.92
Cook_Social Connectivity/Community Engagement	1	0.92	2	1.83
Cook_greenspace/aesthetic	4	3.67	6	5.50
Cook_leisure	4	3.67	10	9.17
Cook_less_use	24	22.02	34	31.19
Cook_mental/physical/social wellness	24	22.02	58	53.21
Cook_multi-transportation/utilization	12	11.01	70	64.22
Cook_social connectivity/community engagement	21	19.27	91	83.49
Cook_student life/experience	11	10.09	102	93.58

Miami-Non Athletic Identity	1	0.92	103	94.50
ROTC	3	2.75	106	97.25
Sports	1	0.92	107	98.17
keep Cook Field /greenspace	1	0.92	108	99.08
neglect of safety/accessibility concerns	1	0.92	109	100.00

"Other, Specify": How important has Cook Field been to your experience of Miami University/Oxford?

Code 1

Code_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	701	27.77	701	27.77
Cook_Accessibility_Good Location	256	10.14	957	37.92
Cook_Low_Importance	208	8.24	1165	46.16
Cook_ROTC	12	0.48	1177	46.63
Cook_greenspace/aesthetic	519	20.56	1696	67.19
Cook_mental/physical/social wellness	150	5.94	1846	73.14
Cook_multi-transportation/utilization purposes	464	18.38	2310	91.52
Cook_social connectivity/community engagement	17	0.67	2327	92.19
Cook_student life/experience	174	6.89	2501	99.09
For Project	1	0.04	2502	99.13
Miami Nonathletic Identity	1	0.04	2503	99.17
Other	2	0.08	2505	99.25
Perceived Disconnect from Admin	3	0.12	2508	99.37
donotuse	3	0.12	2511	99.48
for project	5	0.20	2516	99.68
keep Cook Field/greenspace	2	0.08	2518	99.76
neglect of safety/accessibility concerns	6	0.24	2524	100.00

"Other, Specify": How important has Cook Field been to your experience of Miami University/Oxford?

Code 2

Code_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	169	26.32	169	26.32
Cook_Green space/aesthetic	63	9.81	232	36.14
Cook_ROTC	1	0.16	233	36.29
Cook_Student Life/Experience	50	7.79	283	44.08
Cook_accessibility_good location	131	20.40	414	64.49
Cook_mental/physical/social wellness	45	7.01	459	71.50

Cook_multi-transportation/utilization purpose	148	23.05	607	94.55
Cook_social connectivity/community engagement	8	1.25	615	95.79
Cook_student life/experience	11	1.71	626	97.51
For Project	1	0.16	627	97.66
Low_Importance	6	0.93	633	98.60
Miami Nonathletic Identity	1	0.16	634	98.75
Other	3	0.47	637	99.22
institutional detraction	2	0.31	639	99.53
keep Cook Field/greenspace	2	0.31	641	99.84
other_idea	1	0.16	642	100.00

Frequency Missing = 1882

"Other, Specify": In your time at Miami University/Oxford, how have you used Millet Hall and how often?

Code 1

Code_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Accessibility Concern	1	0.36	1	0.36
Millet_Multi-Transportation/utilization purposes	23	8.36	24	8.73
Millet_mental/physical/social wellness	8	2.91	32	11.64
Millett_Career Development/Work	24	8.73	56	20.36
Millett_Leisure	1	0.36	57	20.73
Millett_Less_use	1	0.36	58	21.09
Millett_Low Importance	1	0.36	59	21.45
Millett_Social/Event Gathering	43	15.64	102	37.09
Millett_Sports	54	19.64	156	56.73
Millett_Student events/experiences	116	42.18	272	98.91
Millett_greenspace/aesthetic	1	0.36	273	99.27
ROTC	2	0.73	275	100.00

"Other, Specify": If the type of facilities currently located on Millet Hall were relocated to the current location of Cook Field, to what extent would your use of those facilities change?

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
In Favor	2	1.52	2	1.52
Institutional Detraction	1	0.76	3	2.27
Millett_Career development/work	7	5.30	10	7.58
Millett_Leisure	3	2.27	13	9.85

Millett_Loss of Support	33	25.00	46	34.85
Millett_Loss of support	1	0.76	47	35.61
Millett_Low Alignment/Salience	1	0.76	48	36.36
Millett_Multi-Transportational/utilization purpose	10	7.58	58	43.94
Millett_ROTC	1	0.76	59	44.70
Millett_Social/Event Gathering	17	12.88	76	57.58
Millett_Sports	19	14.39	95	71.97
Millett_mental/physical/social wellness	1	0.76	96	72.73
Millett_student life/experiences	21	15.91	117	88.64
Neglect of safety/accessibility concerns	1	0.76	118	89.39
Other	4	3.03	122	92.42
neglect of safety/accessibility concerns	10	7.58	132	100.00

"Other, Specify": How important has Millett Hall been to your experience of Miami University/Oxford?

Code 1

Code 1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Accessibility Concern	1	0.05	1	0.05
Institutional Detraction	1	0.05	2	0.09
Living/Learning Disruption	3	0.14	5	0.23
Miami NonAthletic Identity	129	5.93	134	6.16
Millett_Accessible/Good Location	13	0.60	147	6.76
Millett_Accessible/Good location	57	2.62	204	9.38
Millett_Career Development/Work	144	6.62	348	16.01
Millett_Good Impact	4	0.18	352	16.19
Millett_Graduation/Convocation/Orientation	140	6.44	492	22.63
Millett_Graduation/Convocation/Orientation	3	0.14	495	22.77
Millett_Institutional Importance/Nostalgia	132	6.07	627	28.84
Millett_Low Alignment/Salience	645	29.67	1272	58.51
Millett_Low Convenience	115	5.29	1387	63.80
Millett_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	4	0.18	1391	63.98
Millett_Miami Identity/Nostalgia	25	1.15	1416	65.13
Millett_Not Accessible	8	0.37	1424	65.50
Millett_Outdated	6	0.28	1430	65.78
Millett_ROTC	27	1.24	1457	67.02
Millett_Show/Concerts/Lecture	50	2.30	1507	69.32
Millett_Social/Community Events	65	2.99	1572	72.31
Millett_Sport Events	435	20.01	2007	92.32

Millett_Student Events/Experiences	68	3.13	2075	95.45
Millett_multi-transportational/utilization purpose	40	1.84	2115	97.29
Millettt_Accessible/Good Location	1	0.05	2116	97.33
Milllett_Career Development/Work	6	0.28	2122	97.61
Other	38	1.75	2160	99.36
Other_Idea	2	0.09	2162	99.45
Renovate Millett	2	0.09	2164	99.54
Resource Prioritization Concerns	1	0.05	2165	99.59
Waste of Money/No Need	1	0.05	2166	99.63
other	8	0.37	2174	100.00

"Other, Specify": How important has Millett Hall been to your experience of Miami University/Oxford?

