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Purpose
This three-year, multi-institution study will examine students’ access to work-related experiential activities (WREAs) relative to their geographic proximity to major economic and workforce regions.

Geospatial Data and Methods
Spatial data:
• Occupational profile of surrounding areas
• Businesses or other WREA possibilities
• Access to amenities

Analysis methods:
• Develop an Opportunity Index for census tracts near each university.
• Assess geographic factors affecting WREA selections
  • Proximity to opportunities
  • Local amenities
  • Distance from WREA to home and school

Map shows 30-min. driving time from UGA in 5-min. increments.

Mixed Methods
• Surveys
• Individual, semi-structure interviews
• Integration with geospatial data

Participants
• Fields: engineering and computer science
  • Recently hired alumni recruiters
  • Employers
  • University Career Center staff
  • Student survey respondents

Timetable Years 1-3
Develop (Year 1)
• Pilot survey instruments and interview protocols
• Gather data from current literature and career fairs
• Draft geospatial mapping

Data collection (Years 1-2)
• Administer Year 1 and 2 surveys
• Conduct zoom interviews
• Construct geospatial mapping and geomaps

Analysis (Years 1-3)
• Transcribe interviews and code
• Conduct statistical analysis of survey data
• Analyze geospatial data
• Integrate findings
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Finding(s)

Increasing the frequency of feedback increases student learning.

Methods

Subjects
Sample sizes
Independent variables
Dependent variables
Analysis methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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