

AN ANALYSIS OF ON-CAMPUS HOUSING AT PUBLIC RURAL
COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES

Pat Gallagher Moeck, B.A., M.B.A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2005

APPROVED:

Stephen G. Katsinas, Committee Chair
John Anthony, Committee Member
V. Barbara Bush, Committee Member
Randall E. Schumacker, Committee Member
Ron Newsom, Higher Education Program
Coordinator
Michael Altekruise, Chair of the Department of
Counseling, Development and Higher
Education
M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of
Education
Sandra L. Terrell, Dean of the Robert B.
Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Moeck, Pat Gallagher. An Analysis of On-Campus Housing at Public Rural Community Colleges in the United States. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), May 2005, 136 pp., 25 tables, references, 27 titles.

This study has two purposes. First is to dispel myths that there are no residence halls at community colleges. Second is to discuss the ways in which these residence halls are administered, the amenities offered to students, the benefits of residence halls, and their future in community colleges. The study is based upon the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 classifications and divides community colleges into 7 categories: Urban multi campus, Urban single campus, Suburban multi campus, Suburban single campus, and Rural small, medium and large.

Included in the study are tables of data received from an original survey sent to 232 community college CEOs who reported to the US Department of Education that they had residence halls at their campus. The results indicate that a significant number of community colleges with residence halls exist, particularly at rural community colleges, that they bring significant financial gain to the colleges, and they append numerous benefits to students and to student life at these colleges. Residence halls are housed in divisions of student services and directed by experienced student affairs professionals.

The study concludes with recommendations for policy as well as practice, the most important of which calls for more accurate data collection regarding on-campus residence housing by the US Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics.

Copyright 2005

by

Pat Moeck

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No one reaches this pinnacle alone. In my case, a host of individuals close by have supported and allowed me space to complete the hours of work, cheered the victories and accomplishments, wiped the tears of frustration and defeat, and never allowed me to fall into despair when life hands out lemons. I have been blessed with a squad of cheerleaders who have refused to accept anything but positive completion. Drs. Ray Young and Tommy Davis, you are my inspiration. How lucky I am to know you!

First, for your extraordinary patience, your mentorship, your unwavering belief in my abilities, and your unquestioning loyalty, Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas, I thank you from the depths of my being. I would not have completed this project had you not stayed on task, pushing, encouraging, and inspiring. As an instructor, you showed us the stars, you introduced us to the legends in higher education, you inspired us to dream, and you pushed us to give of ourselves and to raise our personal standards. You shared your hospitality, the expertise of your wife, Dr. Rene Katsinas, and your time and energy with the generosity of a Republican. Sir, as the chair of my dissertation, my sounding board, and my friend, you will never be forgotten. Drs. John Anthony, V. Barbara Bush, and Randall E. Schumacker, your input and critical review are most appreciated as well.

Howard F. Moeck, Jr., thank you for your unrelenting confidence that I would emerge victorious, and your constant reminders that if you could pass the Texas Bar Exam, I could finish this project. Your love and respect for me throughout the 36 years of our marriage affords me the roots of security that we have formed down the years, and the wings to dare to begin this and other adventures. I do love you. You complete me.

Pat and Esta Gallagher, having brought me up under a microscope, this is the expectation you placed firmly on my shoulders from birth. I am glad I rose to your standards and prevailed. Your constant support and belief in my capacity for academic achievement has propelled me through a lifetime of learning. I can confess that I am a Renaissance woman, and it is because of your steadfast encouragement and insistence that I persevere. Bridget, Mother has always wanted to be a good role model. Now, go out and get your own advanced degrees. Chuck, I learned from your example. Thank you for leading. Addison, Bridget and Daniel, see what Grandmother did?

Dr. David E. Hardy, you are a brilliant scholar and a gentleman whose research and accomplishments have contributed greatly to this project. The thousands of miles and the thousands of hours we spent commuting to classes into the night; the music, the euphoria, the fury, the heart wrenching, disclosing conversations covering diverse subjects, and watching fireworks from the windows, have all left indelible marks on who I am and who I need to be. I am so lucky to have you as a friend. You are in my heart.

To classmates Mary Reid, Paul May, Soko Starobin, David Hardy, and Ted Phillips, what a RIDE! We have many memories to share. I have loved knowing, studying with and learning from you all. Our support group should continue to prosper throughout our academic and professional lives. We need each other.

This study has changed my self-perception. While I do not expect to pursue another doctorate, I will be secure in the knowledge that it is well within my capability to perform research, analyze the results, apply analytical reasoning, share my findings, and finally, smile because it has all been accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapters	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	5
Purpose of Study	6
Research Questions	11
Primary Research Questions	11
Secondary Research Questions.....	11
Significance of Study	12
Definition of Terms.....	13
Limitations and Delimitations	17
Delimitations	17
Limitations	18
2. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE	19
Introduction	19
Journal Articles	20
The Bush White House	23
The Catt Dissertation	24
Historical Research.....	26
The Doggett Dissertation	27
The Summers and Budig Study	31
ACUHO-I and EBI Benchmarking Project.....	33
Relevant Research Since Summers and Budig	34
3. METHODOLOGY AND COLLECTION OF DATA	38
Introduction	38
Research Questions	38
Primary Research Questions	38
Secondary Research Questions.....	39

Research Design – Part 1	39
Definition and Selection of Population for Part I	40
Part I Instrumentation – Identification of IPEDS Data Elements to Be Used	40
Part I Data Extraction Procedures.....	41
Part I Data Analysis.....	42
Part I Output.....	42
Research Design – Part II.....	42
Definition and Selection of the Population for Part II.....	43
Part II Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedures	43
Part II Data Analysis.....	43
Part II Output.....	44
Summary	44
4. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	45
Introduction	45
Sample.....	46
Results of Survey Outcomes	52
5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
Introduction	90
Findings	95
Conclusions	108
Recommendations.....	114
Recommendations for Policy	114
Recommendations for Practice	116
Closing Remarks	119
APPENDICES	121
A. COVER LETTER TO COLLEGE PRESIDENTS.....	121
B. SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	123
C. COMMUNITY COLLEGES REPORTING TO IPEDS.....	128
REFERENCE LIST	135

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Community Colleges with Residence Halls in the Dallas/Ft. Worth Area	8
2. Community Colleges with Residence Halls Listed by Type*	49
3. Community Colleges with Residence Halls Listed by Accrediting Region	50
4. Community Colleges with Residence Halls Listed by State.....	51
5. Ownership of Residence Halls Listed by Type*	53
6. Number of Beds by Type*	55
7. Number of Specialized Housing Options by Type*	58
8. Percentage of Students in Residence Halls from the Primary Service Area of the College by Type*	61
9. Estimated Percentages of Students Living in Residence Halls by Gender and Marital Status by Type*	62
10. Estimated Percentages of Students Living in Residence Halls by Age and Enrollment by Type*	65
11. Percentage of On-campus Housing Filled in Fall, 2004 and Waiting Lists by Type*	66
12. Amenities Offered by On-campus Housing by Type*	69
13. Involvement of Campus Leaders in On-campus Housing by Type*	70
14. Child Care Offered on Campus by Type*	71
15. On Campus Residency Requirements by Type*	73
16. Privatization of Services by Type*	75
17. Reasons for Privatizing by Type*	77
18. Motivating Factors in College Residence Hall Involvement by Type*	79
19. Importance of Offering On-campus Housing by Type*	81
20. Operations of On Campus Housing from an Economic Perspective and Total Revenue Generated by Type*	84

21.	Administration of On-campus Housing and Title of Responsible Supervisor by Type*	86
22.	Highest Degree Earned and Years of Experience by On-Campus Housing Supervisor by Type*	87
23.	Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Residence Hall Staff by Type*	88
24.	Future of Residence Halls by Type*	89
25.	Projected Undercount of Community Colleges with Residence Halls.....	97

*Type refers to the following categories as listed in the Katsinas, Lacey & Hardy (2005) Classifications:

1. Urban-Serving Multicampus
2. Urban-Serving Single Campus
3. Suburban-Serving Multicampus
4. Suburban-Serving Single Campus
5. Rural-Serving Small
6. Rural-Serving Medium
7. Rural-Serving Large

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Forthcoming college freshmen and their parents visit campuses of higher education institutions throughout the country each year to scrutinize the environment for a perfect fit for themselves and their children. Whether it is because of an athletic or academic scholarship, a legacy, a specialized academic program offered, an affordable higher education option, or any number of reasons for the visit, these families are searching for an attachment and an assurance of well being for themselves. Selecting an alma mater should be a carefully planned endeavor. Campus student services and admissions/recruitment organizations offer guided tours to parents and prospective students. The purpose of these tours is to spotlight the major points of interest of the college, attempt to create a bond with the recruits, and answer any questions that arise. One of the first campus locations to visit is most likely a residence hall. It is in this edifice that students will spend the most time, so the secure and well-maintained residence hall is in some instances the deciding factor in student recruitment. Prospective students and parents who perceive a campus residence hall to be comfortable, private, and otherwise conducive to a positive learning experience will appreciate, and perhaps select, the campus that provides the best possible housing.

Reflecting upon what factors contribute to successful retention and matriculation of undergraduate students in their landmark 1991 meta-analysis of how the process of attending college impacts students, Ernest T. Pascarella and Patrick T. Terenzini observed that: "Living on campus [versus commuting to college] is perhaps the single-most consistent within-college determinant of impact." (1991, p. 400). Their work, *How*

College Affects Students, references over 100 separate studies related to residence halls. These studies cover topics that include but are not limited to career satisfaction of housing professionals at universities; university planning for housing, including space for specific groups; student development and learning theories as applied to university residence halls; privatization of housing at universities; socialization of students in higher education; predictions for success; predictions of attrition among on-campus residents at universities; academic persistence and degree attainment; and training of residence hall advisors at universities.

Pascarella and Terenzini, however, do not cite a single study related to residence halls at the nation's 1,200 publicly controlled two-year community, junior, and technical colleges. One possible reason for this omission is that community colleges are relatively young institutions with emerging policies that affect students in ways dissimilar to those of the four-year colleges and universities (Catt, p.16).

As community college students often have different perspectives for attending higher educational institutions, such as completing vocational training programs, retraining for job demands, certificate and associate degree offerings in allied health and nursing, and transfer opportunities to universities, their needs can be studied and analyzed based on their own priorities.

Community colleges were fashioned for a broad number of reasons beginning in the early 20th century. Studies involving specific policies, offerings, and procedures of community colleges have not been forthcoming. However, no other type of higher education institution invites all populations to become college students, regardless of

age, previous test scores, or background. Additionally, no other type of higher education institution is mandated to serve the community where it is located.

Mythology exists within higher education that America's 1,200 community colleges do not have residence halls. For example, in April 2003, a front-page feature in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* about the unequal impact of state cuts in public higher education operating budgets on community colleges and access-oriented four-year universities quoted Travis J. Reindl, Director of State Policy Analysis for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities as saying "Regional universities have fixed costs, such as heating dormitories, that community colleges do not face. The crunch of limited revenues and growing costs, is forcing state colleges to consider major cuts to instructional budgets, such as the elimination of some majors and even entire academic programs" (Hebel, 2003, p.22).

Is Reindl correct in his assertion that community colleges do not sustain the same fixed costs, such as residence halls, as do four-year universities? It appears that he assumes, as do Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), that *all* 10.4 million of America's community college students (www.aacc.nche.edu) commute, and do not live in on-campus residence facilities. If Reindl is correct, it logically follows that state and federal policymakers concerned about cutting costs in tight budgetary and fiscal environments would not need to fund non-tuition and fee-related expenses for community college students at the same levels as those of students attending four-year institutions. This is but one of many examples as to how an unsubstantiated claim, i.e., that community colleges do not have residence halls, can enter the mythology of American higher education and have dramatic and unintended consequences for policy and practice. If

left unchallenged, such framings can have long-term negative impacts.

For example, the financial aid programs operated by federal and state governments could be impacted, since many state governments operate their own student assistance programs. Reindl's assumption that community colleges do not have on-campus housing does not comport with practice. The imprecise terminology of some reporting agencies can cause misunderstanding and frustration when trying to ascertain information. For instance, if one institution refers to its housing as "residence halls" and another identifies its housing as "on-campus housing," the answers to a survey question, an annual report, or some other query designed to ascertain the presence of on-campus housing could result in an erroneous report, bad data, and the loss of possible funding. Although the terms "dormitory" and "residence hall" are repeatedly considered interchangeable, some of the other terms describing on-campus housing evoke entirely different images to readers of the requests for data, those submitting reports, and those interpreting answers.

In Texas, for example, virtually every rural-serving community college offers its students residence hall options. Some Texas suburban community colleges, such as Collin County Community College District, do not directly operate residence halls. They have created 501c (3) foundations to privatize the management of nearby apartment complexes that in turn rent those facilities to students. The author's personal research experiences, and those of several experts with whom she has conducted informal interviews, anecdotally disproves Reindl's indiscriminate and biased supposition. Yet, to date, no hard data exists on the subject, so myths persist. The time has come to dispel these myths.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to quantify the extent of and reasons for community college involvement in the operation of on-campus housing facilities. Although the American Colleges and Universities Housing Officers – International (ACUHO-I) maintains baseline data on four-year institutions, no such solid quantitative baseline data on community colleges presently exist. The American Association of Community Colleges' *2000 Fact Book*, based on material from the National Profile of Community Colleges: Trends & Statistics, offers no information on residence halls at community colleges (Phillippe & Patton, 2000).

Community college administrators need to be fully aware of the cost of residence halls and the outcomes of their presence, or lack thereof, in terms of the overall value they bring to the institution. This is particularly true for rural-serving community colleges that have lower total student enrollments and, thus, have fewer students over which to spread fixed costs (Katsinas, Opp and Alexander, 2003).

This study will develop a baseline national analysis of community college participation in on-campus housing using a respected quantitative data set, and then provide additional descriptive information and analysis as to why community colleges are involved, including selected benefits, and challenges associated with successful operation of residence halls in the community college setting. The study also will examine the possible connections between residence halls and athletic and fine arts programs, and assess the expenditures associated with residence hall operations including staffing and food service. To date, no such descriptive information exists within the literature on community colleges.

Purpose of the Study

There are two purposes to this study: First, to create quantitative baseline data on the level and extent of involvement by U.S. community colleges in residence halls. This study assesses the number of residence halls at community colleges and the number of students served in those residence halls. A second purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive analysis of key issues motivating community college involvement in residence hall operations, and effective practices related to the operation and management of residence halls.

Presently, no database on community college involvement in residence halls exists. Yet practitioners are well aware of just how common community college involvement in residence hall operations actually is. Of the approximately 1,200 publicly controlled two-year colleges in the United States, roughly 700—the majority - were classified as rural-serving in 1999 (Katsinas, 2003). While the fact that in Northern and Midwestern states such as Minnesota, Wyoming, and Michigan, virtually every rural-serving community college maintains residence halls is well documented, the level of involvement by community colleges in the South and Southwest in residence hall operations is not so clear.