CODE 2

CODE_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Accessibility Concern	1	0.10	1	0.10
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	2	0.19	3	0.29
Cook_Greenspace/Aesthetic	1	0.10	4	0.38
Cook_Less_Use	1	0.10	5	0.48
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	2	0.19	7	0.67
Cook_Social Connectivity/Community Engagement	2	0.19	9	0.86
Cook_Student Life/Experiences	7	0.67	16	1.53
For Project	9	0.86	25	2.39
For Project_Build Elsewhere	2	0.19	27	2.58
Good_Impact	1	0.10	28	2.68
Institutional Detraction	6	0.57	34	3.25
Institutional Incongruence	4	0.38	38	3.64
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	10	0.96	48	4.59
Living/Learning Disruption	18	1.72	66	6.32
Miami NonAthletic Identity	44	4.21	110	10.53
Millet_Social/Community Event	1	0.10	111	10.62
Millet_Student Life/Experiences	1	0.10	112	10.72
Millett_Accessible/Good Location	126	12.06	238	22.78
Millett_Accessible/Good location	1	0.10	239	22.87
Millett_Career Development/Work	78	7.46	317	30.33
Millett_Concert/Shows	2	0.19	319	30.53

Millett_Good Impact	58	5.55	377	36.08
Millett_Graduation/Convocation/Orientation	63	6.03	440	42.11
Millett_Institutional Importance/Nostalgia	22	2.11	462	44.21
Millett_Low Alignment/Salience	202	19.33	664	63.54
Millett_Low Convenience	11	1.05	675	64.59
Millett_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	7	0.67	682	65.26
Millett_Not Accessible	13	1.24	695	66.51
Millett_OutDated	1	0.10	696	66.60
Millett_Outdated	8	0.77	704	67.37
Millett_ROTC	2	0.19	706	67.56
Millett_Shows/Concerts/Lecture	74	7.08	780	74.64
Millett_Social/Community Event	28	2.68	808	77.32
Millett_Sport Events	122	11.67	930	89.00
Millett_Student Events/Experiences	91	8.71	1021	97.70
Millett_multi-transportational/utilization purpose	5	0.48	1026	98.18
Milllt_Good Impact	2	0.19	1028	98.37
Other	1	0.10	1029	98.47
Other_Idea	1	0.10	1030	98.56
Perceived Admin Disconnect	3	0.29	1033	98.85
Renovate Millett	9	0.86	1042	99.71
Resource Prioritization Concern	1	0.10	1043	99.81
Waste of Money/No Need	2	0.19	1045	100.00

Frequency Missing = 1129

"Other, Specify": How important has Millett Hall been to your experience of Miami University/Oxford?

CODE 3

CODE_3	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Accessibility Concern	1	0.34	1	0.34
Cook_Less_Use	2	0.68	3	1.02
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	1	0.34	4	1.36
Cook_Student Life/Experience	2	0.68	6	2.04
Cook_Student Life/Experiences	1	0.34	7	2.38
Cook_Student Life/experiences	1	0.34	8	2.72
For Project	7	2.38	15	5.10
Institutional Detraction	4	1.36	19	6.46

Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	10	3.40	29	9.86
Living/Learning Disruption	11	3.74	40	13.61
Living/Learning Disruption	1	0.34	41	13.95
Living/Learning Disruption	1	0.34	42	14.29
Miami NonAthletic Identity	5	1.70	47	15.99
Millett_Institutional Importance/Nostalgia	1	0.34	48	16.33
Millett_Accessible/Good Location	27	9.18	75	25.51
Millett_Career Development/Work	11	3.74	86	29.25
Millett_Good Impact	17	5.78	103	35.03
Millett_Graduation/Convocation	16	5.44	119	40.48
Millett_Graduation/Convocation/Orientation	1	0.34	120	40.82
Millett_Graduation/Convocation/Orientation	2	0.68	122	41.50
Millett_Institutional Importance/Nostalgia	12	4.08	134	45.58
Millett_Low Alignment/Salience	1	0.34	135	45.92
Millett_Low Alignment/Salience	7	2.38	142	48.30
Millett_Low Convenience	10	3.40	152	51.70
Millett_Low Importance/interest/frequency of use	64	21.77	216	73.47
Millett_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	1	0.34	217	73.81
Millett_Not Accessible	3	1.02	220	74.83
Millett_Outdated	1	0.34	221	75.17
Millett_ROTC	1	0.34	222	75.51
Millett_Show/Concert/Lecture	28	9.52	250	85.03
Millett_Social/Community Event	7	2.38	257	87.41
Millett_Sport Events	8	2.72	265	90.14
Millett_Student Event/Experience	1	0.34	266	90.48
Millett_Student Event/Experiences	11	3.74	277	94.22
Millett_Student Life/Experiences	1	0.34	278	94.56
Millett_multi-transportational/utilization purpose	6	2.04	284	96.60
Perceived Admin Disconnect	2	0.68	286	97.28
Renovate Millett	7	2.38	293	99.66
Waste of Money/No Need	1	0.34	294	100.00

Frequency Missing = 1880

"Other, Specify": Factors for you when deciding whether to attend sporting events at Millet Hall?

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
MillettFactor_Accessibility/Time Availability	51	41.80	51	41.80

MillettFactor_social/community events	28	22.95	79	64.75
Attendance	12	9.84	91	74.59
Other	7	5.74	98	80.33
MillettFactor_Amenitites/Cost	5	4.10	103	84.43
Location	4	3.28	107	87.70
Miami NonAthletic Identity	3	2.46	110	90.16
Attendance	2	1.64	112	91.80
MillettFactor_Friend/Family on Team	2	1.64	114	93.44
MillettFactor_Institutional Importance/Miami Identity	2	1.64	116	95.08
MiamI NonAthletic Identity	1	0.82	117	95.90
MilettFactor_Stats	1	0.82	118	96.72
MillettFactor_Low Alignment/Salience	1	0.82	119	97.54
MillettFactor_Popularity/Peer Interest	1	0.82	120	98.36
Millett_ROTC	1	0.82	121	99.18
other	1	0.82	122	100.00

"Other, Specify": Factors for you when deciding whether to attend sporting events at Millet Hall?

CODE 2

CODE_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Location	2	33.33	2	33.33
Attendance	1	16.67	3	50.00
Community	1	16.67	4	66.67
Millett_Low Importance/Infrequent Use	1	16.67	5	83.33
Millett_Type of Sport	1	16.67	6	100.00

Frequency Missing = 116

"Other, Specify": To what extent would the following changes impact your attendance at athletic events at Miami University?

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Better_Facilities	1	1.27	1	1.27
FactorAttend_Legacy & Tradition	1	1.27	2	2.53
FactorAttend_Student life_Experiences	3	3.80	5	6.33
For Project_Build Elsewhere	3	3.80	8	10.13

Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	2	2.53	10	12.66
Living/Learning Disruption:	12	15.19	22	27.85
Miami NonAthletic Identity	1	1.27	23	29.11
MillettFactor_Low Alignment and Salience	11	13.92	34	43.04
Millett_Accessibile/Good Location	1	1.27	35	44.30
Millett_Low Alignment/Salience	1	1.27	36	45.57
Millett_Not Accessible	3	3.80	39	49.37
Millett_Shows/Concerts/Lecture	1	1.27	40	50.63
Millett_Sport Events	1	1.27	41	51.90
Millett_social/community events	1	1.27	42	53.16
Other	7	8.86	49	62.03
Other_Idea	11	13.92	60	75.95
Renovate Millett	16	20.25	76	96.20
Waste of Money/No Need	3	3.80	79	100.00

"Other, Specify": When you decided to attend/work at Miami University (and/or live in Oxford), how important were the following factors in your decision?

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
FactorAttend_Academics	38	26.03	38	26.03
FactorAttend_Student life_Experiences	24	16.44	62	42.47
FactorAttend_Legacy & Tradition	19	13.01	81	55.48
FactorAttend_Location/Parking	17	11.64	98	67.12
Other	14	9.59	112	76.71
FactorAttend_Cost	13	8.90	125	85.62
FactorAttend_Green_Space/Aesthetics	13	8.90	138	94.52
FactorAttend_Athletics	8	5.48	146	100.00

"Other, Specify": When you decided to attend/work at Miami University (and/or live in Oxford), how important were the following factors in your decision?