Based upon his informal travels to more than 300 community colleges in 34 states over the past two decades, Katsinas (personal communication, March 12, 2004) indicates his belief that most rural-serving community colleges in the majority of states *do* operate residence halls. He also believes that residence halls are located in a major portion of rural-serving community colleges established before the Baby Boom, especially those founded before World War II areas. For example, East Mississippi

Community College, a community college in rural-serving Scooba, Mississippi, visited twice by both Katsinas and myself, has residence halls. According to interviews with college officials, nearly every rural-serving community college in that state operates residence halls. A similar reality can be found in Oklahoma, New Mexico, and other southern and southwestern states. Nine community college districts serve the Dallas/Fort Worth (Texas) metropolitan area.

According to the 2000 Census, the population of the D/FW Metroplex was roughly 5.5 million. Of the nine districts, three were established during the Post World War II Baby Boom era (1965-1975): Dallas County Community College District, Grayson County College, and Tarrant County College District. One suburban district, Collin County Community College District, was established in 1985. The districts of Grayson County College, Hill College, Navarro College, North Central Texas College, Trinity Valley Community College, and Weatherford College operate community college campuses that serve counties that are now part of the fast-growing D/FW metropolitan area.

Table 1 below illustrates the establishment dates of the various community college districts. Also, it displays the unduplicated headcount and total number of credits generated for the 2000-2001 academic year. For further identification, those districts that operate residence halls are in bold print. Together, these nine districts served an unduplicated headcount total of 186,615 in 2000-2001, and generated a total of 2,204,904 credit hours. Within these nine community college districts, there are thirty-one separate community college campuses and non-credit outreach centers.

Table 1

Community Colleges in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex (the Majority of which Operate Residence Halls and Student Housing) 2000-2001

Community College District	Year Established	Number of Campuses	Total Unduplicated Headcount 2000-2001	Total Credit Hours Generated 2000-2001
Collin County Community College District	1985	6	21,697	254,284
Dallas County Community College District	1966	8*	88,043	985,919
Grayson County College	1965	1	4,561	50,946
Hill College	1923	2	3,563	50,446
Navarro College	1946	2	7,873	96,982
North Central Texas College District	1924	3	7,862	62,639
Tarrant County College District	1967	5	43,240	537,132
Trinity Valley Community College District	1946	2	5,692	107,727
Weatherford College	1869	3	4,084	58,829
TOTAL:		32	186,615	2,204,904

Dallas/Fort Worth region community college districts with residence halls are in **bold** type.

Source of Data: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), NCES, U.S. Department of Education 2001, prepared by the Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education, University of North Texas, 3/03.

Notes:

1. The Dallas/Fort Worth (Texas) Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area includes Dallas, Tarrant, Collin, Denton, and adjacent counties.
2. A major difference between Fall 2001 Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment and Unduplicated Headcount for 2000-2001 is observed. In the real world in which community college boards, administrators, faculty, and students live, adequate parking, computer access, and access to quality student services must be provided to every student. Fall FTE enrollment data is therefore not a good barometer of the reach of community college services.
3. These data do not include non-credit enrollments, and likely understate the reach of community college services delivered in the DFW Metroplex. Nationally, over 40 percent of total US community college enrollments are in noncredit courses.
4. While Fall FTE data was available for Trinity Valley Community College, Unduplicated Headcount was not included in IPEDS. An estimate is provided here, based upon the approximate 2:1 ratio between Fall FTE and Unduplicated Headcount, similar to other adjacent colleges (for example, Weatherford's ratio is about 2:1).
5. This number includes the Bill J. Priest Center for Economic Development, which offers mostly non-credit college courses in its facility.

Seven of these nine districts operate residence halls. It is interesting to note that all of the community college districts established prior to the 1960s Baby Boom generation college era operate residence halls today. Neither of the two districts created in the urbanized counties that include the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth (DCCCD and TCCD) operate residence halls. Grayson County College, established during the “Baby Boom” era (1965 – 73) in what once was a totally rural-serving area, did create and today operates residence halls that can serve up to 256 students (IPEDS, 2001).

Interestingly, while Collin County Community College District, which was established in 1985 and encompasses suburban Plano, does not formally operate residence halls, it created a private foundation that owns 128 apartment units serving students on land immediately adjacent to the district’s flagship Spring Creek campus. Thus, it is clear that residence halls and housing for students is an important issue for community college administrators and trustees in the D/FW region.

Nationally, quantitative data on the full extent of involvement in the operation of residence halls by urban-serving, suburban-serving, and rural-serving-serving community colleges simply does not exist. Without such data, only anecdotal responses citing reasons for operating residence halls are available from community college officials. In the judgment of the author, these reasons include but are not limited to poor transportation (a great problem prior to World War II and during the Baby Boom), cost, distance, and the need to house student athletes and others who are on scholarship, and the need to improve access for those who live beyond a feasible commuting distance to the college. It would also seem clear that for many rural-serving areas to be well served, residence halls are important, given the lack of available low-cost public

transportation and low-income students served. This can be especially true for students from geographically sparse and/or mountainous regions where distance is simply too far for a daily commute to community colleges in such places. In terms of the geographic context, it appears that many smaller-sized rural-serving community college mission statements reference “educating the whole person,” and list on-campus student activities in a manner similar to those listed by four-year institutions.

Personal conversations reveal that since many potential college students in rural areas do not live immediately adjacent to a community college, rural-serving community colleges rely upon providing significant on-campus activities in athletics and the fine arts to bolster their overall full-time enrollments and improve their economies of scale while simultaneously creating the aura of a “collegiate experience.” Students who reside in the state-assigned service delivery area of the college but lack transportation often must secure local housing to attend classes and participate in extracurricular college activities. Community colleges with intercollegiate athletic programs frequently recruit and award scholarships to students whose permanent addresses lie far outside the college’s service area, state, or even outside of the United States. Some community colleges that serve international students also justify their involvement in residence halls upon this educational purpose. For example, according to its official institutional research *Fact Book* (2002), Grayson County College has a substantial international student enrollment, which doubled from 2001 to 2002. Nearly all of these international students live in on-campus housing. Still, the question begs: What is the extent of community college involvement in providing residence halls to their students?

Research Questions

Primary Research Questions

1. What is the extent of community college involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students?
2. What are the major reasons justifying community college involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students?
3. Are there differences in the level of involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students among and between rural-, suburban-, and urban-serving community colleges?

Secondary Research Questions

1. What is the financial investment of community colleges in the operation of residence halls?
2. Which of the following reasons are generally considered by practitioners to be benefits of operating residence halls at community colleges?
 - a) a positive impact on institutional finances
 - b) increased full-time student enrollments
 - c) student life producing a “college experience” (broad array of services)
 - d) making other student services more efficient (spreading costs of campus dining, health center, etc.)
 - e) diversifying the student body (international students, athletes, minority students, etc.)
 - f) diversifying academic program enrollments (fine arts, allied health and nursing, etc.)

3. How are residence halls at community colleges practically administered?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for a number of reasons. First, no definitive literature currently exists on the subject. If community colleges are to participate in strategic planning, there needs to be a base of knowledge available to guide educators through the maze of housing issues. With the predicted influx of community college students forecast for the next twenty years and beyond, on-campus housing accommodations for students may be critical for states to effectively use existing community college enrollment capacity. Community colleges clearly suffer disproportionately from budget cuts (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 15, 2003, p.1) and need a firm hold on their financial obligations, of which residence halls could be a significant factor.

As population demographics continue to shift from rural towards urban and especially suburban regions, workers' commute time has been significantly lengthened, which may or may not impact on the importance of rural-serving community colleges. It is highly likely, however, that many of the positive attributes accorded by Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) to the full-time students' out-of-class experiences would append to community college students living full time in on-campus housing. Residence halls clearly provide an opportunity for creating a better student life by integrating specific residence-hall programming that will assist students in their intellectual and personal development and in achieving developmental tasks.

Anecdotal evidence points to residence halls as critical to supporting athletic programs and international student enrollment. Individual community colleges can work in the direction of adopting a student-housing philosophy; which supports the

institutional student development stated philosophy. The creation of permanent, qualified staff charged with the responsibility of managing residence-life programs in accordance with each college's goals and objectives, is therefore critical.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

1. *Residence Hall* - a place at a college or university where students live.
2. *Dormitory* - A room providing sleeping quarters for a number of persons. A building used for housing a number of persons, as at a school or resort. A community whose inhabitants commute to a nearby city for employment and recreation. Sometimes this is a term that is interchangeable with residence hall.
3. *Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) Classifications* – A codification of publicly controlled community colleges into seven types: according to location (urban-serving, suburban-serving and rural-serving), college governance (single and multi-campus among urban-serving and suburban-serving) and size (small, medium and large among rural-serving). (Katsinas, Lacey, 1996; Katsinas, 2003; Katsinas personal communication, 2004, Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004). Urban-serving and suburban-serving community colleges lie within the 102 U.S. statistical metropolitan areas (SMAs) with total populations of more than 500,000, while rural-serving community colleges do not. Rural-serving community colleges are further classified into three types: small, medium and large, based on actual student headcount using 2001 IPEDS data. Small urban-serving institutions have an unduplicated headcount of fewer than 2,500 students in 2001 – 2002. Medium rural-serving community college institutions have a 2,500 – 7,499 unduplicated

headcount. Large rural-serving community colleges have an unduplicated headcount greater than 7,500.

4. *Unduplicated Headcount* – The sum of students enrolled for credit with each student counted only once during the reporting period, regardless of the number of credit hours taken or full-time/part-time status.
5. *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)* - The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is a codification of surveys conducted by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The use of IPEDS began in 1986 and involves annual institution-level data collections. All postsecondary institutions that have a Program Participation Agreement with the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE), U.S. Department of Education must report data using a Web-based data collection system. IPEDS currently consists of the following components: Institutional Characteristics (IC); Completions (C); Employees by Assigned Position (EAP); Fall Staff (S); Salaries (SA); Enrollment (EF); Graduation Rates (GRS); Finance (F); and Student Financial Aid (SFA) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). This study utilizes 2000 – 01 IPEDS, except where indicated.
6. *Association of College and University Housing Officers – International (ACUHO-I)* - The preeminent professional association dedicated to supporting and promoting the collegiate residential experience by: creating value through services, information, and collegial relationships that are indispensable to its members;

and continually changing and adapting in ways that assist members in meeting the needs of dynamic campus environments.

1. *Southwest Association of College and University Housing Officers (SWACUHO)*
– The regional association that corresponds to ACUHO-I. Its home campus is Texas A&M University, College Station.
7. *The 2000-2001 Academic Year* - is consistent with IPEDS definitions.
8. *Full-Time Student* – A student enrolled for 12 or more semester credits, or 12 or more quarter credits, or 24 or more contact hours a week each term.
9. *Part-Time Student* – A student enrolled for either 11 semester credits or less, or 11 quarter credits or less, or less than 24 contact hours a week each term.
10. *In loco parentis* – Latin for "instead of a parent" or "in place of a parent," this phrase identifies a foster parent, a county custodial agency or a boarding school which is taking care of a minor, including protecting his/her rights.
11. *Credit* – Recognition of attendance or performance in an instructional activity (course or program) that can be applied by a recipient toward the requirements for a degree, diploma, certificate or other formal award.
12. *Credit Hour Activity* – The provision of coursework to students, which can be measured in terms of credit hours. For purposes of this study, total credit hour activity for a 3-credit hour course with an enrollment of 30 students is 90, which is determined by multiplying the credit hour value of the course by the total number of students attempting the course.
13. *Undergraduate Students* - All students enrolled in 4-year or 5-year bachelor's degree programs, associates degree programs, or any vocational/technical

programs that grant degrees, or certificates below the baccalaureate level. This includes students who have already earned a bachelor's degree but are taking undergraduate courses for college credit.

14. *Publicly Controlled Institution* - An educational institution whose programs and activities are operated by publicly elected or appointed school officials and which is supported primarily by public funds.
15. *Regional Accreditation Agency* – Any of six agencies that determine whether an institution meets the minimum requirements set for official approval of the agency. The agencies accrediting community colleges include: 1 – Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS), 2 – New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), 3 – North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS), 4 – Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NWASC), 5 - Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and 6 – Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
16. *On-Campus Housing Capacity* – The maximum number of students that the institution can provide with residential facilities, whether on or off campus (some colleges contract with private entities to offer off-campus dormitory space that is reserved by the institution).
17. *Board* – The charge for an academic year for meals, for a specified number of meals per week.
18. *Room Charges* – The charges for an academic year for rooming accommodations for a typical student sharing a room with one other student.

19. *National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA)* - A voluntary membership organization chartered in 1938 for California schools only. By 2003 the NJCAA had expanded to over 505 members in 44 states (NJCAA, 2003). The NJCAA acts as the governing and regulatory body for intercollegiate athletics in its member community colleges.
20. *Public Community College* – A college identified by the US Department of Education as being a publicly controlled, two-year college.
21. *Full-time Equivalent (FTE)* – The US Department of Education uses a multiplier to give an accurate estimate and equalize students who are enrolled part-time with those students who are enrolled full-time. For two-year institutions, approximately three part-time students are considered as equivalent to one full-time student. FTE enrollment equals full-time enrollment plus 1/3 part-time enrollment.
22. *Programming Element* – A specific type of training, counseling, informative session, or student service designed to strengthen the bond between the college, the residence hall staff and the students.

Limitations and Delimitations

Delimitations

1. This study investigates only publicly controlled two-year colleges that Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) used in their classifications. Four-year institutions, private postsecondary institutions, tribal colleges, and proprietary schools are not included in the study.

2. 2000- 2001 is the year of the IPEDS information used in gathering data on community colleges. While without doubt changes in available on-campus housing do occur from year to year, it is highly likely that the data found in the 2000-01 are representative data, given the permanent nature of residence hall construction.
3. This study does not attempt to assess the quality or design of residence halls or facilities, but rather only investigates the impact and scope of their presence on community college campuses.
4. Participants in the survey were limited to presidents and their designees (housing officers, student services staff, and president's cabinet members) who were employed during the 2003-2004 academic year.

Limitations

1. A total of 232 publicly controlled community colleges reported to IPEDS that they possessed residence halls. For the purpose of this study, this represents the universe to be surveyed as to practices, policies, and reasons for possessing residence halls. It is assumed that these institutions have reported accurate information to IPEDS.
2. No single existing instrument could be found to collect all of the data necessary for the study. The results of this study are limited by the survey instrument, which was developed and administered especially for the study.
3. The survey-sampling frame is limited to publicly controlled community colleges as identified by the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) classifications.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Introduction

Although ample information is available on four-year university housing, community college residence hall research is not as forthcoming. Nevertheless, this review of the literature will summarize and synthesize the small number of journal articles directly devoted to housing at community colleges. The search will also concentrate on the impact of athletics and fine arts programs on rural-serving community colleges with residence halls. Selected newspaper articles will provide information for discussion of specific colleges' housing offerings. It is important to note at the onset that none of the articles, reports, Websites or dissertations reviewed for this study included a hard, quantitative estimate as to the number of publicly controlled community colleges in the US with residence halls.

Research and literature on residence halls and housing in American higher education is extensive. Two searches employing descriptors such as "Housing Deficiencies," "Dormitories," "College Housing," "Student Housing," "Campus Planning," "Educational Trends," "Student Costs," "Ancillary School Services," "Housing Needs," "Access to Education," and "Residential Colleges," prompt over two thousand results. A third search using like descriptors produces over 2800 citations. The vast majority of these results are devoted to the concerns of four-year colleges and universities. Of the thousands of articles recovered from numerous search engines and databases, only 86 of these articles dealt exclusively with the subject of, and issues surrounding, community college residence halls. Of these 86, the majority merely displayed tables

presenting numbers of community colleges with residence hall facilities and did not investigate or elaborate on the risks, benefits, strengths and weaknesses of housing choices for students on campus. The content of these articles is not sufficient to provide a comprehensive analysis of the conditions, the trends, the predictions or the status of residence hall philosophies held by community colleges.