CODE 2

CODE_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
FactorAttend_Green_Space/Aesthetics	2	50.00	2	50.00
FactorAttend_Location/Parking	2	50.00	4	100.00

Frequency Missing = 142

"Other, Specify": Please rank the importance of the following qualities/values you most associate with Miami University

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
FactorAttend_Student life_Experiences	14	20.59	14	20.59
FactorAttend_Academics	13	19.12	27	39.71
FactorAttend_Legacy & Tradition	11	16.18	38	55.88
FactorAttend_Green_Space/Aesthetics	9	13.24	47	69.12
FactorAttend_Athletics	8	11.76	55	80.88
FactorAttend_Cost	5	7.35	60	88.24
Associate_Town_Experience	4	5.88	64	94.12
FactorAttend_Location/Parking	3	4.41	67	98.53
Associate_Livability/Cost	1	1.47	68	100.00

"Other, Specify": If you were a university leader, which of the following strategic priorities would you focus investment on to remain competitive?

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Invest_Academic Prioritization>Project	23	60.53	23	60.53
Invest_Nature	9	23.68	32	84.21
Invest_Student_Recourse	4	10.53	36	94.74
Invest_Parking	1	2.63	37	97.37
Other	1	2.63	38	100.00

"Other, Specify": If you were a university leader, which of the following strategic priorities would you focus investment on to remain competitive?

CODE 2

CODE_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Invest_Academic Prioritization>Project	4	100.00	4	100.00

Frequency Missing = 34

"Other, Specify": As Miami plans for the future, what do you believe would be the best use of Cook Field?

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Best Use_Preserve	22	55.00	22	55.00
Best Use_Preserve_Develop	10	25.00	32	80.00
Best Use_Better_Facilities	2	5.00	34	85.00
Best Use_Develop	2	5.00	36	90.00

Best Use_Parking	2	5.00	38	95.00
Best Use_Academic	1	2.50	39	97.50
Other	1	2.50	40	100.00

"Other, Specify": As Miami plans for the future, what do you believe would be the best use of Cook Field?

CODE 2

CODE_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Best Use_Parking	2	33.33	2	33.33
Best Use_Academic	1	16.67	3	50.00
Best Use_Better_Facilities	1	16.67	4	66.67
Best Use_Develop	1	16.67	5	83.33
Best Use_Dorms	1	16.67	6	100.00

Frequency Missing = 34

"Other, Specify": As Miami plans for the future, what do you believe would be the best use of Cook Field?

CODE 3

CODE_3	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Best Use_Academic	1	50.00	1	50.00
Best Use_Parking	1	50.00	2	100.00

Frequency Missing = 38

"Other, Specify": Considering the prospect of an arena being constructed on Cook Field, please describe the extent to which the following items are a concern for you.

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Institutional Detraction	23	17.97	23	17.97
Institutional Incongruence	17	13.28	40	31.25
Safety Concern	14	10.94	54	42.19
Living/Learning Disruption	11	8.59	65	50.78
Resource Prioritization Concern	11	8.59	76	59.38
Cook_Student Life/Experiences	9	7.03	85	66.41
Other	7	5.47	92	71.88
Academic Prioritization>Project	4	3.13	96	75.00
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	4	3.13	100	78.13
Perceived Admin Disconnect	4	3.13	104	81.25

Miami NonAthletic Identity	3	2.34	107	83.59
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	2	1.56	109	85.16
Cook_Accessible/Good Location	2	1.56	111	86.72
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	2	1.56	113	88.28
Lack of Communication &/or Inclusion of Stakeholders	2	1.56	115	89.84
Other_Idea	2	1.56	117	91.41
Waste of Money/No Need	2	1.56	119	92.97
Accessibility Concern	1	0.78	120	93.75
Amenities_ROTC	1	0.78	121	94.53
Cook_Core Memory/Miami Identity	1	0.78	122	95.31
For Project	1	0.78	123	96.09
Millett_Accessible/Good Location	1	0.78	124	96.88
Millett_Low Alignment/Salience	1	0.78	125	97.66
OTHER	1	0.78	126	98.44
Resource Prioritization Concern	1	0.78	127	99.22
other	1	0.78	128	100.00

"Other, Specify": Considering the prospect of an arena being constructed on Cook Field, please describe the extent to which the following items are a concern for you

CODE 2

CODE_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Institutional Incongruence	3	37.50	3	37.50
Perceived Admin Disconnect	2	25.00	5	62.50
Institutional Detraction	1	12.50	6	75.00
Living/Learning Disruption	1	12.50	7	87.50
Miami NonAthletic Identity	1	12.50	8	100.00

Frequency Missing = 120

"Other, Specify": If the MU Administration moves forward with plans to build a replacement recreation space on the current Millet Hall location (i.e., a new Cook Field), what types of facilities and amenities would you like to see in this facility?

CODE 1

CODE_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	57	29.23	57	29.23
Millett_Low Convenience	41	21.03	98	50.26

Amenities_Fitness	23	11.79	121	62.05
Amenities_Tennis	17	8.72	138	70.77
Ameneties_Greenspace/Nature	15	7.69	153	78.46
Other	12	6.15	165	84.62
Accessibility_Safety	11	5.64	176	90.26
Other_Idea	8	4.10	184	94.36
Amenities_Walking_Biking	5	2.56	189	96.92
Amenities_Basketball	2	1.03	191	97.95
Amenities_ROTC	2	1.03	193	98.97
Amenities_Volleyball	1	0.51	194	99.49
Perceived Admin Disconnect	1	0.51	195	100.00

"Other, Specify": If the MU Administration moves forward with plans to build a replacement recreation space on the current Millet Hall location (i.e., a new Cook Field), what types of facilities and amenities would you like to see in this facility?

CODE 2

CODE_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Amenities_Volleyball	2	100.00	2	100.00

Frequency Missing = 193

Open-ended Responses: What, if any, thoughts or feelings do you have about decision-making and/or communications, to date, regarding the multipurpose arena/entertainment district project?

Code 1

Code_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Lack of Communication &/or Inclusion of Stakeholder Input	237	20.81	237	20.81
Perceived Admin Disconnect	133	11.68	370	32.48
Institutional Incongruence	118	10.36	488	42.84
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	101	8.87	589	51.71
Miami NonAthletic Identity	67	5.88	656	57.59
Resource Prioritization Concern	67	5.88	723	63.48
Living/Learning Disruption	64	5.62	787	69.10
Institutional Detraction	54	4.74	841	73.84
For Project	51	4.48	892	78.31
Academic Prioritization>Project	40	3.51	932	81.83
For Project_Build Elsewhere	31	2.72	963	84.55
Renovate Millett	31	2.72	994	87.27

Waste of Money/No Need	28	2.46	1022	89.73
Cook_Student Life/Experience	22	1.93	1044	91.66
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	18	1.58	1062	93.24
Good Communication/Updates	12	1.05	1074	94.29
Loss of Donor Support	12	1.05	1086	95.35
other	12	1.05	1098	96.40
Cook_Accessibility/Good Location	10	0.88	1108	97.28
Other_Idea	7	0.61	1115	97.89
Cook_Greenspace/Aesthetics	4	0.35	1119	98.24
Cook_Less_Use	4	0.35	1123	98.60
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social wellness	4	0.35	1127	98.95
Neglect of Safety Concerns	3	0.26	1130	99.21
Cook_Multi-transportational/utilization purpose	2	0.18	1132	99.39
Cook_Social Connectivity/Community Engagement	2	0.18	1134	99.56
Cook_Core Memory/Miami Identity	1	0.09	1135	99.65
Cook_Low Importance	1	0.09	1136	99.74
For project	1	0.09	1137	99.82
Waste of money/no need	1	0.09	1138	99.91
waste of money/no need	1	0.09	1139	100.00

Frequency Missing = 1490

Open-ended Responses: What, if any, thoughts or feelings do you have about decision-making and/or communications, to date, regarding the multipurpose arena/entertainment district project?

Code 2

Code_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Perceived Admin Disconnect	147	23.90	147	23.90
Institutional Incongruence	73	11.87	220	35.77
Living/Learning Disruption	59	9.59	279	45.37
Miami Non-Athletic Identity	49	7.97	328	53.33
Lack of Communication &/or Inclusion of Stakeholder Input	46	7.48	374	60.81
Renovate Millett	36	5.85	410	66.67
Academic Prioritization>Project	29	4.72	439	71.38
Institutional Detraction	29	4.72	468	76.10
Cook_Student Life/Experience	26	4.23	494	80.33
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	18	2.93	512	83.25
Other_Idea	18	2.93	530	86.18

Resource Prioritization Concern	16	2.60	546	88.78
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	10	1.63	556	90.41
Cook_Social Connectivity/Community Engagement	10	1.63	566	92.03
Cook_Accessible/Good Location	7	1.14	573	93.17
Cook_Less_Use	7	1.14	580	94.31
Accessibility Concern	6	0.98	586	95.28
Safety Concern	6	0.98	592	96.26
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	3	0.49	595	96.75
Cook_Greenspace/Aesthetic	2	0.33	597	97.07
Cook_Low Importance	2	0.33	599	97.40
For Project_Build Elsewhere	2	0.33	601	97.72
Loss of Donor Support	2	0.33	603	98.05
Waste of Money/No Need	2	0.33	605	98.37
Cook=Accessibility/Good location	1	0.16	606	98.54
Cook_Living/Learning Disruptions	1	0.16	607	98.70
Cook_Multi-Transportation/Utilization Purposes	1	0.16	608	98.86
Cook_Use_Less	1	0.16	609	99.02
Cook_mental/physical/social wellness	1	0.16	610	99.19
For Project	1	0.16	611	99.35
For Project_Build elsewhere	1	0.16	612	99.51
For project	1	0.16	613	99.67
Good Communication/Updates	1	0.16	614	99.84
Good Communication/updates	1	0.16	615	100.00

Frequency Missing = 2014

Open-ended Responses: What, if any, thoughts or feelings do you have about decision-making and/or communications, to date, regarding the multipurpose arena/entertainment district project?

Code3

Code3	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Perceived Admin Disconnect	31	22.79	31	22.79
Institutional Incongruence	14	10.29	45	33.09
Renovate Millett	13	9.56	58	42.65
Miami Nonathletic Identity	12	8.82	70	51.47
Living/Learning Disruption	11	8.09	81	59.56
Academic Prioritization>Project	7	5.15	88	64.71
Institutional Detraction	6	4.41	94	69.12
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	6	4.41	100	73.53

Cook_Accessibility/Good Location	4	2.94	104	76.47
Cook_Greenspace/Aesthetic	4	2.94	108	79.41
Cook_Less_Use	4	2.94	112	82.35
Lack of Communication &/or Inclusion of Stakeholder Input	4	2.94	116	85.29
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	3	2.21	119	87.50
Cook_Student Life/experience	3	2.21	122	89.71
Other_Idea	3	2.21	125	91.91
Neglect of Safety Concerns	2	1.47	127	93.38
Resource Prioritization Concern	2	1.47	129	94.85
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social wellness	1	0.74	130	95.59
Cook_Student life/experience	1	0.74	131	96.32
Cook_student life/experience	1	0.74	132	97.06
For Project_Build Elsewhere	1	0.74	133	97.79
Loss of Donor Support	1	0.74	134	98.53
Perceived Admin Disconnect	1	0.74	135	99.26
Safety Concern	1	0.74	136	100.00

Frequency Missing = 2493

Open-ended Responses: What, if any, thoughts or feelings do you have about decision-making and/or communications, to date, regarding the multipurpose arena/entertainment district project?

Other

Other	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
bias	1	50.00	1	50.00
other	1	50.00	2	100.00

Frequency Missing = 2627

Open-ended Responses: What, if any, other thoughts or comments would you like to share?

Code 1

Code_1	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	156	32.64	156	32.64
Renovate Millett	35	7.32	191	39.96
Perceived Admin Disconnect	34	7.11	225	47.07
Institutional Incongruence	30	6.28	255	53.35
Living/Learning Disruption	27	5.65	282	59.00
Waste of Money/No Need	25	5.23	307	64.23

Academic Prioritization>Project	22	4.60	329	68.83
Lack of Communication &/or Inclusion of Stakeholders	20	4.18	349	73.01
For Project	16	3.35	365	76.36
Resource Prioritization Concern	15	3.14	380	79.50
For Project_Build Elsewhere	14	2.93	394	82.43
Institutional Detraction	14	2.93	408	85.36
Miami NonAthletic Identity	12	2.51	420	87.87
other	10	2.09	430	89.96
Loss of Donor Support	9	1.88	439	91.84
Other_Idea	7	1.46	446	93.31
Other	6	1.26	452	94.56
For Project_If	5	1.05	457	95.61
Safety Concern	5	1.05	462	96.65
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	4	0.84	466	97.49
Cook_Student Life/Experiences	3	0.63	469	98.12
Cook_Accessible/Good Location	2	0.42	471	98.54
Keep Cook Field/GreenSpace	2	0.42	473	98.95
Accessibility Concern	1	0.21	474	99.16
Cook_Less_Use	1	0.21	475	99.37
Cook_Social Connectivity/Community Engagement	1	0.21	476	99.58
Cook Field_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	1	0.21	477	99.79
FoR Project_If	1	0.21	478	100.00

Frequency Missing = 2241

Open-ended Responses: What, if any, other thoughts or comments would you like to share?

Code 2

Code_2	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Perceived Admin Disconnect	30	16.76	30	16.76
Living/Learning Disruption	27	15.08	57	31.84
Miami NonAthletic Identity	15	8.38	72	40.22
Institutional Detraction	13	7.26	85	47.49
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	13	7.26	98	54.75
Academic Prioritization>Project	12	6.70	110	61.45
Institutional Incongruence	11	6.15	121	67.60
Lack of Communication &/or Inclusion of Stakeholders	10	5.59	131	73.18

Other_Idea	10	5.59	141	78.77
Accessibility Concern	7	3.91	148	82.68
Renovate Millett	7	3.91	155	86.59
Resource Prioritization Concern	5	2.79	160	89.39
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	3	1.68	163	91.06
Cook_Less_Use	3	1.68	166	92.74
Cook_Student Life/Experience	3	1.68	169	94.41
Loss of Donor Support	3	1.68	172	96.09
Safety Concern	3	1.68	175	97.77
Cook_Student life/experience	1	0.56	176	98.32
Cook_multi-transportational/ulitization purposes	1	0.56	177	98.88
For Project_Build Elsewhere	1	0.56	178	99.44
For Project_If	1	0.56	179	100.00

Frequency Missing = 2540

Open-ended Responses: What, if any, other thoughts or comments would you like to share?

Code 3

Code_3	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
Perceived Admin Disconnect	7	12.96	7	12.96
Academic Prioritization>Project	6	11.11	13	24.07
Institutional Incongruence	6	11.11	19	35.19
Keep Cook Field/Greenspace	5	9.26	24	44.44
Accessibility Concern	4	7.41	28	51.85
Institutional Detraction	4	7.41	32	59.26
Living/Learning Disruption	4	7.41	36	66.67
Renovate Millett	4	7.41	40	74.07
Miami NonAthletic Identity	3	5.56	43	79.63
Cook=Core Memory/Miami Identity	2	3.70	45	83.33
Cook_Student Life/Experience	2	3.70	47	87.04
Loss of Donor Support	2	3.70	49	90.74
Other_Idea	2	3.70	51	94.44
Cook_Mental/Physical/Social Wellness	1	1.85	52	96.30
For Project_If	1	1.85	53	98.15
Waste of money/No need	1	1.85	54	100.00

Frequency Missing = 2665

Open-ended Responses: What, if any, other thoughts or comments would you like to share?