Journal Articles

Associations of college and university housing officers regularly publish journals regionally, nationally, and internationally supporting and promoting the collegiate residential experience. The Association of College and University Housing Offices – International (ACUHO-I), and its regional affiliate, Southwest Association of College and University Housing Offices (SWACUHO) are two large organizations that provide networking, support and information to their members. As supportive well-meaning and as the housing associations such as ACUHO-I and SWACUHO are, these groups tend to concentrate their efforts and attention on four-year institutions of higher education that offer bachelor's degrees and above. Articles in their journals, topics at their annual meetings, and other publications by and for their membership focus on the impacts, needs and challenges of university and four-year college residential management.

Likewise, in the literature of higher education, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) devote a substantial amount of space in their meta analysis of the complete college experience to issues of persistence and success that focus on the residential life of four-year college students. Regrettably, such topics as community college residence hall philosophy, management, trends, and student encounter are consolidated with the university literature, and tend to be rarely mentioned or overlooked altogether.

While some of the published research can apply to community college residence hall concerns, little of the available literature focuses on or reports studies that exclusively concentrate on community colleges. Such statistical abstracts of state-supported higher education as those published for North Carolina and New York (Central Staff Office of Institutional Research, State University of New York, Albany, 1995), Oregon, (Anderson Strickler, LLC, 2000) and Arizona report data covering the current status of all higher education, and in some reports, merely list number and percentage of community colleges that offer residence halls. Cory Decker's *Guide to Technical, Trade, and Business Schools, Including All Community Colleges*, (1998 – 2000), which lists community colleges, technical, trade and business schools alphabetically by region of the United States. In each of its four sections - Admissions, Financial, Academic, and Student Life - information on housing options at each profiled institution is included. Other reports focus entirely on the needs of the state's public four-year colleges and universities.

In his paper examining community attitudes toward colleges in Illinois and Iowa presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (AIR), Stout (1996) refers to economic impacts such as attracting new businesses, purchases made by college students, faculty and visitors, employee training provided by the colleges, the retention of young people in the community, college-related taxes, availability of college students as a part-time labor force, loss of income from the tax-exempt status of the college, the cost of providing government services to college personnel, inflation in prices of rental housing for students and college personnel who reside in off-campus locations, local entertainment, athletics, and other benefits, both monetary and non-

monetary. Stout concludes that knowledgeable people have opinions founded on economic contributions of local colleges and universities. While this information is valuable, it does not provide a complete representation of the profile of residence halls in community colleges.

In an unpublished manuscript by Ware and Miller (1997) on current research trends in college residential life, the authors note a lack of consistency in the findings of the current literature base and the relative anonymity of housing programs and professionals in the field. This manuscript underscores the need for national research, recognized authorities in the field, and consistency in the data associated with residential life at all institutions of higher education.

In his *Chronicle of Higher Education* article, Lords (1999) suggests that college recruitment efforts within such student populations as athletes, international students, and non-local students can be significantly expanded as a result of the building of residence halls. While Lords does not personally propose community college residence halls, he references and quotes people who both advocate and oppose them. Although critics of such proposals cite the loss of funds on new construction, the student reaction to having the option of living in college residence halls is positive. Lords did not; however, offer tables on how many or what type of community colleges had residence halls.

Murrell, Denzine and Murrell (1998) in their commentary state that in terms of success in higher education, residence hall staff members are perceived by students to be higher contributors to a climate of academic success than residential peers. As with

Lords, no accounting of number or type of community colleges offering residence halls on campus was included in this article.

The Bush White House

President George W. Bush acknowledged the efforts of community colleges in his State of the Union Address on January 20, 2004 (www.whitehouse.gov). In the section devoted to intensification of the job forecast, Bush stated that in addition to the crop of new workers entering the present job market, many older students and current workers also will need to strengthen their skills to compete for the jobs of tomorrow. These new workers current workers needing new training are prospective community college students. President Bush proposed more than \$500 million for a series of measures called Jobs for the 21st Century designed to provide extra help to middle and high school students who fall behind in reading and math, expand Advanced Placement programs in low-income schools, and invite math and science professionals from the private sector to teach part-time in high schools. In his 2005 State of the Union Address on January 19, 2005, President Bush proposed a five-year increase of \$500.00 to the maximum Pell Grant. This is good news for community colleges, because they represent an open door to almost anyone who aspires to earn a college education.

In addition, the President's Jobs for the 21st Century initiative also increases support for America's community colleges to provide training to workers for the industries that are creating the most new jobs. The initiative will also provide larger Pell Grants for low-income students who prepare for college with demanding courses in high school.

President Bush's Jobs for the 21st Century initiative also focuses on retraining workers, many of whom will receive their job training in community colleges that offer by workforce education associate's degree and/or certificate programs. These programs include, but are not limited to, nursing and allied health, office technology, computer information systems, biotechnology, hospitality, and building trades. As a new focus on community colleges and their effectiveness and impact on higher education becomes more manifest, writers and researchers have begun to realize the necessity of studying and publicizing the contributions of, the opportunities presented by, the challenges facing, and the strengths and requirements of our public community colleges. Housing needs will certainly factor into the decisions that these students and institutions will face.

The Catt Dissertation

In both his studies of adjustment problems of freshmen attending a non-residential community colleges, Catt (1998) contended that students who attend distant community colleges that do not offer residence halls have less academic success than students living and attending college in their home community. Catt noted that over 80% of community colleges do not have residence halls or provide any residential support systems. He also reported that of the 1,046 community colleges registered with the American Association of Community Colleges in 1995; only 55 institutions identified themselves as having residence halls. While he cited the above statistics, there was no national census or typography of community colleges with residence halls included in his study.

In a qualitative study of students and employees of a community college in the Northeast, Catt (1998) found obstacles to student success and retention such as

loneliness, housing problems, budgeting, an inability to bond with the community, and security concerns to be threats to student success in the community college. Grades and retention rates of the students studied were also analyzed, and it was determined that this quantitative data further illustrated Catt's concerns.

Catt focused his study on principles, attitudes, philosophies, and policies that enable students to learn. Retention and attrition of students is of extreme importance in the expansion of his student development theory. He cites the theories of Arthur Chickering, Lawrence Kohlberg and William Perry as being the most influential works toward guiding students to reach the goals of achieving competence, managing emotions, developing autonomy, establishing identity, freeing interpersonal relationships, developing purpose and developing integrity.

While these goals may seem lofty for an institution that no longer stands *in loco parentis*, it is apparent that societal changes through the history of community colleges have required an evolutionary approach to student development. A strong point he made is that because community colleges rely on current funds and grants for their budgetary needs, many times there are no surpluses, or for that matter, opportunities of any sort, for funding student development activities, as is the case with universities. Any political upheaval can have a devastating affect on publicly controlled community colleges. Because they have a shorter history on which to base their institutional mission, endowments from alumni, foundation support, certain state slush funds, and other university-specific grants or funding opportunities, are not forthcoming to community colleges (Catt, 1998). For many publicly controlled community colleges in

the United States, their only financial rewards come from increasing and retaining enrollment.

Historical Research

Articles from the 1980's were dedicated to the subjects of residence hall occupancy rates, long-range planning, market analyses, programs and services available within housing systems, and revitalization of existing residence halls are accessible. Hutchens (1986), Jons (1981) and Anderson and Atelsek, (1982) together provided a broad assessment that showed that 41% of community college students in Wyoming lived in residence halls.

Nonetheless, in published research devoted entirely to the information embracing community college residence halls, conflicting data abound. For example, according to Table 2 ("Number and Percentage of Community Colleges Offering Student Housing by State") in the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) resource titled "AACC Research and Data, February – December 1995," there were 307 U.S. community colleges (21.3%) that offered residence halls in 1992. The cited source for the data was the U.S. Department of Education. In his article in the April-May 2000 issue of the *Community College Journal*, Steven R. Saffian (2002) cites two figures from other sources. The first is from a November 12, 1998 article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in which David Pierce, the then president of the AACC, was quoted as saying, "only about 60 of the nation's 1,200 community colleges have on-campus housing." This figure of 60 community colleges corresponds to just 5% of his total. The second source is from *U.S. News and World Report's* college Website which documented in 2000 that, "a fifth of the 1,571 community colleges reported residential

housing with meal plans and campus security.” There is no data presently available to support any evidence that between 1998 and 2000, 371 new community colleges were established. Thus, the imprecise information included in the relatively small number of published sources provides some additional substantiation to the lack of accessible and reliable data dedicated to community college residence halls.

The Doggett Dissertation

A search of Dissertation Abstracts International recovered only two dissertations devoted to community college housing. It is interesting for a researcher to have access to previous documents to compare and contrast the findings and data of present studies. In addition to the Catt (1998) dissertation described previously, Billy Jack Doggett’s (1981) East Texas State University, now Texas A&M Commerce, dissertation presents guidelines for enhancing student development through residence education in community colleges. Doggett stated that there are certain aspects of student housing that are essential if community college residence halls are to be educationally oriented: (1) adopting a student housing philosophy, (2) determining goals and objectives which support that philosophy, (3) selecting a permanent, qualified staff to manage residence hall programs in accordance with the goals and objectives, and, (4) initiating specific programming that assists students in their intellectual and personal development. Doggett also acknowledged the need for further research dedicated to issues surrounding residence halls in community colleges, explored the existing research on residence halls in community colleges, and concluded that there were no guidelines available for community college leaders who wished to improve the quality of residential life or to establish procedures for dealing with community college residence halls.

Doggett (1981) developed and distributed a survey instrument to develop his theory and sent it to the entire population of ninety community colleges that were accredited through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges as his national sample. This survey was centered on the five components of residential education developed by Decoster and Mable in their 1974 work, *Student Development and Education in College Residence Halls*. According to Doggett, Decoster and Mable identified five components of residence hall education based on a student development concept: (1) systematic planning of the residence hall education, (2) the role of the residence educator in student development, (3) involvement of the student residents, (4) the various living options available to students, and (5) integration of residence halls with the formal academic curriculum.

Doggett (1981) sent his survey to 450 community college presidents, students, directors of housing, deans of instruction, and deans of student services who attended or were employed by the 90 community colleges accredited by SACS. The findings of his survey prompted the recommendation that his previously stated 4 aspects of student housing be inaugurated by officials in community colleges with residence halls.

Most of the background information used by Doggett (1981) was drawn from the literature on four-year colleges and university residence halls; for the reason that he repeatedly stressed that there was very little literature available regarding community college involvement in residence halls. In the 25 years since Doggett's study, this paucity of available literature continues to be evident. In his literature review, Doggett explored the history of residence halls and discussed the British system as well as the

American system, comparing and contrasting each, citing benefits of each, and listing possible shortcomings according to his theories.

The essence of Doggett's research was to establish a frame of reference that would embrace and integrate the community college mission to educate the whole individual. Doggett's procedures were proposed to serve as a framework for individual community colleges to formulate their own unique set of guidelines. Doggett's (1981) survey instrument was descriptive, containing thirty proposed guidelines for community college residence hall operations employing a Likert scale of response. Each question was answered recording both a value and reason scale. The values were philosophical, financial, administrative, and none. This survey posed 30 questions, most of which were focused toward the development of a community college residence hall philosophy. In a separate survey of the regional accrediting agencies, he found that none of them had knowledge or used specific guidelines determining the extent to which community colleges integrate their residence hall programs into their overall educational mission.

Doggett (1981) further researched residence education as it relates to student development, systematic planning, the role of the resident educator, the involvement of student residents, various living options, integration with formal curriculum, residence education as it relates to the developmental tasks of students, achieving emotional independence of parents and other adults, developing intellectual skills and concepts necessary for successful accomplishment and civic competence, achieving new and more mature relations with age-mates of both sexes, and achieving a masculine or feminine role in accepting one's physique. He also examined the process, of selection

and preparation for an occupation or profession, and the progression of acquiring a set of values and an ethical system as a means of achieving socially responsible behavior.

Doggett (1981) found that some colleges and universities did not perceive the role of residence halls as having an educative function. However, he believed that a progression toward this purpose seemed to be emerging with the demise of *in loco parentis*. As colleges repositioned from a custodial to an educationally oriented approach, the individual student's issues and needs were beginning to be the subject of some research. Rather than identify the primary emphasis and purpose of residence halls as to maintain student control and uphold rules and regulations, the college's residence halls should serve as sanctuaries that promote emotional, intellectual and personal growth.

Doggett (1981) concluded that there were no philosophical guidelines for community college residence halls, that there needed to be such guidelines, and that more study on the subject was called for. He recommended that community college officials who wanted to improve or evaluate their present residence hall philosophy could employ his study as a standard. He also recommended that further study be devoted to residence halls in community colleges.

It should be noted here that Doggett's call for community colleges to have a philosophy of administration for its residence halls was very consistent with the landmark work of Ernest L. Boyer (1991), who called for a new philosophy of student affairs in US colleges and universities. At the time he wrote this, Boyer was President of the prestigious Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching.

The Summers and Budig Study

The most relevant study found in the literature was conducted by Drs. Phillip Summers and Jeanne Budig (1988) of Vincennes University, which operates a public two-year college in Indiana. Through personal communication with Dr. Summers, President Emeritus of Vincennes, a copy of the study results from the 1987 survey was acquired. The study was presented in a roundtable discussion that Drs. Summers and Budig facilitated for the 1988 annual convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), now named the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC).

Summers and Budig (1988) surveyed the chief executive officers of 244 institutions reporting to IPEDS that indicated current residence hall systems. Based upon the 104 responses (46.7%), they drew the following nine conclusions: (1) most public institutions with residence halls were found in the South and in states with relatively low population concentration per square mile; (2) housing systems tended to be small, with 80% of the colleges reporting fewer than 500 beds; (3) 92.2% of the housing systems did their own maintenance/custodial services in-house; (4) 41% utilized in-house food services; (5) co-ed housing was available on 39 campuses; (6) 38 colleges had special housing for athletes, 17 for married students, and 12 for international students, while 4 had institutionally sponsored sororities and fraternities; (7) 70 campuses had conference housing during the summer; (8) study lounges were available in 72 housing facilities, 36 had tutoring available, 17 had computer terminals, and 2 offered credit classes within the facility; and (9) alcohol and drug use, eating disorders, and wellness or fitness programs emerged as major concerns. The paper

also contained a list of colleges that were willing to share their residence hall policy statements.

Interestingly, no additional surveys or studies that had been conducted in the 17 years from 1988 to the present addressing the specific issues of size and scope of programs and services available within community college residential systems, discipline, or other policies, priorities and concerns unique to two-year college residence programs could be found in the ERIC database.