Other

Other	*Frequency*	*Percent*	*Cumulative Frequency*	*Cumulative Percent*
idk where this goes	56	65.12	56	65.12
Non/Invalid	27	31.40	83	96.51
mentions survey	3	3.49	86	100.00

Frequency Missing = 2633

Appendix IV: Survey Questionnaire

[Page 1]
Miami University's Administration is proposing to develop an "Arena District"— including a sports arena, hotel, and related services—on Cook Field, while relocating those recreational fields to the vicinity of Millet Hall. Although the Board of Trustees has identified Cook Field as its preferred location, it has yet to formalize a decision on if/how to proceed.
This project's potential impacts on the physical campus and university budget make it one of the most substantial in Miami University's history. This survey seeks to gauge public opinion from across the Miami University/Oxford community—students, faculty, staff, alumni, family members, and local residents—on these choices, planning, and the values that inform them.
This survey was designed and administered by Miami University students, alumni, and faculty mentors to gauge public perception and inform public conversation. This survey does not represent the official views of Miami University, nor are its results a formal part of university planning and decision-making. Given the importance of this topic to the future of Miami University and its community, we thank you for your engagement in this process.

[PAGE 2] **Miami University Arena Development Project Community Survey (Online)**

What this research is about

You are invited to participate in a research project being conducted by a group of undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, and faculty mentors from Miami University. The purpose of this research is to examine relevant stakeholders' perceptions of the proposed multipurpose arena and entertainment district project on Cook Field, views on the values and identity of Miami University, and priorities for university investments and use of current facilities and resources, in order to potentially help inform the administration's planning and decision-making process.

What you will be asked to do

Participation in this research is restricted to persons **18 years of age or older**. The online survey should take about **5-10 minutes**. Your participation is **voluntary**, you may skip questions you do not want to answer and may stop at any time.

Benefits & Risks

There are no reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts greater than those experienced in daily life and navigating/ completing an online survey.

The benefit of this study is to contribute valuable community perspectives that will hopefully help inform university planning and decision-making for this historic capital investment project.

Confidentiality & Data Use

The survey does not request information that would explicitly identify you. If you inadvertently include identifying information, such information will be removed from stored data. Only the researchers will have access to individual responses. Results of the survey will only be presented publicly as aggregate summaries. The research data will be stored on a university-issued, password-protected folder and retained until November 2026.

The Miami University faculty member overseeing this program is Jennifer Bulanda (Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology and Gerontology, 375 Upham Hall). If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Bulanda (bulandjr@miamioh.edu, 513-529-5642). If you have questions or concerns about the rights of research subjects, you may contact our reviewing body: Research Ethics and Integrity Office at Miami University at (513) 529-3600 or humansubjects@miamioh.edu.

The Miami University Research Ethics & Integrity Program reviewed this study and determined its exempt status, study #05223e.

Informed Consent

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the above information sheet.
2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and am free to withdraw or skip questions without penalty.
3. I understand that my data will be kept confidential, and if disseminated, the data will not be identifiable as mine.

- Based on the above consent criteria, do you agree to participate in this study?
    - Yes, I would like to participate and give my consent
    - No, I do not my give my consent and would not like to participate [SEND TO LAST PAGE OF THE SURVEY]

By completing the survey, you indicate your consent to participate in the study.

Click here for a PDF of this information for future reference. [ENTER HYPERLINK]. Thank you for your participation.

[PAGE 3 - DEMOGRAPHICS]

- Age [# Years]
- Which of the following best describe your relationship to Miami University (select all that apply):
    A. Current undergraduate student
    B. Current graduate student
    C. Current faculty member
    D. Former faculty member
    E. Current university staff
    F. Former university staff
    G. Parent/guardian or other family member of a current or former Miami student
    H. Alumnus/alumna
    I. Local resident
    J. Local business owner or employee
    K. Other, specify [OPEN]

[If 18+ years old and consent is given, move on to page 3; otherwise, send to last page]

[PAGE 4]

<u>Use of Cook Field/Recreation Sports Fields</u>:

GENERAL USAGE PREAMBLE: Cook Field is currently an open campus green space—located along Patterson Avenue, across the street from the Farmer's School of Business and Bishop Woods—that is used by students and non-students alike for intramural sports, informal sport activities, recreation and leisure. Millett Hall currently hosts Miami University Men's Basketball, Women's Basketball, and Men's and Women's Volleyball, as would the proposed new arena. Please keep this in mind when answering the next six questions.

1. In your time at Miami University/Oxford, how have you used **Cook Field** and how often? [BLOCK/MATRIX QUESTION: Never, Rarely, Occasionally, Somewhat frequently, Very frequently]
    a. Organized sports competitions
    b. Informal physical activity
    c. Leisure and green space
    d. Parking lot
    e. Other, specify [OPEN]
2. If the **facilities currently located on Cook Field were relocated** to the current location of Millett Hall, to what extent would your use of those facilities change?[Matrix with column options: (1) I would use them a lot less; (2) I would use them somewhat less; (3) I would use them about the same amount; (4) I would use them somewhat more; (5) I would use them a lot more]
    a. Organized sports competitions
    b. Informal physical activity
    c. Leisure and green space
    d. Parking lot
    e. Other, specify [OPEN]
    f. Not applicable (I no longer live on/near campus or Oxford)
3. How important has **Cook Field** been to your experience of Miami University/Oxford?
    a. Not at all important
    b. Only a little important
    c. Somewhat important
    d. Very important
        - In a few words, please explain: [OPEN]
4. In your time at Miami University/Oxford, how have you used **Millet Hall** and how often? [BLOCK/MATRIX QUESTION: Never, Rarely, Occasionally, Somewhat frequently, Very frequently]
    a. Attending athletic events
    b. Attending non-athletic events (e.g. job fairs, dances, concerts, etc.)
    c. Class meetings
    d. Student groups (e.g. ROTC, clubs, etc.)
    e. Other, specify [OPEN]
5. [MATCH THE MATRIX RESPONSES TO Q above] If the type of **facilities currently located on Millet Hall were relocated** to the current location of Cook Field, to what extent would your use of those facilities change? [Matrix with column options: (1) I would use them a lot less; (2) I would use them somewhat less; (3) I would use them about the same amount; (4) I would use them somewhat more; (5) I would use them a lot more]
    a. Attending athletic events
    b. Attending non-athletic events (e.g. job fairs, dances, concerts, etc.)

c. Class meetings
d. Student groups (e.g. ROTC, student clubs, etc.)
e. Other, specify [OPEN]
f. Not applicable (I no longer live on/near campus or Oxford)

6. How important has **Millett Hall** been to your experience of Miami University/Oxford?
    a. Not at all important
    b. Only a little important
    c. Somewhat important
    d. Very important
        - In a few words, please explain: [OPEN]

Use of Indoor Arena Facilities:

GENERAL USAGE PREAMBLE: Millett Hall currently hosts Miami University Men's Basketball, Women's Basketball, and Men's and Women's Volleyball, as would the proposed new arena. Please keep these in mind when answering the next three questions.