After Budig and Summers (1988) identified the 244 institutions reporting “days per week for board” in a NCES publication (“College Costs: Basic Student Charges, two-year Institutions, 1983-84”) they noted that of these 244, 162 were public two-year colleges. The results of their survey were not surprising. They concluded that housing systems in community colleges tend to be small. Eighty percent of respondents reported fewer than 500 beds assigned. Rural community colleges led in number of institutions offering residence halls. The South (Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas) had the largest concentration of institutions with residence halls. Summers and Budig stated that virtually all the institutions experienced declining enrollments between 1985 and 1987, and that some of the colleges were dealing with vacant and unused halls; however, others were planning additional construction within the next ten years. The majority of the institutions with housing systems did their own residence hall maintenance in-house, and about 60% outsourced the food service contracts.

In a section devoted to specialized housing and special programming, Summers and Budig (1988) indicated that some community colleges offered specialized CO-ED, athletic, married student, international student, handicapped, honors students, and

“quiet floors” housing arrangements. Summer conference housing was also offered at a number of colleges, and others reported that they were planning to convert unused residence halls into conference housing. Available programs in the residence halls included wellness and fitness, eating disorders counseling, alcohol and drug abuse intervention programs, study lounges, tutoring, computer terminals, libraries within the residence halls, and offerings of credit classes inside the halls.

ACUHO-I and EBI Benchmarking Project

A benchmarking project sponsored by the ACUHO-I and Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI) provided considerable findings regarding student and staff perceptions of the college and university housing experience. David Butler, (2002) project director of the study, offered a new paradigm in higher education research and presented his findings to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA).

Numerous directories, pamphlets and reports are easily and regularly available from education agencies in states such as California (1980), Mississippi (1990), Texas (1993), Iowa (1995), and New York (1995). These publications list information such as enrollment numbers of full and part-time students, graduation requirements, resident status, sources of revenue, utilization of facilities, age and characteristics of students, gender, ethnicity, family income, marital status, educational goals, degrees sought, programs offered, completions, demographics, social characteristics, salaries of faculty and staff, financial scholarships, amounts paid for housing, tuition and fees, student aid, transportation, miscellaneous fees, and types of technology available at the campuses in California, Iowa, and New York. While these analyses offer tables, comparisons, and

statistics addressing four-year postsecondary institutions, the state's community colleges, if mentioned at all, are not tackled separately. The only exception is the state of Mississippi, which operates a separate State Board for its 16 community and junior colleges.

Relevant Studies Since Summers and Budig

Recent newspaper and Internet articles devoted to college housing center on four-year schools. An article by Pallack in the *Arizona Daily Star* (Jan. 11, 2004) discusses alternative housing to dormitories. As changing demographics and advanced technologies are impacting institutions of higher education as a whole, the housing systems are also challenged and encouraged to adapt and embrace the changes that technologies offer. While this article focused on universities in Arizona, it gave tips to parents of any age college student on purchasing condominiums and houses. Additional tips and suggestions were given as other options dealing with student housing.

David Unruh (1995) predicted trends based on the diverse generational housing necessities of college undergraduates. As student populations associated with college residential halls no longer exclusively reflect the needs of single, 18 to 2two-year-old, full-time, Western European, Caucasian, heterosexual residential students, and as federal and state support for education are declining, college officials are challenged to make difficult choices between improving existing facilities and offering additional services more suited to present demands. Technology accessibility, creature amenities, heightened student expectations, and generational peer personality traits dictate the tone of the popular culture and the success and failures of student residence hall policy and budget decisions.

Unruh (1995) cites four generational peer personalities and offers the following analyses. The *Civic Generation*, born between 1901 and 1924, controls 60% of the wealth of the United States. This is a heroic, community-oriented, overachieving group who went to college on the GI Bill, and became builders of giant corporations. The *Adaptive Generation*, born between 1925 and 1942, has little influence in national affairs, has yet to produce a U.S. President, and grew up overprotected and suffocated during the Great Depression and World War II. They are also known as the Silent Generation. The *Idealist Generation* is the most visible generation of the 20th century. These “Baby Boomers,” born between 1943 and 1960, came of age during the Consciousness Awakening of the 1960s and 1970s, and fragmented into the Yuppies of the 1980s, are inwardly focused and self-indulgent. Having produced two U.S. presidents, Boomers are raising the last of the Thirteenth Generation (Generation X). The *Reactive Generation*, born between 1961 and 1981 are risk takers, under-protected and criticized for their caustic view on life.

Unruh (1995) predicted that beginning in the fall of 2000, the cycle of the four generations would begin again on college campuses. A new Civic Generation, born after 1982 and growing up with increased parental protection, positive outlooks, a flair for technology, affluence, and a sense of community pride would enroll in higher education. The members of the new Civic Generation are comfortable with computers, economic advantages, and appropriate social behavior, but uncomfortable with sharing a bedroom and toilet facilities with strangers. Civic Generation students of the new Millennium come to campuses from diverse cultures, ethnic backgrounds, lifestyles, and may not be comfortable with those of differing foci. Residence hall staff will be able to

shift their concentration from discipline to offering programs on community building. According to Unruh, to meet the changing generational peer students' needs, it is essential that residence halls undergo vast structural and programmatic reorganization, and that housing officials will need to be prepared to document how residence hall life improves the quality of education.

Where is the financial basis for this kind of change? The answer could possibly be through privatization, according to Gregory Johnson and Rafael Anchia (2003) of the Patton Boggs Law Firm, a national law firm based in Washington, D.C., with offices in Texas, Colorado, Virginia and Alaska. Posted on the firm's Web page in November 2003, their Internet article outlines a plan to privatize student residence halls. This is the route taken by Collin County Community College District located in several suburban areas of Dallas, Texas. Specific tax advantages, such as 501(c)(3) non-profit status can allow colleges to enter into lease arrangements with national housing nonprofit corporations, which Patton Boggs represent. The nonprofit corporations participate in a tax-exempt bond issue, which, if passed, will provide funding for facility construction. Secured solely by project revenues, the bond issue is not associated in any way with the college. The college gains the benefit of a quality residence hall product by using the efficiencies and creativity of the private sector, while maintaining control over the design, operation and quality of the project, without incurring additional debt or obligation on its balance sheet. Once constructed, a private company or the college's housing system can manage the residence hall project.

Based on current data, there are nearly 60 million students currently enrolled in grades 1-12, and these students will be more likely to attend college than at any time in

US history. With college enrollments predicted to continue to rise through 2020 (Murdoch, 2002), there will be more opportunities for colleges to offer residence hall options to students than ever before, and housing issues must be addressed.

In summary and conclusion, there are very few published studies devoted to the subject of community college residence halls. Of those studies available, most are either decades old, assume that information gained from universities applies equally to community colleges, based on interviews with specific regional subjects, or focused on philosophy and policy rather than specific data. While residence hall educational programs have long been considered an important subsystem of higher education, they have not received the attention of researchers necessary to adequately and accurately analyze and report on trends, improvements and challenges faced by campus directors. Additional information devoted specifically to residence halls and their administration in two-year publicly controlled community colleges is greatly needed, particularly as community colleges are challenged to serve increasing numbers of traditional aged students.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND COLLECTION OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodological procedures were employed to investigate the use of residence halls at community colleges in the United States. Procedures consisted of a two-part descriptive and quantitative analysis of public community colleges related to residence hall operations to determine how many and which community colleges are involved. The next stage was the development a profile of those community colleges that do operate residence halls and housing facilities. The Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) Community College Classification System was used to identify appropriate institutional types for inclusion in this study, as well as to categorize the institutions for the purpose of data analysis.

Research Questions

As noted in Chapter 1, the research questions investigated in this study are as follows:

Primary Research Questions

1. What is the extent of community college involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students?
2. What are the major reasons justifying community college involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students?
3. Are there differences in the level of involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students among and between rural-, suburban-, and urban-serving community colleges?

Secondary Research Questions

1. What is the financial investment of community colleges in the operation of residence halls?
2. Which of the following reasons are generally considered by practitioners to be benefits of operating residence halls at community colleges?
 - a. a positive impact on institutional finances
 - b. increased full-time student enrollments
 - c. student life producing a “college experience” (broad array of services)
 - d. making other student services more efficient (spreading costs of campus dining, health center, etc.)
 - e. diversifying the student body (international students, athletes, minority students, etc.)
 - f. diversifying academic program enrollments (fine arts, allied health and nursing, etc.)
3. How are residence halls at community colleges practically administered?

Research Design – Part I

In Part I of this study, data from the National Center for Educational Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) were extracted and analyzed to determine which community colleges are involved in residence halls and what the characteristics of these institutions are. For purposes of this study, IPEDS surveys for the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 academic years were used.

The researcher secured an institutional database of public two-year colleges that has been encoded with Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) Classification System

identification codes from the University of North Texas College of Education's Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education (BJPCCCE) as a starting point from which to perform a number of data extractions from the NCES IPEDS databases to create a number of descriptive data tables for use in the analysis of public community colleges that operate residence halls regarding the following institutional characteristics:

- a. Presence of residence halls (if any)
- b. Housing capacity
- c. Cost for student room and board
- d. Enrollment by Gender
- e. Enrollment by Ethnicity
- f. Number of Full-Time Degree/Certificate Seeking Students
- g. Full-Time and Part-Time Enrollment
- h. Enrollment by Age Category
- i. Credit Hours of Undergraduate Instruction
- j. Types of Educational Offerings Available
- k. Special Learning Opportunities and Student Services Available

Definition and Selection of Population for Part I

The population involved in Part I of the study includes all public, two-year community colleges that reported, via the IPEDS survey collection system, that they operate residence halls. The primary year of study and the basis for construction of the study samples is the 2001-2002 academic year. As not all institutions reported all data elements via the IPEDS survey collection system in every year that the surveys have been administered, the sample for each of the data elements listed above varied. In each case, the sample included all institutions that reported.

Part I Instrumentation – Identification of IPEDS Data Elements to Be Used

For Part I of this study, appropriate data elements for tabulation and analysis of the characteristics identified above was extracted from the following 2001-2002 academic year NCES IPEDS surveys: Institutional Characteristics (IC); Enrollment (EF);

Completions (C); Graduation Rates (GRS). A table presenting a crosswalk between each research question component and the IPEDS survey and questions/items used as source data is included as an appendix.

Part I Data Extraction Procedures

To extract and prepare the data necessary for the investigation of each institutional characteristic of interest in Part I of the study, the following steps were taken:

1. Using the IPEDS Dataset Cutting Tool found at <http://www.nces.ed.gov/ipedspas/>, the IPEDS UnitID numbers for all public, two-year institutions coded as urban-serving, suburban-serving or rural-serving on the classification master list was uploaded to create a cohort for data extraction.
2. Once this occurred, the required data elements from the appropriate IPEDS surveys were selected for the 2001-2002 academic year and downloaded as comma-separated value files.
3. These files were then imported into Excel[®] and, using Access[®], were linked to the classification master list to make a file that contained a single record for each institution containing all data elements.
4. The resulting Excel[®] worksheet was then filtered to include only those community colleges that indicate via IPEDS that they *do* operate residence halls. All other institutional records were deleted, and further analysis involved only the residence hall-operating institutions that remained.

Part I Data Analysis

To analyze the data for each data element extracted from IPEDS in Part I of the study, a series of cross-tabulations were done. In each of these, the data was aggregated to the institutional class and subclass levels using the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) Classification System codes appended to each record and included simple calculations such as number and percentage of the entire sample and number of cases within the class or subclass.

Part I Output

The data extracted and analyzed in Part I of this study is presented as a series of tables with one table for each IPEDS data element included in the survey instrument. Each table includes aggregate data for each institutional type reported by Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) class and subclass. Additionally, where it appears to be useful in illustrating the data, charts and other visual representations of this aggregate data have been created.

Research Design – Part II

As a second stage of this study, a survey was mailed to Presidents and housing officers at each of the community colleges determined in Part I to be operating residence halls or housing facilities. This survey was used to collect data concerning the level and scope of institutional housing operations and to collect specific data that is not available through the analysis of the IPEDS datasets related directly to student housing operations.

Definition and Selection of Population for Part II

The population for Part II of this study was all community colleges that operate residence halls as identified in Part I. As the number of such institutions is low, all members of the institutional population were sent a survey.

Part II Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedures

As no survey instrument currently exists that includes items related to all of the research questions and areas of interest being explored in this study, the researcher developed an original instrument. Items from the survey instrument used in the 1987 Summers and Budig (1988) study and the survey utilized by ACUHO-I to collect housing-related data from four-year colleges and universities as part of a 2001-benchmarking project were used as the bases for this new instrument. An initial draft of the survey instrument and cover letter are included at the end of this study.

Once the survey instrument was approved and finalized, it was constructed using Inquisite[®] survey software as a scannable form and was sent via first class U. S. mail to presidents of each community college operating residence halls identified in Part I. Respondents were given two weeks in which to return the survey.

Part II Data Analysis

At the expiration of the response period, all returned survey instruments were read and all data were exported. These response records were linked to the records created in Part I to analyze the data for each item in the survey in relation to the other data that had already been extracted from IPEDS in Part I and from the master classification list received from the BJPCCCE. Then, a cross-tabulation of the responses to each survey item was done. In each of these, the data were aggregated at

the institutional class and subclass levels using the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) Classification System codes appended to each record and included calculations number and percentage of the entire population and number of cases within the class or subclass.

Part II Output

The data extracted and analyzed in Part II of this study are presented as a series of tables with one table for each item on the survey instrument. Each table includes aggregate data for each institutional type reported by Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) class and subclass. Additionally, where it appears to be useful in illustrating the data, charts and other visual representations of this aggregate data have been created.

Summary

Thus, using on-line data extraction procedures to pull information from the IPEDS database, a national survey of community college housing officers, and standard methods of calculating and presenting basic descriptive statistics including means, percentages and case counts, this study created a set of quantitative, tabular outputs for the review and analysis that constitutes Chapter 4 of the dissertation to draw the conclusions that are presented as Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Introduction

This study contained three primary research questions and three secondary research questions. The three primary questions were as follows: “What is the extent of community college involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students?” “What are the major reasons justifying community college involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students?” and “Are there differences in the level of involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students among and between rural-, suburban-, and urban-serving community colleges?” These three questions served as the basis for the research data gathered for this dissertation.

The secondary research questions of the study were the following: “What are generally considered by practitioners to be benefits of operating residence halls at community colleges?” “How are residence halls at community colleges administered?” and “What is the financial impact of operating residence halls at community colleges on full-time enrollments, student life, and other student services?” These three secondary questions provided opportunities for explanations, analysis, and qualitative responses.

Responses from the survey that was sent to the Presidents or CEOs of all the publicly controlled community colleges who reported residence halls to IPEDS were analyzed for results. Because the entire population of publicly controlled community college presidents reporting residence halls was surveyed, the data recorded represents the actual responses, percentages, and the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) Classifications as a basis for analysis. Simple calculations are used to report the

data. The next section of this chapter will describe the population of publicly controlled community colleges responding to the survey according to size, location, and classification. Where applicable, tables are included to further explain findings.

Sample

The entire population of the 232 public community colleges reporting residence halls to IPEDS in 2001-2002 and identified by Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) was selected to receive a copy of the survey. The resulting 232 public community colleges were then sorted by governance (single or multi-campus), size (small, medium or large, according to student population), and geographic location (rural-serving, suburban-serving or urban-serving). The sorting procedure was performed by employing the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2005), (1993, 1996 and 2003) classifications. As the typology continues to be revised during its existence, this study employs the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy Classifications (2005), the 2000 US census information, and the 2000-2001 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics and Enrollment Survey data, which is the most complete and current information available at the time of the survey. IPEDS generally delays about two years between collection of data from colleges and granting public access to the reported data.

Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) data identified the 232 public community colleges with residence halls, and copies of the 21-question survey were mailed through the United States Postal Service to the presidents of these colleges. The survey cover letter also included a suggestion to each president to consult with the campus housing staff and incorporate responses from the college's housing officers in their replies.

When the responses were tabulated, it was observed that 28 of the colleges that responded were components of universities. These schools are classified as “2 under 4”, or “regional campuses” and their responses are not included in the analysis. An example of the 2-under-4 classification corresponds to the twenty-four community Associate Degree-granting colleges attached to Pennsylvania State University. While these campuses award associate degrees and may be located in suburban or rural areas of Pennsylvania, their governance is from a public state university perspective, and not from the standpoint of a locally controlled public community college overseen and advised by elected trustees from the service area of the college. Because of the above reasons, these “2-under-4” responses were not viewed as appropriate, and the data did not become part of this study. Additional states reporting residence halls in community colleges under the governance of universities are Arkansas, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Wisconsin and West Virginia. Not all of these colleges responded to the survey.

Responses from the surveys sent to the remaining 204 colleges were used to compile the data for this study. Of the 204 remaining publicly controlled community colleges, 126 colleges responded to the survey. This resulted in a total response rate of 61%. Inferences, findings, conclusions and recommendations in this study are based on the data collected from these response data.

As not all responders provided answers to every one of the questions, there is discrepancy in some of the percentages and total responses to some of the survey questions. More than one president sent the survey back completely unanswered.

Another president returned the blank survey with a personal note stating that their college does not answer unsolicited surveys. The researcher realized caution in requesting data on such subjects as school finances, gross or net profits, losses, and salaries. Responses were not as forthcoming on these subjects as others. The subject of salaries was avoided altogether. The act of requesting access to this sensitive information can be perceived by some top administrators as going beyond the scope of a student-generated study. Consequently, inquiries involving these subject matters might be more appropriately posed by such entities as state and federal government agencies, grant funding bodies, regional, state and national accreditation organizations, or the elected members of the boards of trustees, the taxpayers who personally support the college.

Table 2 below provides a description of the type, percentage of responses, and location classifications of the colleges responding to the survey. As documented by the numbers and percentages of the totals in each category, residence halls in public community colleges are not evenly distributed among the three classification types. The reported residence halls are located primarily in publicly controlled community colleges in the rural areas of the United States. The rural publicly controlled community colleges comprise 59% of all colleges reporting residence halls on campus. With nearly three times the number of colleges offering on campus housing located in rural areas as either suburban or urban, the rural public community college presidents contributed the majority of the data used as research for this study.

Table 2

Public Community Colleges that Reported to IPEDS as Possessing Residence Halls, By Type of Community College using the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2005) classifications (n = 126)

Type of Community College		Total in Katsinas Classification	Total Reporting Housing to IPEDS, 2001	Total Responding to Survey	Category Responding to Survey %
Rural	Small	206	51	26	51%
	Medium	499	107	73	68%
	Large	217	32	18	56%
	Total, Rural	922	190	117	62%
Suburban	Single Campus	122	6	2	33%
	Multi-Campus	206	8	6	75%
	Total, Suburban	328	14	8	57%
Urban	Single Campus	44	0	0	0%
	Multi-Campus	258	2	1	50%
	Total Urban	302	2	1	50%
Combined Totals:		1,552	206	126	61%

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Table 3

Two-Year Publicly Controlled Colleges Reporting in 2001 that They Possessed Residence Halls to the US Department of Education Compared to the Survey Responses to the 2004 Survey “Survey of On-Campus Housing at Community Colleges” By Accrediting Region

Accrediting Region	Two-year Colleges		Survey Respondents 2004		Total Percent Responding
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Middle States	18	8%	7	5%	39%
New England	6	3%	1	1%	17%
North Central	104	45%	63	46%	61%
Northwest	15	6%	10	7%	67%
Southern	71	31%	44	32%	62%
Western	16	7%	11	8%	69%
Total	232		136		

Another approach on reporting to IPEDS was to inspect selected states and determine the actual number of community colleges and the actual number of those that report residence halls. Table 4 below illustrates the data that corresponds to the 38 states that reported residence halls to IPEDS in 2001. Table 4 also shows the number of community colleges whose presidents responded to this study’s survey. All survey responses were tabulated. Some of the responses; however, were deemed unusable because they were either from four-year colleges that had a two-year component, two-year community colleges that were not publicly controlled, or from special interest institutions that did not serve all types of students, such as tribal colleges and colleges that were specifically designed for a certain type of student, for example, the deaf.

Table 4

Two-Year Colleges who Indicated to IPEDS in 2001 that they possessed On-campus Housing, by State

State	Number of Colleges with Residence Halls	
	reporting to IPEDS	responding to Survey
1. AK	2	0
2. AL	8	2
3. AR	1	1
4. AZ	6	4
5. CA	11	6
6. CO	7	3
7. FL	3	2
8. GA	6	2
9. HI	1	1
10. IA	11	8
11. ID	1	1
12. IN	1	1
13. KS	20	16
14. KY	2	1
15. MD	1	1
16. ME	5	1
17. MI	5	5
18. MN	6	3
19. MO	8	5
20. MS	16	11
21. MT	4	2
22. ND	5	3
23. NE	6	3
24. NH	1	1
25. NM	5	1
26. NV	1	1
27. NY	8	3
28. OH	2	0
29. OK	12	5
30. OR	4	3
31. PA	9	5
32. SC	1	0
33. TX	37	25
34. UT	3	2
35. WA	4	3
36. WI	3	3
37. WV	1	0
38. WY	7	2

Results of Survey Outcomes

Research Question 1: What is the extent of community college involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students, in terms of number of community colleges with residence halls, number of beds, and types of dorms including coed/single sex residence halls? Of the 21 survey questions, several addressed a special concern to the extent of involvement in the operation of on-campus housing. The first question was to determine who owns the on-campus housing at each college. Table 5 below relates to the ownership of the residence hall facilities.

The extent to which on-campus housing is owned by the college is extremely high in all three rural-serving geographic location sub-categories. In the public rural community colleges, an overwhelming majority of those reporting, for a total of 87% of the colleges, own their residence halls. This is compared to 5% reporting that an outside interest owns the housing and 4% reporting dual ownership between the college and a third party. The remaining 15 colleges, or 13% of the respondents, did not generate a usable answer to the question. In the non-rural colleges 100% of all responses indicated that the college owned the residence halls/on-campus housing.

The question also addresses the notion of privatizing the residence halls. At this time, even though published literature and personal communication suggests that many colleges privatize other services such as bookstores, campus maintenance and food service. They also report that they are researching possibilities and even making inroads towards privatization of residence halls; however, the inclination to follow through with privatization of residence halls has not proved to be the course of action by those responding to the survey.

Table 5

Ownership and Operation of Residence Halls at Rural Publicly-Community Colleges using the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2005) Classifications: Survey Question #1 - Who owns and operates the on-campus housing at your college? (n = 124)

Community College Type		Total Responding to Survey Item	Owned by College	Owned by Third Party	Both College and Third Party Own
Rural -Serving	Small	27	26	1	0
	Medium	72	59	5	4
	Large	17	16	0	1
	Total	116	101	6	5
	Percent	100%	87%	7%	6%
Total, Non-Rural		15	15		

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.

According to IPEDS data, by far the largest proportion of residence halls in public community colleges is located in rural-serving areas. Thus, while a respectable percentage of these institutions returned the survey, the number of responses to the entire survey from both suburban-serving and urban-serving colleges was extremely small. For purposes of reporting, the suburban-serving and urban-serving institutions will be regrouped and results will be categorized as Rural-Serving and Non-Rural Serving from this point forward. No equitable conclusions can be drawn, but the

information from their responses is nevertheless presented to allow information to be reported even though the response was small. As represented in Table 6 below, a large number of community college students live in on campus residence halls. According to the survey responses, the vast majority, 93% of all beds are located in rural-serving community colleges. Based on the typology of the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2005) Classifications, of the 101 rural-serving institutions reporting the number of beds, 17% of all rural-serving beds were in small colleges, 65% were located in medium colleges and 18% in large rural-serving community colleges.

Of note is that 71 (31%) of the colleges reporting on campus housing are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The majority of these colleges, 103, (44%) of schools reporting residence halls on campus are accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS). These two regions comprise the largest agriculturally based economies in the country and together account for 75% of the colleges reporting residence halls on campus. This contradicts the Catt (1998) study that reported the majority of residence halls in community colleges were located in the rural South.

The passage of a decade could in part account for the discrepancy in figures. Additionally, the South has the greatest concentration of rural-serving community colleges, but some of these community colleges are not publicly controlled. Catt did not differentiate between publicly controlled community colleges and all two-year institutions in his study. The finding is consistent; however, with the Summers and Budig (1988) and with Catt studies, that indicated that the rural community colleges had relatively small facilities.

Table 6

Number of Beds in Residence Halls at Public Community Colleges, by Type of Community College using the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2005) Classifications

Survey Question #2: Please indicate the total number of beds at your college's on-campus housing. (n = 124)

Community College Type		Total Responding to Survey Item		Total Beds in Residence Halls	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Rural -Serving	Small	23	23%	6,060	17%
	Medium	65	64%	22,912	65%
	Large	17	17%	6,420	18%
	Total	101	100%	35,392	100%
	Average Number of Beds			350	
Total, Non-Rural		8		2,595	

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey. 109 respondents replied to this question.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

The third survey question addressed the existence of specialized on campus housing. College presidents or housing officers were requested to supply data on their campus' extending a choice of housing types that are either restricted to special populations or are designed for the distinctive needs of certain student groups. The next table shows in rank order the responses of the community college presidents. Of special interest is the information that community colleges do, indeed offer specialized housing.

They are very responsive to the needs of their on campus residents. The most widely offered specialized housing was non smoking rooms. With 47% responding that they offer specialized housing for non-smokers; this demonstrates recognition that some students might be allergic or hypersensitive to cigarette or cigar smoke. It serves as an authentication of the awareness of the residence hall decision-makers to the needs of non-smoking students.

Community colleges also responded that they offered specialized housing for athletes. Many athletic scholarships at community colleges include room and board privileges to the students who represent the schools in certain intercollegiate athletics. Offering special halls, floors or sections to team members can often contribute to a sense of teamwork, school spirit, increase student retention and promote recruitment. Living as a team in specialized housing also fosters a certain prestige and recognition that is associated with representing the college on an athletic team. A total of 27% of those responding offered specialized athletic living facilities.

Other areas offered by more than 10% of the reporting population were private rooms, and 12-month living options. For students who attend classes year round or who practice with their athletic teams during summers and breaks, or who work at 12-month jobs on campus or in the vicinity, it is important to have living accommodations that support these efforts. Twenty-three percent of the community colleges offer 12-month residence hall contracts.

Private rooms are another well-appreciated specialty of a student-centered campus. The 2-person "cell" approach to residence hall living, equipped with large, open shower rooms and multiple rows of restroom stalls located down the hall on each

floor, so customary in the residence facilities of previous decades, is losing favor as students prefer more personal privacy and the opportunity to control their own space. In fact, 27% of respondents indicated that there were private rooms offered to students, when available. Housing for married and single-parent family students, which together comprise 33% of responses from the question regarding specialized housing, would be forced to secure more expensive off-campus rental housing, and would in all probability not be comfortable or appropriately served by the “cell” approach to residence hall living. If it were not for the specialized housing offered at some campuses, some students simply would not attend. Special academic programs, such as nursing and firefighting, and academic honors specialty housing added to the most common specialized lodging options, accounting for 12% and 10% respectively.

The responses from this survey question address the first as well as the third primary research question, which is, “Are there differences in the level of involvement in the operation of on-campus housing for students among and between rural-, suburban-, and urban-serving community colleges?” By offering specialized housing for certain selected categories of students, community colleges extend their level of involvement to a more student-centered status than merely offering a one-size-fits-all, take-it-or-leave-it option. This is consistent with the findings of Catt (1998) and Doggett, (1981) who qualitatively interviewed students and recorded their preferences. It is also consistent with the ACUHO-I study. Table 7 below illustrates the types of specialized housing offered and the types of colleges where they are offered. The options are listed in descending order, with the most commonly offered specialization, Non-Smoking, listed first.

Table 7

Specialized Housing at Rural Community Colleges that Reported Possessing Residence Halls to IPEDS by Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2005) Classifications – Survey Question #3: Does your college offer specialized housing for... (N = 124)

Type of Specialized Housing	Total number of colleges responding affirmative	Colleges indicating responses to specific items					
		Total Non-Rural	Rural Community Colleges			Rural Totals	
			Type of Rural College			Total	%
			Small	Medium	Large		
Non-Smoking	63	5	12	37	9	58	47%
Athletics Residence	38	4	8	18	8	34	27%
Private Rooms	35	2	8	19	6	33	27%
12 Month	33	5	4	20	4	28	23%
Single Parent/Family	25	2	4	17	2	23	19%
Married Student/Family	18	1	4	12	1	17	14%
Specific Acad. Programs	18	3	3	10	2	15	12%
Honors	12	0	1	8	3	12	10%
Quiet or Intensive Study	10	0	3	7	0	10	8%
First Year Experience	5	0	1	3	1	5	4%
International House	4	0	1	2	1	4	3%
Smoking	4	0	2	2	0	4	3%

Notes:

1. Percentages do not add to 100% because colleges multiple answers were permitted in this survey question.
2. A total of 124 useable responses were received from colleges responding to this survey item Notes:
3. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
4. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
5. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
6. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
7. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.

Medium sized, rural-serving publicly controlled community colleges provided the majority of answers to this question. Over 52% of all institutions that reported that they offered students specialized housing options were from this category.

If students are moving into on-campus housing, from where are they moving? The next survey question is devoted to determining the primary home location of the students who occupy on campus residence halls. The next table reveals that approximately 45% of all on campus residents live outside the primary service area of the college they attend. What are the conclusions that can be drawn from this data? It is possible that the residence halls located on campuses in remote areas contribute greatly to the total enrollment of the colleges. Even though a college is located within a certain number of miles from a student's home, it does not guarantee that this is always a reasonable commute for students.

When evaluating the distance between home and school, one must take into consideration such factors as the yearly weather conditions, the terrain between home and school, and road conditions. When comparing these circumstances, it can be reasonably supposed that a 20-mile commute is not the same in every area of the United States. A distance that would involve a matter of minutes for someone driving on a suburban or urban street, an Interstate highway, a freeway, or another type of 4-lane divided highway could wind up taking several hours. If the driver had to navigate through snow, over mountains, through rural back roads, or was experiencing road construction, repair or other delays, commuting to campus via unreliable conditions could prove prohibitive to academic success. The fluctuation of the price of gasoline and car repairs also account for some unexpected expenses that commuters can incur.

This in some measure explains the high percentage of non-rural commuters. In urban and suburban areas that can justifiably afford to maintain hazardous weather road equipment, the thoroughfares are many times more drivable. Direct routes to campus have been laid out by city planners to ease commute time in all kinds of weather far more often than in rural locations. Additionally, students attending college in rural areas are less likely than urban or suburban-serving community college students to have access to public transportation such as busses, trains and light rail, and must rely on their own automobiles, bicycles or walking to attend classes. Another strong case for on-campus housing involves student autonomy. Leaving home, making decisions on their own, and learning to be independent are further challenges that college students face. This supports Catt (1998) who discussed the adjustments that two-year college students face attending a distant college without on-campus housing.

The greatest percentage of responses on the subject of the primary service area reported in Table 8 below was received from the rural-serving medium sized, publicly controlled community colleges. Fifty-eight per cent of their students were reported as living outside the primary service area of the college. Whether these students might be moving to campus because of athletic recruitment, nearest location to home, specialized education such as nursing, firefighting, or allied health occupations, it is clear that living on campus is an option that they choose. Not only do the medium-sized rural colleges make up the largest group of colleges in the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2005) community college classifications, they also provided the highest percentage of total responses to all items in the survey.

Table 8

Percentage of Students in Residence Halls from the College's Primary Service Area at Rural Community Colleges using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question # 4: What percent of the students in the residence halls come from the college's primary service area?

Community College Type		Responses (N = 124)	Mean % from Service Area
Rural Serving	Small	22	42%
	Medium	56	58%
	Large	15	35%
	Total	93	45%
Non Rural Serving ⁶		6	
Total		99	

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

A major factor in the determination of space for students is the gender of the students who will inhabit the residence halls. Table 9 below addresses this issue. It is obvious that in all of the classifications, the male population of residence halls constitutes the majority. This is possibly true in part to the fact that athletic teams in male-dominated sports such as football, basketball, track, and baseball are more common components of community college athletics, and as stated previously, athletic scholarships often include room and board.

The overwhelming majority (98%) of students from all classifications that were reported to reside in on-campus facilities are single. Even though, as discussed in Table 5, there are significant numbers of colleges that reported that they provide specialized accommodations for married students (14%) and single parent families (19%), the percentage of colleges that offered specialized housing for these groups is substantially lower than for athletics (27%). This figure does not take into consideration the actual number of specialty units each college offers, merely that they offer a specialized housing option for these students.

Table 9

Residence Hall Populations by Gender and Marital Status at Rural Publicly-Controlled Community Colleges, using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question Item #5A: Please estimate the percentage of students living in your residence halls who are male, female, single, and married.

Community College Type		# Resp. Colleges (N = 111)	By Gender (%)		By Marital Status (%)	
			M	F	Single	Married
Rural Serving	Small	26	60%	40%	99%	1%
	Medium	57	56%	44%	94%	6%
	Large	20	54%	46%	100%	0%
	Total and Mean %	103	56%	44%	98%	2%
Non Rural Serving ⁶		8	(n/a)			

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 111 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 15 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Taking into consideration the large number of community colleges that offer and recruit athletes for scholarship opportunities, and that the majority of athletic teams in community colleges are comprised of single males, even though a respectable number of female athletes are playing for community college teams, it follows that single males account for 60% of inhabitants of publicly controlled community college on campus residential facilities (Castaneda, 2004).

The age group and path of study of the students at publicly controlled community colleges is the subject of the next survey question and table. Table 8 refers to the age and curricular route taken by the students. As in other tables, the vast majority of responses are from medium, rural-serving colleges. The population is made up of full-time students between the ages of 18 and 24, and they are taking transfer courses. Over 90% of students from reporting colleges are full-time students between the ages of 18 and 24, and the number of transfer students is more than double compared to that of the non-transfer students. The non-transfer curriculum students could possibly be enrolled in specialized vocational courses offering such programs as auto and diesel mechanics, heating and air conditioning repair, funeral science, welding, building trades, nurses aide, cosmetology, medication aide and home-health aide training, auto body repair, firefighter academies, and other career options that, while are not offered in four-year institutions, are well-compensated and respected vocations that are very important to the quality of life in rural, suburban and urban settings.

According to the data supplied in Tables 10 and 11 below, a snapshot of the typical residence hall inhabitant of a publicly controlled community college residence hall would be a male, between the ages of 18 and 24, who attended classes full-time,

and would be enrolled in courses that would transfer to a four-year college or university. To be considered eligible for certain types of athletic scholarship awards, a student must be enrolled in courses that involve degree or certificate completion. This partially explains the transfer enrollment. This is consistent with the Summers and Budig (1988) study.

If you build it, will they come? The question of the population of the halls having been answered, it is next in the line of interest to determine the overall proportion of filled beds and waiting lists of those who wish to be assigned a place in the residence halls.

Table 11 below illustrates the present capability of residence halls in rural-serving publicly controlled community colleges to provide for the students who request living facilities. It also shows that approximately 39% of those reporting have waiting lists for space. This information is valuable to those responsible for strategic planning, future facilities usage, proposed bond elections, and student services.

Roughly 4 out of 5 (81%) of the reporting institutions affirmed that they were filled to capacity. Of those, an average of 87% of them were rural-serving, and 34% of the rural-serving institutions reported that they had waiting lists. A few presidents wrote notes on their survey to indicate that the waiting lists were for family housing and apartments only. This underlines the previous notion in Table 6 that students prefer a more home-like environment to the traditional dormitory "cell" approach to campus residence halls.

The non-rural serving institutions that reported stated that 89% of their residence halls were full. Additionally, the non-rural colleges reported that 60% had waiting lists of

students requesting to be a resident of the college's on-campus housing. Students like to have the option to live on campus. They also like to live in a residence that offers home-like amenities, but regardless of the options, according to Table 10 below, if you build it, they will come.

Table 10

Residence Hall Population in Rural Publicly-Controlled Community Colleges by Student Status (Full-Time/Part-Time, Traditional Aged, and Transfer), and by Type of Community College using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question #5B: Please estimate the percentage of students living in your residence halls who are full time students (> 12 hours), traditional aged students (18-24), enrolled in transfer curricula or enrolled in non-transfer curricula.

Community College Type		# Resp. Colleges (N = 113)	Full Time (%)	Trad'l Aged (%)	Transf (%)	Non Transf (%)
Rural Serving	Small	25	100%	97%	67%	33%
	Medium	61	97%	96%	73%	27%
	Large	18	98%	95%	64%	36%
	Total and Mean %	104	98%	96%	68%	32%
Non Rural Serving ⁶		9	(n/a)			

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 113 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Table 11

Residence Halls at Rural Publicly-Controlled Community Colleges that were filled to Capacity and/or had a Waiting List using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004

Classifications – Survey Questions #6&7: What percentage of your on campus housing is filled for the fall 2004 term? Is there presently a waiting list for on campus housing at your college?

Type of Rural Serving Colleges (N = 108)	Filled to Capacity		Has Waiting List	
	#	%	#	%
Small	26	81%	7	27%
Medium	61	86%	22	36%
Large	15	94%	8	53%
Total ⁴	102	81%	37	34%
Mean %		87%		32%

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 108 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 6 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.

Amenities in community college residence halls run a long gamut between just above the bare necessities to what some could perceive as luxury. For this question a quick glance at the most common amenities offered in university residence halls became a somewhat unscientific basis for the choices offered in the survey. According to Table 11, the most common amenity in community college residence halls is laundry facilities. As 80% of the surveys reported, there are laundry facilities connected with the residence halls. This could be any of the following options: coin-operated washing machines and dryers located inside the hall, a community Laundromat located on campus and used by all students, or actual individuals who

come by the hall to pick up the soiled laundry and deliver it cleaned. Cable TV and telephone service appeared to be common as well, with 77% and 76% of the surveys reporting these amenities respectively. The increasing popularity and usage of cell phones by students is perhaps a factor in land-line telephone service being an option that is not as popular as laundry facilities and cable TV connections.

Students like the ease of having access to their own computers in their living quarters. With 71% of the housing officials listening to and accommodating this need, the students are able to write, surf the Web, do research, send emails, play computer games, listen to music, and perform the basic computer functions from their residence hall. There were two options regarding computer access. One dealt with in-room access to computers and the Internet. Surprisingly, more colleges reported Internet access in the student's room than access to the college's computer connections. Sometimes, the library is connected to the college Web page, thus allowing students who have access to the Internet to connect all over campus. The amenity of whether students had access to college computer connections did not specify whether the connections were in each room/apartment, or in a specific "computer room" or location, but just asked if the residence hall had university computer connections. These areas appear to be the highest priority and the most popular amenities in community college residence halls.

Presidents gave marginally positive answers to the availability of tutoring, fitness centers, and access control systems. Between 49% and 34% of the residence halls answering the survey reported that they had these three amenities. These could be considered nice, but not high priority for the halls. If tutoring is available in the library

or another facility on campus, many residence hall directors might not consider this a priority. An on-campus gymnasium open to the students at specified hours could be considered a fitness center. Some residence halls actually have small “fitness rooms” much like certain hotel chains, that allow students access to a limited number of weight machines, tread mills, or aerobic exercise areas on a 24/7 basis.

Other amenities such as swimming pools, health centers, and maid service appear to be low priority. With lower than 25% of survey respondents reporting these amenities, they are not considered as necessary as some others. Still, with over 11% reporting maid service, some campuses consider this amenity worth the investment.

Non-urban-serving community colleges answered the survey with much the same percentages; however, there were so few responses that conclusions are not drawn. Urban-serving community colleges offered very few responses. Table 12 below illustrates in descending order of rural responses the most popular amenities offered by publicly controlled community colleges with residence halls.

Student services are very important to campus life. In many instances the opportunities to identify with certain clubs, organizations, teams, cohorts, and other groups of students make a difference in recruitment, retention, and overall student satisfaction with an education. Being a “part” of the college is a fundamental need for a large component of first-time college attendees, and can be perceived as a strong factor in student success. When student leaders are living on campus, they are much more likely to be available to members of their organizations, faculty sponsors, administration, and other interested parties (Catt, 1998). Unlike the commuter student who must drive 25 miles one way to campus to attend classes, it is far less difficult for a campus

Table 12

Amenities at Residence Halls at Public Community Colleges by Type of Community College using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question #8: What amenities are offered to students living in your college's on-campus housing? (N = 124)

Amenity Type	College Type				Non Rural
	Small	Medium	Large	Total	
Laundry Facilities	23	60	16	99	7
Cable TV Service	24	57	14	95	8
Telephone Service	19	62	13	94	8
Computer/Internet Access in Rooms	16	50	12	88	4
Computer Connections	16	49	11	66	5
Fitness Center	16	35	10	61	4
Tutoring	13	35	11	59	2
Access Control System	9	28	5	42	4
Health Center	6	19	6	31	3
Swimming Pool	7	14	4	25	1
Maid Service	3	6	5	14	2

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 124 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.

resident to walk across the street or down the block to attend a play, concert, sports game, student forum, guest lecture or club meeting. Being positioned “where the action

is” prompts students to align with campus organizations and participate in activities designed by student services staff to broaden the educational experience.

Table 13 below shows that between 38% and 42% of the responding rural-serving publicly controlled community colleges report that their club presidents and other student leaders live in on campus residence halls. In the small number of non-rural responses the percentage was 88%. These data underline the importance of the presence of residence halls from the student services perspective.

Table 13

Percentages of Student Activity Leaders who live on campus at Publicly Controlled Rural Community Colleges with Residence Halls using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2005) Classifications – Survey Question #9: Do most of the club presidents/activity chairs of academic and student service clubs at your college live in on-campus housing?

Type of Community College		# Resp. Colleges (N = 107) ⁴	Leaders Living On Campus
Rural	Small	26	42%
	Medium	61	39%
	Large	15	33%
	Total	102	38%
Non Rural ⁶	Single Campus	1	100%
	Multi Campus	4	75%
	Total	5	88%

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 113 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 6 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Table 14

Percentage of Publicly Controlled Community Colleges with Residence Halls that Offer On-Campus Child Care using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question #10: Is on campus child care offered? (N = 126)

Type of Community College		# Responding YES	%
Rural	Small	9	35%
	Medium	28	39%
	Large	11	61%
	Total	48	41%
Non Rural ⁶		5	100%

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 113 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Table 14 above provides information about the availability of on campus childcare. In rural-serving institutions 41% of the presidents acknowledged the prevalence of campus childcare for the benefit of the students with children. 100% of the non-rural serving colleges answering this question said they had the benefit. The smaller the college, the fewer childcare centers were reported. A possibility for this response could be that it is easier to find childcare workers in more dense populations.

Some colleges have residency requirements that pertain to certain types of students. Whether it corresponds with a student's age, culture, financial aid status, academic classification, or scholarship status, some colleges make requirements on the

living arrangements of their students. As mentioned above in Table 5, athletic scholarships frequently include housing and food. Table 15 below illustrates that more schools do not have a specific policy on student residency. The closest to an even division between no policy and a policy on residency is in athletics. The responses were evenly divided at $n = 47$. International student residency rates indicated that 70 rural-serving colleges had no policy and 24 colleges required international students to live on campus. Students receiving academic scholarships had the lowest residency requirements, with 86 responding “no policy” and only 8 indicating that the academic scholarship recipients live in on campus residence halls. The small number of non-rural respondents mirrored the rural-serving colleges with a greater number of “no policy” answers than actual residency requirements.

A few college presidents reported qualitatively through personal notes handwritten in the margin of the survey that they required all students below 21 years of age, all freshmen, or all international students to live on campus, regardless of their other status as athletes, international or academic scholarship recipients. While it was not an option for this question, this qualitative data is worthy of recording.

Table 15

Residency Requirements for Students Living in Residence Halls at Publicly Controlled Rural Community Colleges, using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question # 11: Does your campus have any on-campus residency requirements for the following students? (N = 107)

Community College Type		International Students		Athletic Scholars		Academic Scholars	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Rural	Small	12	7	1	18	13	6
	Medium	53	11	37	2	62	2
	Large	5	6	9	27	11	0
	Total	70	24	47	47	86	8
Non Rural ⁶		6	1	2	5	5	2

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

A separate survey question was dedicated to addressing the subject of privatized services at publicly controlled community colleges. This subject refers to primary research questions 1 and 3, as well as secondary research questions 1 and 3.

Privatizing allows outside businesses that concentrate on certain services to contract with the college to provide those services to the college and its students. These vendors are successful in the services they provide, and it affords the opportunity for the college staff to concentrate on services that they know best.

Table 16 below indicates that 3 in 4 of every rural-serving college responding reports some privatized services. According to the responders, food service was clearly the most common service that colleges choose to contract with outside vendors to manage. In fact, 89% of rural-serving publicly controlled community colleges responded that they privatized food services. The non-rural responses were 100% for privatized food service. Many colleges contract with franchise fast food retailers to offer them space in a “food court” arrangement, allowing students to choose from a diverse selection of food types, tastes and treatments. This adds to the cultural diversity of the college if common national offerings such as Italian, Asian, and Mexican, and common regional favorites, such as barbecue, fried chicken, pizza and submarine sandwiches, and are food choices for the students to select.

Other areas of privatization at publicly controlled rural-serving community colleges are campus bookstores at 37%, and health centers and janitorial/maintenance service at 10% each. Non-rural serving institutions reported no privatization of health centers or bookstores, but some involvement with privatized janitorial/maintenance services. Although the concept of privatization of certain services appears to be a well-publicized trend in the management of educational facilities, in practice, it is not yet universal in all venues. This information appears to contradict the Doggett and Summers and Budig (1988) studies. It is possible that the passage of time has proved that privatizing is an evolving phenomenon.