7. In the last 12 months, approximately how many Miami University athletic events have you attended **at Millet Hall**?
    a. 0
    b. 1-2
    c. 3-5
    d. 6-10
    e. 10+
8. How important are the following factors in shaping your decisions to attend athletic events **at Millet Hall**? [Not at all important; Of little importance; Somewhat important; Very important]
    a. Quality of the arena/facilities
    b. Quality of the teams
    c. Convenience of location
    d. Costs of attendance
    e. Overall interest in college sports
    f. Other, specify [OPEN]
9. To what extent would the following changes impact your attendance of athletic events at Miami University [Matrix with the following Likert scale for each item: (1) I would attend a lot less, (2) I would attend somewhat less, (3), My attendance would not be impacted either way, (4) I would attend somewhat more, (5) I would attend a lot more]:
    a. Renovation of **Millet Hall**
    b. New arena, at or near the current location of **Millet Hall**
    c. New arena, at the **Cook Field location**
    d. New arena, at the **corner of Oak and Spring Street**

e. None of the above

f. Other, specify [OPEN]

Values, Priorities, Identity:

10. When you decided to attend/work at Miami University (and/or live in Oxford), how important were the following factors in your decision: [Likert: Not at all important; Of little importance; Somewhat important; Very important]
    a. Academic reputation/prestige of Miami University
    b. Campus beauty/green spaces
    c. Miami University athletics
    d. Miami University non-athletic events/activities
    e. Quality of Miami University athletic facilities
    f. Other, specify [OPEN]
11. Please rank the importance of the following qualities/values you most associate with Miami University [Likert: Not at all important; Of little importance; Somewhat important; Very important]:
    a. Quality of education/teaching
    b. Campus beauty/aesthetics
    c. Collegiate athletics
    d. Institutional reputation/prestige
    e. College town experience (Oxford)
    f. Professional/career preparedness
    g. Other, specify [OPEN]
12. [MATRIX with THREE COLUMNS that allow only one response per column: 1st choice, 2nd choice, 3rd choice]: Miami University proposes to allocate $200-225 million to construct a new arena, likely to be primarily funded with existing student fees (perhaps $500/year or $2,000 over four years per student). If you were a university leader, which of the following strategic priorities would you focus investment on to remain competitive? (Rank order your top three choices)
    a. Student experience and campus culture
    b. Research facilities and support
    c. Athletic programs and facilities
    d. Campus safety and accessibility
    e. Reduce cost of attendance
    f. Instructional quality and facilities
    g. Expand offerings and facilities in high-growth fields
    h. Digital technology infrastructure and online learning
    i. A robust humanities and liberal arts curriculum
    j. Career preparation and experiential learning
    k. Community programming and events
    l. Marketing/branding and communication

m. Campus sustainability
n. Other, specify [OPEN]

13. Campuses must evolve to meet changing demands, while preserving traditional qualities. As Miami University plans for the future, what do you believe would be the best use of **Cook Field**?
    a. Preserve as open/green space
    b. Redevelop as an Arena District
    c. Redevelop as an academic quad
    d. Redevelop with a mix of academic and open spaces
    e. Redevelop as an Arena District with some academic uses
    f. Other, specify [OPEN]
14. When considering the prospect of an arena being constructed on Cook Field, please describe the extent to which the following items are a concern for you: [MATRIX with the following column response options: Very significant concern; Somewhat significant concern; Minor concern; Not at all a concern]
    a. Parking/traffic congestion
    ○ Loss of campus green space
    ○ Construction-related noise/congestion/pollution/disturbance
    ○ Inadequate demand for athletic event attendance
    ○ Impacts on campus aesthetics/beauty
    ○ Use of resources/opportunity costs (e.g. not investing in other important amenities, campus resources, financial aid/costs, research funding, etc.)
    ○ Other, specify [OPEN]
15. The Miami University Administration and Board of Trustees voted to locate a multipurpose arena and entertainment district (including hotels, parking, and other potential amenities) on the current Cook Field site, and is currently in the project planning phase. Overall, to what extent do you support or oppose this project?
    a. Strongly oppose
    b. Somewhat oppose
    c. Neither oppose nor support
    d. Somewhat support
    e. Strongly support
16. If the Miami University Administration moves forward with plans to build a replacement recreation space on the current Millet Hall location (i.e., a new Cook Field), what types of facilities and amenities would you like to see in this facility? (Select all that apply)
    ○ Turfed sports fields (e.g., soccer, football)
    ○ Baseball/softball field(s)
    ○ Outdoor basketball courts
    ○ Pickleball courts

- Volleyball courts
- Outdoor fitness equipment
- Changing rooms and bathrooms
- Concession stand
- High ropes course
- Walking/running paths
- Open air green space
- Other, specify [OPEN]

Closing Questions:

17. Have you ever donated money to Miami University?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Unsure/Don't know
18. How might a decision to construct an Arena District on Cook Field affect your likelihood to donate to Miami University in the future?
    a. A lot less likely
    b. Somewhat less likely
    c. About the same likelihood (i.e. no impact)
    d. Somewhat more likely
    e. A lot more likely
19. What, if any, thoughts or feelings do you have about the decision-making and/or communications, to date, regarding the multipurpose arena/entertainment district project? [OPEN]
20. What, if any, other thoughts or comments would you like to share? [OPEN]

CLOSING REMARKS: Thank you for anonymously providing your thoughts, reflections, and input. They will help inform community conversation and perhaps decision making by the Miami University Administration and Board of Trustees. Results of the survey will be publicly shared after data collection and analysis are completed. **Please feel free to encourage other members of the Miami University community to participate in the survey**.

If you have any questions about how this data will be used, you can contact Dr. Bulanda (bulandjr@miamioh.edu). If you have questions or concerns about the rights of research subjects, you may contact our reviewing body: Research Ethics and Integrity Office at Miami University at (513) 529-3600 or humansubjects@miamioh.edu. Thank you.

Appendix V: List of Relevant Sources

Newspaper Articles:

The following arena-related newspaper articles are organized chronologically, with the most recent publications listed first. For a list of all arena-related articles on Oxford Free Press' website, see: https://www.oxfreepress.com/tag/arena/.

- Dugan, Evelyn (2026), "Survey findings indicate strong opposition to arena district construction on Cook Field." *The Miami Student*, January 13. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2026/01/survey-findings-indicate-strong-opposition-to-arena-district-construction-on-cook-field?ct=content_open&cv=cbox_featured
- Zawila, Sidney (2025), "Unnecessary movements: Miami's costly construction project" - *The Miami Student*, September 29. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2025/09/miami-university-cook-field-arena-district-construction-noise-levels?ct=content_open&cv=cbox_featured
- Aluise, Katelyn (2025), "What we know about Miami's 'Event District' so far." *Oxford Free Press*, August 29. https://www.oxfreepress.com/what-we-know-about-miamis-event-district-so-far/

  https://www.journal-news.com/lifestyles/what-we-know-about-miami-universitys-planned-event-district-so-far/62NOCSMKLVEXHPIZMW2ZZB4SCI/
- Babu, Kethan (2025), "Recreation Board discusses comprehensive strategic plan at August meeting." *Oxford Free Press*, August 22. www.oxfreepress.com/recreation-board-discusses-comprehensive-strategic-plan-at-august-meeting/
- Hodges, Bebe (2025), 'Miami University's controversial event district could host 'world-class' acts." *Cincinnati Enquirer*, July 24. https://www.cincinnati.com/story/news/2025/07/24/miami-university-event-district-would-host-sports-world-class-acts-at-new-arena-going-up-oxford-ohio/84536202007/?gnt-cfr=1&gca-cat=pp&gca-ds=override&sltsgmt=0154_E
- Schnabl, Steve (2025), "The Old Townie: Traffic woes and a new arena." *Oxford Free Press*, June 4. https://www.oxfreepress.com/the-old-townie-traffic-woes-and-a-new-arena/
- Sullivan, Eliza (2025), "[Humor]: The Cook Field Stadium: An Undeniably Perfect Choice." *The Miami Student*, April 3. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2025/04/the-cook-field-stadium-an-undeniably-perfect-choice?ct=content_open&cv=cbox_latest
- Schwartz, Lara (2025), "Miami University offers first look at potential arena district design." *Cincinnati Business Courier*, April 15. https://www.bizjournals.com/cincinnati/news/2025/04/15/miami-university-arena-district-design-revealed.html
- Clark, Michael D. (2025), "Miami University unveils rendering of proposed Arena District, offers updates of overall health of school." *Journal-News*, April 10.