Table 16

Privatized Services at Publicly Controlled Community Colleges, using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question # 12: Are the following services privatized at your college? (N = 126)

Community College Type		# Resp.	Colleges Reporting Privatized Services		If Yes, Type of Privatized Service			
			No # (%)	Yes # (%)	Food Svc # (%)	Health Ctr # (%)	Bookstore # (%)	Fac Maint # (%)
Rural Serving	Small	26	7 (27%)	19 (73%)	8 (95%)	1 (5%)	5 (26%)	3 (16%)
	Medium	73	22 (30%)	51 (70%)	47 (92%)	5 (10%)	24 (47%)	5 (10%)
	Large	18	4 (22%)	14 (78%)	10 (71%)	2 (7%)	8 (57%)	0
	Total	117	33 (28%)	84 (72%)	75 (89%)	8 (10%)	37 (44%)	8 (10%)
Non Rural Serving		9	4 (44%)	5 (56%)	5 (100%)	0	0	2 (40%)
Total Colleges Responding		126	37 (29%)	89 (71%)	80 (90%)	8 9%	37 (42%)	10 (11%)

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Table 17 below is a grouping of qualitative responses to the query addressing reasons for privatization. It is helpful to request information concerning the reasoning behind decisions to allow outside sources to operate on-campus services. This information can be shared with other colleges that are considering privatization. Of those who responded to this question, 7 of every 10 indicated cost as the main factor in the decision to contract with outside vendors for services. As stated above, the vendors who contract with the colleges are successful entrepreneurs who know how to manage services through experience in the business world. To make their businesses profitable these vendors have learned many lessons on how to purchase in bulk, how to manage facilities, how to manage personnel, how to make cost effective decisions, how to maintain a solid reputation with customers, and how to price their goods and services. Thus, they have become experts in their private enterprise field.

When a college privatizes with outside vendors the monetary savings occur once; however, the frustration factor of trying to manage and provide services that outside vendors excel in, recurs constantly. Additional qualitative responses received from the colleges who privatize services referred to ease of operation on the part of the college, quality of service afforded to students and the college, and state laws regarding the business operations of colleges.

Non-rural responses indicated that cost was the major factor in the college choice to privatize. No additional responses from non-rural colleges were forthcoming.

Table 17

Reasons for Privatization of Services Reported by Community Colleges that Possess Residence Halls, by Type using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question # 12 B: Please explain why your college moved toward privatization and what your experience has been. (N = 107)

Community College Type		Colleges Indicating Reasons	Major Reasons for Privatization			
			Cost of Service	Quality of Operation	Ease of Operation	State Law
Rural Serving	Small	9	7	1	1	0
	Medium	19	11	3	4	1
	Large	7	6	1	0	0
	Total	35	24	5	5	1
Non Rural Serving		2	2	0	0	0

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 19 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Table 18 displays motivational factors associated with offering residence halls. This question could have been another open-ended qualitative inquiry because it asks “why”; however, for simplification of compilation and comprehension, the respondents were given multiple choices to mark. The most prevalent answers to the reasoning behind the operation of on-campus residence halls were at 80% of all answers, “Providing a true college experience” and “Serving the needs of commuter students.” These two choices underscore the significance and the impact of student services on

the success of the college. Colleges that are student centered in focus tend to respond by putting the basic needs of and the incentives and advantages for the students at the forefront. Desiring to make their college a “place to live and learn,” these administrators in both rural and non-rural serving institutions have put students first. Other answers drawing over 50% responses are “improving institutional finances,” and “diversifying the student body with student athletes, minorities, and international students.”

On the lower end of the spectrum were “improves economies of scale” (33%), “provides cost-effective student services” (33%), and “allows for special programs” (26%). The “special programs” referred to academic programs, such as nursing, firefighting, and allied health, not student services. Only colleges that offered these specialized programs would answer positively to this option, so the actual percentage of importance is higher than it appears.

Coming in last in rural-serving percentages of motivation is “increased full time enrollment” at 18%. While increases in college enrollment are desirable and important, the presence of residence halls did not appear to be a determining factor in increasing the full time enrollment. Non-rural serving responses recorded a higher percentage.

Table 18

Motivation for Community College Involvement in Residence Halls – Survey Question #13: Please explain motivation for your college’s involvement in operating residence hall services. (N =126)

Community College Type (# Resp)	On Campus Residence Halls Provide							Allow the Diversification of the Student Body to Better Serve				
	Pos. Impact on Inst. Fin.	Inc. FTE	True Coll Exp	Better Srv to Comm Stud.	Imp. Econ of Scale	Cost-Eff Stud Svcs	Allow Spec Prog	Int'l	Stud Ath	Minor-ities	Commuter	
Rural Serving	Small (36)	12	19	25	28	11	10	6	16	18	21	21
	Medium (73)	39	50	54	51	22	25	21	46	53	48	59
	Large (18)	7	12	15	15	6	4	3	8	9	9	14
	Total (117)	58	21	94	94	39	39	30	70	80	80	94
	%	50%	18%	80%	80%	33%	33%	26%	60%	68%	67%	80%
Non Rural Serving	3	7	9	8	2	1	2	6	6	6	6	

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 13 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.

Table 19 below expresses the motivation question to a Likert scale approach by asking the presidents to order the factors motivating their college to operate residence halls on campus in terms of Very Important, Important and Unimportant. By posing the question in this manner, it was anticipated to discern the ranking of each motivating factor. Predictably, most college presidents answered either Very Important or Important to nearly every option. In the case of the college's ability to offer specialized academic programs, only the institutions that offered programs of this type ranked this option on the important side.

The responses are analyzed in order of importance ranking. The options that provided a 90% or higher rank in importance are the following: increasing the full time enrollment of the college at 94%, being able to offer a "true college experience" to students at 91%, and diversifying the student body by easing the physical and economic strain on students who live a far distance from the college. Interestingly, the presidents did not rank FTE as particularly high in the motivation factor for operating residence halls on campus, but did rank it the highest in importance. Diversity, commuter students and offering student services that provide a true college experience echoed the college responses regarding motivation in terms of high importance.

Ranking 80 – 89% in importance were diversifying the student body by offering opportunities to minorities at 89%, providing cost-effective services to full time students, so that the savings could be channeled to help provide a broader range of student services to part-time and non-traditional students at 87%, diversifying the student body by offering opportunities to international students at 86%, and diversifying the student body by offering opportunities to athletic scholarship recipients at 85%. Each of these

Table 19

Importance of Reasons for Offering On-Campus Housing at Rural Community Colleges
(N = 113)

Reasons	Very Important		Important		Unimportant	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Allows College to offer true collegiate exp., including broad mix of programs/services otherwise would not be unaffordable	56	51	44	40	10	9
Increases number of full-time enrollments	70	60	39	34	7	6
Provides a vehicle making it possible for the college to diversify its student body with international students	55	56	29	29	15	15
Student athletes	53	56	28	30	13	14
Minority students	54	58	29	31	10	11
Students who live a long distance from the College	48	61	24	30	7	9
By providing cost-effective services to full-time students, college offers broad range of services to its not-traditional part-time/commuter students	50	43	54	47	15	13
Provides a positive impact on inst. finances	31	33	39	41	25	26
By lowering transportation costs/barriers, allows better service to students with commuting difficulties	24	24	43	42	35	34
Makes if possible for students to complete specialized academic programs in college's service area such as allied health and nursing.	25	21	39	38	38	37

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 19 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.

options has strong ties to student services, demonstrating a genuine involvement between top administration and that division. Additionally, these questions could have been either partially or completely answered by the residence hall authorities. As the presidents were encouraged to consult with housing officials on certain questions, it appears that they did.

Responses below 80% importance were the following: making a positive impact on institutional finances at 74%, lowering transportation costs to commuting students at 66%, and enabling students to complete specialized academic programs that fill college service area needs at 63%. The shortage of nursing and allied health professionals as well as the shortage of qualified faculty to educate and train students in these programs receives a great deal of national publicity. In rural areas, the deficiencies are perceived to be many times more serious, considering the vast income differences and job responsibilities between health care professionals in urban and suburban localities compared with those in the especially remote rural regions. Again, only the schools that offered specialized programs ranked their importance high. Lowering transportation costs for commuters was not perceived as important as actually providing a place for them to live on campus; however, it did receive a positive response. This could be in response to the concerns for non-traditional aged students who have families and could not or would not otherwise live in on campus residence halls. It could also refer to part-time commuting students who would also not be appropriate candidates for on campus housing, since so many of the colleges have reported that their residence halls are filled to capacity with full-time students.

Table 20 below discusses the actual financial impact of residence halls on the publicly controlled community colleges that have them. The most conspicuous statistic is the 2/3 majority of college officials reporting that they operate the residence halls located on their campus on an annual total revenue basis, instead of a cost per bed basis. The inconsistency in total answers to total colleges reporting is rationalized by information that some college officials reported that they operate campus residence halls by both cost per bed and annual total revenue.

Rural colleges reported a mean income of \$256,904.00 annually from the operation of residence halls. A note of explanation of this figure is that although 121 rural colleges responded to this question, relatively few either had the figures available or chose to share this information in my survey. The total rural-serving publicly controlled community colleges reporting annual income figures was 32, which represents 26% of the total responses to the survey item. Regardless of the percentage of responses, a quarter of a million dollars annually is a significant total amount of income for rural-serving community colleges. The dollar amount is possibly a low estimate of total annual income derived from residence halls. If the mean annual income from residence halls reported in this survey by rural-serving colleges holds for all, there would be a total of over \$100,000,000.00 in annual revenue derived from residence halls.

Non-rural serving community colleges reported at the rate of 100% of the operation was the annual total revenue basis, with a comparatively similar mean annual income from residence halls at \$261,400.00.

Table 20

Economic Basis of Administering Residence Halls at Rural Publicly-Controlled Community Colleges, using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question: # 15: From an economic perspective, how are residence halls operated on your campus? (N = 126)

Community College Type		# Resp.	Annual Cost/Bed	Annual Total Revenue	Annual Est. Amount (\$ mil)
Rural Serving	Small	29	7	22	1,955,400
	Medium	70	23	49	24,850,000
	Large	22	9	13	4,280,000
	Total	121	39	84	\$ 31,085,400
Total Non Rural		5	3	5	1,307,000
Total Annual Revenue Reported					\$ 32,392,400

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 19 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Besides the amount of annual revenue derived from on campus residence halls at publicly controlled community colleges, there is also an interest in how the operation and management of these halls figures into the entire spectrum of the institution's operation. The titles of those responsible are varied; however over half of them are either division Deans or Directors. To assign an entire division to the operation of college student services indicates that campus life is important to publicly controlled

community colleges. The motivation of a college to serve the needs of the enrollment is reflected in the organization structure, and certainly this table demonstrates the high priority status assigned to individual students and their requirements.

Non-rural institutions reported a higher connection between residence halls and the business office. The majority of the titles of those individuals responsible for the operations were also Deans and Directors.

The level of education and experience of those administrative personnel who are responsible for the on-campus housing at publicly controlled community colleges is the subject of Table 21 below. Over 50% of all those individuals responsible for publicly controlled community college residence halls in rural-serving institutions hold either a Master's Degree or a Doctorate. When the non-rural institutions are included, the percentage increases to nearly 60%. In the rural-serving institutions, there is a 34% proportion of housing officers reporting a Bachelor's degree as their highest level of educational attainment.

In response to the question on length of job experience, 46% of rural-serving housing officers indicate that they have worked over 7 years as a campus housing official. Another 13% reported over 5 years of experience, so the total of housing officials with over 5 years of experience was 59%.

Table 21

Education and Years of Experience of Chief Housing Officers at Rural Community Colleges with Residence Halls – Survey Question 17: What title is held by person with day-to-day administrative responsibilities for supervision of on campus housing at your college?; Survey Question 18: What is the highest degree earned by the on campus housing director at your college?; Survey Question 19: How many years of experience does the director of on-campus housing at your college have?

Community College Type	Title of Administrator Responsible for Housing on your campus				Highest Degree Earned (114 responses)				Years Experience (111 responses)				
	Dean Student Services	Director Student Life	Director of Housing	Other	Doc	MA	BA	Other	0-2	3-4	5-7	Over 7	
Rural	Small	8	5	8	9	3	8	16	2	11	2	5	11
	Medium	8	12	23	25	2	39	20	9	14	14	7	30
	Large	2	2	7	5	1	8	4	3	2	3	2	10
	Total	18	19	38	39	6	55	39	14	27	19	14	51
	%	16%	17%	33%	34%	5%	48%	34%	12%	24%	17%	13%	46%
Total Non-Rural		3	1	3	2	1	5	0	2	0	2	2	4

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 19 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Table 22 below addresses the division of residence hall oversight and the title of the individual who is entrusted with these responsibilities. The overwhelming majority of these housing officers (90%) are assigned to the Student Services divisions.

Table 22

Organization/Division and Title of Administrator Responsible for Housing at Rural Community Colleges with Residence Halls – Survey Question # 16: What division on campus does administration of on-campus housing report to?

Community College Type		Residence Hall Oversight Reports to the Division		
		Student Services	Business Services	Other
Rural	Small	24	1	1
	Medium	50	5	2
	Large	13	1	0
	Total	87	7	3
	%	90%	7%	3%
Total Non-Rural		5	4	1

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 19 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

Including the non-rural responses, the total housing officers with over 5 years of experience increases to 62%. These figures reveal a well educated, well equipped by experience group of administrators responsible for on-campus housing in publicly controlled community colleges.

Staffing considerations are the subject of Table 23 below. A total of 1,435 employees in publicly controlled rural-serving community colleges were reported by presidents and housing officers. Of this figure, 532, or 39% were full-time employees, and 873, or 61% were part-time. With a ratio of 1 full time employee to approximately 1.5 part-time employees, it appears that the residence halls are adequately staffed.

Table 23

Mean Number of Staff for Residence Halls at Public Community Colleges, by Type of Community College using Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy 2004 Classifications – Survey Question #20: Please estimate the total number at your college of full-time staff and part-time staff involved in on campus housing. (N = 116)

Community College Type		Number of Staff Who Are	
		Full Time	Part Time
Rural	Small	97	49
	Medium	408	708
	Large	57	116
	Total Employees	562	873
Non Rural Employees		44	71

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 19 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

The final research question addresses publicly controlled community college projections for renovations or new construction in the next 5 years. According to Table 23 below, approximately half of the rural-serving colleges submitting responses to the

survey (90% of those who answered the question) indicated that they would build new residence halls, and 4 out of every 10 (91% of those who answered the question) respondents disclosed intentions to renovate existing structures.

Table 24

Future Renovation and New Construction of Residence Halls at Public Community Colleges – Survey Question # 21: Is it likely in the next five years that major renovations to existing residence halls and/or new construction will occur at your college?