https://www.journal-news.com/news/miami-university-unveils-rendering-of-proposed-arena-district-offers-updates-of-overall-health-of-school/SG7NEHK23RFGHJLDDGKXECQ7IE/

- Scott, Sean (2025), "Old buildings, new developments and alternative visions." *Oxford Free Press*, March 17. https://www.oxfreepress.com/miami-oxford-town-gown-developments-arena/
- Scott, Sean (2025), "How does Miami plan for campus development, and is it enough?" *Oxford Free Press*, March 16. https://www.oxfreepress.com/miami-university-campus-development-master-plan/
- Zien, Kathleen (2025), "Letter to the Editor: Miami arena needs are currently met." *The Miami Student*, March 7. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2025/03/miami-arena-needs-are-currently-met

  Zien, Kathleen (2025), "Letter to the Editor: Miami arena needs are currently met." *The Oxford Free Press*, February 14. https://www.oxfreepress.com/letter-to-the-editor-miami-arena-needs-met/
- Carreon, Zack (2025), "Miami U. committee picks Cook Field for potential new arena. Not everyone is on board." *WVXU*, February 28. https://www.wvxu.org/education/2025-02-28/miami-university-cook-field-new-arena
- Clark, Michael D. (2025), "Preliminary plan approved by Miami U officials to build new arena at Cook Field." *Journal-News*, February 28. https://www.journal-news.com/news/preliminary-plan-approved-by-miami-u-officials-to-build-new-arena-at-cook-field/ZIT2YYYQBRAT3KZE5PEMHYFVX4/
- Babu, Kethan (2025), "Is Miami's attendance issue really about where the arena is?" *The Miami Student*, February 28. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2025/02/is-miamis-attendance-issue-really-about-where-the-arena-is?ct=content_open&cv=cbox_latest
- Turman, Kasey (2025), "Survey responses go against committee's recommendations." *The Miami Student*, February 27. www.miamistudent.net/article/2025/02/survey-responses-go-against-committees-recommendations
- Scott, Sean (2025) "'An egregious affront': Survey results show widespread opposition to arena on Cook Field." *Oxford Free Press*, February 26. https://www.oxfreepress.com/cook-field-arena-opposition-survey-results-millett/
- Fall, Chelsea (2025), "Miami University names Cook Field as the location for the new arena." *Oxford Observer*, February 20. www.oxfordobserver.org/17432/briefs/miami-university-names-cook-field-as-location-for-new-arena/
- Scott, Sean (2025), "Committee recommends arena construction on Cook Field." *Oxford Free Press*, February 19. https://www.oxfreepress.com/committee-recommends-arena-construction-cook-field/
- Fall, Chelsea (2025), "Miami considers new arena to replace Millett." *Oxford Observer*, February 13. https://oxfordobserver.org/17338/miami/miami-considers-new-arena-to-replace-millett/
- Turman, Kasey (2025), "Miami announces potential locations for new basketball arena." *The Miami Student*, January 30. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2025/01/miami-announces-potential-locations-for-new-basketball-arena-millett-hall-redhawks

- Scott, Sean (2025), "Committee identifies two potential arena sites for further consideration." *Oxford Free Press*, January 29. https://www.oxfreepress.com/committee-identifies-two-potential-arena-sites-for-further-consideration
- Faculty Alliance of Miami (2025) "Op-ed: A better Miami, a stronger community…but when?" *Oxford Free Press*, January 17. https://www.oxfreepress.com/op-ed-miami-faculty-negotiations-timeline/
- MacDonald, Sue (2024), "Letter to the Editor: Plans for a potential arena on a central campus site." *Oxford Free Press*, December 21. https://www.oxfreepress.com/letter-to-the-editor-plans-for-a-potential-arena-on-a-central-campus-site
- Scott, Sean (2024), "Miami creates site selection committee for new arena as Board of Trustees approves initial planning funds." *Oxford Free Press*, December 13. https://www.oxfreepress.com/miami-university-new-arena-site-selection-funding-board-of-trustees/
- Carreon, Zack (2024), "Miami University may build a new arena, but where it could end up is raising concerns." *WVXU*, December 11. https://www.wvxu.org/education/2024-12-11/miami-university-basketball-arena-slant-walk
- Stanley, Jerome (2024), "Letter to the Editor: Miami's proposed Slant Walk site for a new arena." *Oxford Free Press*, December 6. https://www.oxfreepress.com/letter-to-the-editor-slant-walk-arena-site/
- Scott, Sean (2024), "Slant Walk Green among potential locations for Millett replacement, university committee says." *Oxford Free Press*, November 20. https://www.oxfreepress.com/slant-walk-green-among-potential-locations-for-millett-replacement-faculty-committee-says/
- Campbell, Richard (2024), "Save Millett: Arena over troubled water." *Oxford Free Press*, November 15. https://www.oxfreepress.com/bridge-over-troubled-water-millett-hall/
- Clark, Michael D. (2024), "Miami University exploring replacing iconic sports arena." *Journal-News*, October 23. https://www.journal-news.com/news/miami-university-exploring-replacing-iconic-sports-arena/ED4E6DUMXRC5REPKZWTYTFFWBM/
- Macy, L. (2024). "Budget Symposium 2024: Miami Looks to Diversify as Tuition Revenue Falls." *The Miami Student*, May 2. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2024/05/budget-symposium-2024-miami-looks-to-diversify-as-tuition-revenue-falls-6632f4f5e8f92
- Bey, Sara (2019), "Miami athletic department uses student fee money to purchase tickets." *The Miami Student*, May 7. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2019/05/miami-athletic-department-uses-student-fee-money-to-purchase-tickets
- Remington, Grace (2015), "Athletics spends $17M in student fees." *The Miami Student*. November 17. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2015/11/athletics-spends-17m-in-student-fees

- Staff Writer (2011), "Opinion | Athletic scholarships, fees must be reassessed." *The Miami Student*, April 10. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2011/04/opinion-athletic-scholarships-fees-must-be-reassessed
- Staff Writer (2009), "Half of student general fee supports Miami athletics." *The Miami Student*, September 28. https://www.miamistudent.net/article/2009/09/half-of-student-general-fee-supports-miami-athletics

Miami University News/Announcements:

- Miami University - Campus Announcements (2025), "Board of Trustees approves site for the design phase of an event district with multipurpose arena." February 28. https://miamioh.edu/news/2025/02/board-of-trustees-approves-site-for-the-design-phase-of-an-event-district-with-multipurpose-arena.html
- Miami University - Campus Announcements (2025), "Committee recommends Cook Field site for potential new multi-purpose arena project," February 19. https://miamioh.edu/news/2025/02/committee-recommends-cook-field-site-for-potential-new-multi-purpose-arena-project.html
- Miami University - Campus Life (2024), "Arena exploration project committee seeks feedback." January 28. https://miamioh.edu/news/2025/01/arena-exploration-project-committee-seeks-feedback.html
- Miami University - Campus Life (2024), "Committee formed to review potential arena sites." December 11. https://miamioh.edu/news/2024/12/committee-formed-to-review-potential-arena-sites.html
- Miami University - Campus Life (2024), "Enhancing campus life and stimulating the local economy." October 17. https://miamioh.edu/news/2024/10/enhancing-campus-life-and-stimulating-the-local-economy.html

Other Relevant Sources:

- Miami University Board of Trustees webpage (including meeting minutes): https://miamioh.edu/about/leadership-administration/bot/index.html
- Petition: "Preserve Cook Field at Miami University of Ohio from Basketball Stadium Conversion." https://www.change.org/p/preserve-cook-field-at-miami-university-of-ohio-from-basketball-stadium-conversion?source_location=psf_petitions

Scholarly Sources:

- Baade, Robert A., and Jeffrey O. Sundberg. 1996. "Fourth Down and Gold to Go? Assessing the Link between Athletics and Alumni Giving." *Social Science Quarterly* 77(4):789–803.
- Bozman, Charles S., S. Muthukumarana, and K. R. Tuli. 2015. "The Impact of College Football on University Brand Equity." *Marketing Management Journal* 25(2):1–16.

- Chen, P. (2022). *New Buffalo Bills Stadium Noise Impact Study and Construction Noise Management Plan: The Power of Commitment*. https://www3.erie.gov/environment/sites/www3.erie.gov.environment/files/2024-06/15-ghd-noise-impact-study.pdf
- Christiansen, Leif A., Andrew Greene, and Charles W. Jones. 2019. "College Football Revival: Analyzing the Impact of Marketing Efforts on Key Stakeholders at a Division I FCS Commuter School." *Journal of Applied Sport Management* 11(1):Article 6.
- Chung, Doug J. 2013. "The Dynamic Advertising Effect of Collegiate Athletics." *Marketing Science* 32(5):679–703.
- Chung, Doug J. 2017. "The Commercialization of College Athletics and Its Governance Implications." Pp. 145–170 in *The Business of College Sports*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cormier, Brett M., Stephen E. Mulholland, and Joseph Price. 2023. "The Flutie and Anti‐Flutie Effect: The Impact of Football Championships and Athletic Scandals on Universities." *Journal of Sports Economics* 24(7):905–934.
- Fort, Rodney. 2018. *Sports Economics*. 3rd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Francis, A. E., Webb, M., Desha, C., Rundle-Thiele, S., & Caldera, S. (2023). Environmental Sustainability in Stadium Design and Construction: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sustainability*, *15*(8), 6896. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15086896
- Higgins, Robert R. 2006. "The Impact of Intercollegiate Athletic Success on University Brand Equity and Student Recruitment." *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 16(1):1–21.
- Howard, Dennis R., and John L. Crompton. 2003. "An Empirical Review of the Stadium Novelty Effect." *Sport Marketing Quarterly* 12(2):111–16.
- Huang, Chih, and Brian P. Soebbing. 2021. "No Novelty Effect but a Honeymoon That Lasts: On the Attendance Effects of New Football Stadiums." *Global Economy Journal* 21(4):1–24.
- Hwang, J. C. 2016. *Essays on Demand for College Sports*. PhD dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- June, Audrey Williams. 2006. "What Does Athletics Do for Colleges?" *Chronicle of Higher Education* 52(49):A35–A36.
- King‐White, Ryan, and Alexandra Beissel. 2018. "The Corporatization of College Football and the Erosion of Shared Governance." *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics* 11:1–23.
- King‐White, Ryan, Alexandra Beissel, and Scott Clevenger. 2021. "'Trust Me, Don't Trust Me': Administrative Governance and the Shift to Big‐Time Athletics at Towson University." *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics* 14:627–56.
- Leeds, Michael A., Peter von Allmen, and Victor A. Matheson. 2023. *The Economics of Sports*. 7th ed. New York: Routledge.
- Losak, John, Samuel Marteka, and Peter Mangos. 2023. "National Television Exposure and College Football Attendance." *Journal of Sports Economics* 24(6):745–71.
- Maxcy, J. G., & Larson, D. J. (2014). Reversal of Fortune or Glaring Misallocation: Is a New Football Stadium Worth the Cost to a University? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2382280
- McEvoy, Chad D., and Aaron L. Morse. 2007. "An Investigation of the Relationship between Television Broadcasting and Game Attendance at NCAA Division I Football Games." *The Sport Journal* 10(1):1–15.

- McGehee, G., Marquez, A., Cianfrone, B., & Kellison, T. (2025). *Understanding Organizational and Public Perspectives on Stadium Redevelopment Through Social Media: A Case Study of Georgia State University's "New" Stadium*. Sagepub.com; Human Kinetics Inc. https://sk.sagepub.com/cases/perspectives-stadium-redevelop-social-media-georgia-state-university
- McGrady, Mark. 2011. *The Cinderella Effect: The Impact of NCAA Men's Basketball Success on College Applications*. Undergraduate honors thesis, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, CO.
- Northwestern University. (2022a). *The Economic Rebuild of Ryan Field*. https://rebuildryanfield.com/docs/tu_northwestern-university_ryan-field-v4.pdf
- Padgett, Tim, and C. Shane Hunt. 2012. "The Influence of Winning on Mid‐Major College Football Attendance." *Journal of Applied Business and Economics* 13(2):129–39.
- Pope, Devin G., and Jaren C. Pope. 2009. "The Impact of College Sports Success on the Quantity and Quality of Student Applications." *Southern Economic Journal* 75(3):750–80.
- Schreyer, Daniel, and P. Ansari. 2021. "Revisiting the Novelty Effect from New Stadiums: An Event Study of Attendance in European Football." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 39(4):807–26.
- Sigelman, Lee, and Robert Carter. 1979. "Win One for the Giver? Alumni Giving and Big‐Time College Sports." *Social Science Quarterly* 60(2):284–94.
- Sigelman, Lee, and Saul Bookheimer. 1983. "Is It Whether You Win or Lose? Monetary Contributions to Big‐Time College Athletic Programs." *Social Science Quarterly* 64(2):347–59.
- Tripathi, Manish. 2015. "Brand Equity Development in College Football." Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.
- Woo, C. K. 2017. *Winning at What Cost? The Impact of NCAA Football and Basketball Success on College Applications, Enrollment, and Student Quality*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California.
- Williams, Jordan (2022). *The Unspoken Consequences of Creating a Sports Empire: How Sports Arenas and Stadiums Impact the Environment and Affect Communities in the Greater Los Angeles Area*. Lehigh University, Master's Thesis. *ProQuest*. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2771670341?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses
- Zhang, James J. 1997. "Development of a Spectator Decision‐Making Inventory (SDMI)." *Sport Marketing Quarterly* 6(1):35–42.

Appendix VI: Project Team Members

* Project team members are listed in alphabetical order (by last name)

Adam Beissel (Associate Professor – Sports Leadership & Management)

Scott Brown (Professor – Sociology & Gerontology)

Jennifer Bulanda (Associate Professor – Sociology & Gerontology)

Nathan Divo (Alumnus – B.S. in Mechanical Engineering)

Bri Fitzgerald (Undergraduate Student – Organizational Leadership)

Rylie Francis (Undergraduate Student – Sociology)

Paige Garand (Undergraduate Student – Organizational Leadership)

Caro Hagwood (Undergraduate Student – Psychology, Criminology)

Kaley Koch (Undergraduate Student – Psychology, Sociology)

Mariah Marston (Graduate Student – Social Gerontology)

Ava Nutall (Graduate Student – Liberal Studies)

Wisdom Obioha (Graduate Student – Social Gerontology)

Lauren Okoye (Undergraduate Student – Psychology, Pre-Med)

David Prytherch (Professor – Geography)

Xiao Qiu (Alumna – Ph.D. in Social Gerontology)

Rayna Coronado Quentin (Undergraduate Student – Organizational Leadership, Individualized Studies)

Kevin Reuning (Associate Professor – Political Science)

Ashley Reynolds (Undergraduate Student – Organizational Leadership, Social Justice, Spanish)

Ryan Steel (Assistant Professor – Sociology & Gerontology)

Meadow Stiles (Undergraduate Student – Psychology)

Anna West (Undergraduate Student – Individualized Studies, Comparative Religion)

Elena Ziccareli (Undergraduate Student – Political Science, Data Analytics, Individualized Studies)