Community College Type		Projecting Residence Hall...	
		Renovations (n = 49)	New Facility Construction (n = 57)
Rural	Small	11	15
	Medium	25	29
	Large	8	8
	Total	44	52
Non Rural Total		5	5

Notes:

1. A total of 232 colleges granting associate degrees reported to IPEDS in 2000-2001 academic year that they had residence halls.
2. Of the 232 public colleges reporting, 204 were community colleges.
3. A total 126 community colleges of the 204, or 61%, that reported having residence halls to IPEDS responded to this survey.
4. Not every college responded to every question. A total 126 usable responses were obtained for this question. A total of 19 responses to this question were deemed unusable.
5. IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System developed and maintained by the United States Department of Education.
6. As the number of non-rural colleges replying to the survey is disproportional to the total number of campuses reporting, the data is reported for presentational purposes only. No conclusions are drawn.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study was motivated by a desire to prove or disprove a prevailing myth regarding U.S. community colleges: The extent, participation level, and motivation for community colleges to be involved in the operation of on-campus housing. An April 2003 *Chronicle of Higher Education* feature quoted Travis J. Reindl, Director of State Policy Analysis for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, as saying “Regional universities have fixed costs, such as heating dormitories, that community colleges do not face” (Hebel, 2003 p.22). The lack of specific attention to the issue of community college residence halls from experts such as Pascarella & Terenzini, (1991) and the paucity of available information from journal authors and newspaper writers suggests a need to investigate the issue. Imprecise terminology on the part of federal agencies to whom community colleges submit annual financial and facilities reports, as required for colleges to receive federal student aid under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, unintentionally contributes to the misinformation and inappropriate myths. Sadly, these issues taken together contribute to the perpetuation of misconceptions, false assumptions, and a general tendency to deem community college residence halls as either non-existent or not worthy of study.

The findings of this researcher suggested otherwise. Even a cursory review of community colleges offering housing in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex paints a much more complicated, textured picture. Of the 9 separate districts that operate 32 separate campuses in the Dallas/Fort Worth (Texas) region, 7 operate on-campus housing. Even

suburban-serving community colleges, such as Collin County Community College District, have housing operated through a property management firm adjacent to its large Spring Creek Campus.

As the analysis presented in chapter 4 indicated, the reality is that community college residence halls do exist. They provide significant income to institutions where they are located, and contribute in critically important ways to student life and the total college experience provided to students. In times of uncertain funding opportunities from state legislatures, tax rollbacks, and a general uneasiness regarding future resources, publicly controlled community colleges are challenged to investigate dependable methods by which to secure needed income to finance their missions. In addition to attracting and enabling additional students to attend college, residence halls can be used to provide exposure to the fine arts, add to the excitement and school spirit of athletic teams, and allow for the inclusion of special academic programs critical to economic and social well-being of rural regions, such as nursing and allied health. On-campus housing can offer students a sense of completeness to the community college experience. To overlook these dynamics presents a narrow and incomplete picture of community colleges and their place in higher education. For these reasons, it is important for community colleges to make every effort to represent their whole story, produce accurate data, share information, and provide responses to directly address such false generalizations.

Moreover, since the subject of residence halls in publicly controlled community colleges is obscured by myths and mistaken beliefs, it is essential that inaccuracies be challenged directly. For example, the clearly erroneous impression that no residence

halls in community colleges exist can lead to the misconception that no research is needed on the subject. Some may answer questions regarding on-campus housing at community college with literature pertaining to university residence halls. While the findings of this study include some that do conform to research on housing at four-year universities, there is clearly a need for the community college story to be told in terms appropriate to them as institutions.

A total of 232 community colleges reported through the US Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) that they possessed on-campus housing in 2001. Of these, just 15 or only 6 percent were community colleges serving urban and suburban geographic areas. In contrast, rural-serving community colleges totaled 217 institutions, or 94 percent of those reporting to IPEDS. Not surprisingly, a total of just 9 urban-serving and suburban-serving community colleges responded to the author's *Survey of On-Campus Housing at Community Colleges*, administered in the Fall of 2004. A total of 139 responses to the author's survey were obtained, of which 126 were deemed usable. This represents a response rate of approximately 60 percent. However, the small number of surveys from the non-rural urban and suburban community colleges suggested that the researcher only report data for those institutions, but draw no conclusions from them. Thus, the findings drawn from the survey are based only upon responses from responding rural-serving community colleges, of which 115 responded, producing a 61 percent response rate for this category of community colleges.

According to the Katsinas, Lacey and Hardy (2004) classifications, there were a total of 860 community college districts with 1,552 campuses across the United States.

Based upon 2001 IPEDS data and 2000 Census data, they found 553 rural-serving, 195 suburban-serving, and 112 urban-serving community college districts, with 922, 328, and 302 identifiable campuses, respectively. Of the 9.4 million students attending US community colleges, as measured by unduplicated annual headcount in 2000-2001, about 3.2 million students attended rural-serving community colleges, compared to 3.0 million attending suburban-serving, and 3.2 million attending urban-serving institutions. Within the rural-serving category, Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy (2005) have three sub-classifications, small, medium, and large. They found 140 small-, 303 medium-, and 110 large--sized rural community college districts, which had 206, 499, and 217 identifiable campuses, respectively.

Not surprisingly, when using the Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy (2005) classifications, this researcher found the most common category of publicly controlled community colleges with residence halls to be medium-sized rural-serving colleges. According to the typology, these institutions possess an annual unduplicated headcount enrollment of between 2,500 and 7,000 students. Of the 206 publicly controlled community colleges reporting to IPEDS that they had residence halls, 110 or 53 percent are medium-sized rural-serving colleges. Of the colleges responding to this study's survey, 71 or 56 percent, are classified by the typology as medium-sized rural-serving colleges. For this reason, the researcher is satisfied that the response data is a fair and accurate depiction of publicly controlled rural-serving community colleges.

This chapter accomplishes three objectives. The first objective is to identify and interpret the findings of the research collected by the survey instrument, inquiries from personal interviews conducted by the researcher, and the examination of the existing

literature related to the subject of community college residence halls. By looking backward through the existing literature, gaps in information that have impeded community college housing officers, student services personnel, and interested administration and faculty members in their quest to research residence hall options, management techniques, and operations data can be identified. This study will hopefully clear a pathway to begin a dialogue among funding agencies, researchers and community college personnel that can result in the distribution of enhanced information.

Given the descriptive nature of this study, coupled with the limited amount of existing literature on the subject, research questions are presented as an alternative to statistical hypotheses. Results of this study have afforded sufficient evidence to answer the three primary and three secondary research questions. It is now known that there are residence halls in publicly controlled community colleges. They represent a significant source of income for the colleges that have them, and they bring additional opportunities for recruitment and retention of athletic teams as well as minority students who do not live in the immediate service delivery areas of the institutions. Their existence allows the colleges to better serve commuter students, international students, and commuting part-time students by providing a broader college experience. They assist in allowing colleges to deliver specialized academic programs such as firefighting academies, nursing, and fine arts, which assist the institutions in meeting their economic development and workforce training missions.

The second objective of this chapter is to derive conclusions from the findings.. Results of this study have afforded sufficient evidence to answer the three primary and three secondary research questions.

The third objective is to present recommendations for improving the records and expanding the existing research and published literature on the subject of residence halls in publicly controlled community colleges. These recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions of the first two objectives.

Findings

Finding 1: Involvement by publicly controlled rural-serving community colleges in delivering on-campus housing for their students is undercounted in federal higher education data bases.

According to Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy's (2005) analysis of U.S. Department of Education Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), there were 860 discrete publicly controlled community, junior, and technical college districts that had 1,552 campuses. Of these, 553 districts and 922 campuses are classified as rural-serving. Together in the 2000-2001 academic year these rural-serving community colleges had a total annual unduplicated headcount of 3,213,977 students. The average annual total unduplicated headcount for the 206 small, rural-serving community college campuses was 1,155; that figure was 2,819 and 7,233 respectively for the 499 medium and 217 large rural-serving community college campuses. In addition, there were 36 public universities operating 114 discrete two-year college campuses, a common organizational structure found in states such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. Most of these institutions are located in rural areas, and the average annual unduplicated headcount enrollment for these institutions in 2000-2001 was 2,331 (Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy, 2005).

This response data obtained by this researcher included 26 small-sized, 73 medium-sized, and 18 large-sized rural-serving community colleges, roughly 60 percent of the institutions reporting on-campus housing to IPEDS for each category. From these data it is clear that the vast majority of small and medium rural-serving community colleges (as well the two-year colleges under four-year universities) have annual unduplicated enrolments below 3,000 students. These are small colleges. Decades ago, writing at a time when states were building state systems of public higher education including community colleges, higher education scholars such as the late Howard Bowen and Kent D. Halstead recognized smaller-sized public institutions of higher education would have higher per-student costs of operation, and have greater difficulty in achieving economies of scale as compared to their larger institutions (Katsinas, Alexander, and Opp, 2003).

The beginning point for determining the population to study by the researcher was isolating the number of publicly controlled community, junior, and technical colleges that reported to IPEDS that they offered on-campus housing to their students. A total of 232 institutions, or 13 percent of community colleges campuses did so. Sadly, it is now apparent that the 232 figure masks a serious undercount in documenting the extent of U.S. community college participation in on-campus housing.

The first two columns of Table 25, below, show the total number of community, junior, and technical colleges in 16 selected states, and the number of rural-serving

Table 25

Projected Undercount by US Department of Education of Rural-Serving Publicly Controlled Community Colleges with On-Campus Housing (Selected States)

State	Publicly Controlled Comm. College Campuses (#)	Rural Serving Community Colleges (#)	Rural Serving Community Colleges		
			Reporting Res. Halls to IPEDS	Reporting Res. Halls on Websites	Diff
Illinois	48	23	0	2	+2
Louisiana	52	28	0	0	-
Michigan	30	19	5	10	+5
Minnesota	49	33	6	14	+8
Mississippi	17	17	16	12	-4
New Hampshire	4	4	1	0	-1
New Jersey	19	2	0	0	-
New York	43	19	10	16	+6
North Carolina	59	47	0	0	-
Ohio	55	11	2	2	-
Pennsylvania	33	3	9	3	-6
Texas	69	42	37	48	+9
Washington	35	16	4	5	+1
Wisconsin	19	14	3	2	-1
Wyoming	7	7	8	8	-
Totals	539	285	101	122	+19

Note: Undercount = 19%

community colleges in those states, according to the Katsinas, Lacey, and Hardy 2005 classifications. The third and fourth columns display the number of rural-serving community colleges that reported on their Websites that they offered on-campus

housing to students, and the number of rural-serving community colleges that reported to IPEDS that they offered on-campus housing to their students, both for the same selected states. These data were analyzed by the Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education at the University of North Texas in February and March 2005. The last column in this table, "difference," reveals an undercount of 20 (16%) in IPEDS of rural-serving community colleges with residence halls. While both figures could be correct, considering the possibility that 20 publicly controlled community colleges in selected states have within the last 4 years built and advertised on their Websites the existence of on-campus housing, it is highly unlikely. In the midst of confusing information such as this, it is expected is that the reporting structure ought to be examined, standardized, and corrected. It is apparent that the most important database of the federal government as it relates to higher education, IPEDS, undercounts the extent of on-campus housing at publicly controlled community colleges.

Finding 2: The presence of on-campus housing at publicly controlled rural-serving community colleges is significant, especially in Southern and Midwestern states. In general, the smaller and more remote the college, the more likely will be the presence of residence halls.

Rural-serving community colleges represent the majority of community colleges in the regions served by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) (Hardy, 2005). Of the 38 states with community colleges reporting to IPEDS that they have residence halls, the two regions with the largest saturation of residence halls in community colleges were the Southern and Midwestern states. With 71 of the 232 reporting colleges located in 6

southern states, the total percentage of Southern community colleges offering residence halls to students is 31%. The north central region, another agricultural region, has the most individual schools, with a total of 103 colleges in 17 states for 45% of the US total. Thus, between the Southern and the North Central regions, the location of 76% of community colleges offering residence halls in the United States can be found.

Among the fifty states, Texas has the most community colleges reporting residence halls - 37. An obvious explanation for this is the vast size, the agricultural-based rural economy for many areas of Texas, the multilevel terrain, the unstable weather conditions resulting in the lack of justification for road equipment. Other states reporting 10 or more publicly controlled community colleges with residence halls are Kansas with 20, Mississippi with 16, Oklahoma with 12, Iowa with 11, and rural areas of California with 10. Even though more residence halls in community college are located outside the South, the South is where the greatest concentration lies. There are more than just economic considerations for the location of residence halls in community colleges; however.

Mountainous areas including Colorado, Wyoming, West Virginia, rural New York, and Maine justify their residence halls merely by location. The winter climate in other states such as Wisconsin, Montana, North Dakota, Michigan, and Minnesota sometimes precludes any commute. Many states have multiple justifications for offering residence halls in their community colleges. Of the 12 states that did not report having residence halls in their community colleges, Delaware, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Connecticut are more densely populated and primarily urban or suburban in nature. In other states not reporting housing, for example Louisiana, have a concentration of

short-term vocational/technical training in their community colleges, rather than the traditional transfer, degree seeking, curriculum.

Historically, rural communities were tied to the economics of agriculture, which by tradition did not produce family incomes enabling all to afford colleges far from home. The community college became a vehicle to offer higher education to those who did not qualify for admission, or could not afford to go away to the university. In the Pre-World War II era when many rural community colleges were established, Interstate highways or other modes of public transportation to move students to and from classes did not exist. During this period, it was not uncommon for entire families to move to college towns to facilitate attendance for their children. Lyndon B. Johnson's parents moved to San Marcos, Texas, so as to facilitate the enrollment in college of their four children (Caro, 1981). Many of Texas' rural community colleges were established before World War II, before good farm-to-market roads were constructed. For all of these reasons, residence halls were important in developing and maintaining enrollments and providing overall access.

In recent times, the community college has evolved to represent an opportunity for all to participate in higher education regardless of income, prior test scores, high school honors and activities, prior earned degrees, or legacy. After World War II, when the enrollment of existing community colleges burgeoned to accommodate the returning veterans who were taking advantage of the GI Bill's education opportunities, residence halls continued to serve an important need. Today, commuting to college remains a challenge in many rural communities. The justification for operating residence halls is evident by the number of colleges reporting proposed new construction and existing

halls filled to capacity with waiting lists in place. Nearly 9 of 10 presidents responding to this researcher's survey reported that their residence halls were filled to capacity, and more than a third indicated waiting lists. In personal communication with the author, one Michigan rural community college president indicated plans to bring a proposal to build 96 apartment-style units on campus to his board of trustees at their upcoming Board Retreat (personal communication, March 11, 2005). Dr. Nancy Bentley (personal communication, March, 2004) of Moraine Valley Community College in the suburban Chicago area indicated that her institution had studied the possibilities of building on-campus housing to the extent of hiring a consulting firm to make recommendations. Even though this is a suburban institution, it serves many rural students who must at present commute to classes.

Finding #3: Community colleges with residence halls both own and operate their on-campus housing themselves, and offer a list of selected amenities that will likely enlarge as the amount of construction and renovation of housing increases.

Eighty-seven percent of respondents indicate their college both owns and operates the residence halls on their campuses. Just 7% reported that a third party owned and operated the on-campus housing, and 6% said that both the college and a third party owned and operated on-campus facilities. Publicly controlled community colleges reported that they have a total of 37,987 beds, of which 35,392 are located in rural-serving community colleges. The average number of beds at rural-serving community colleges was 350, and the average revenue was \$31,085,400.

Amenities were offered in at least 10% of community colleges with residence halls. These amenities include non-smoking rooms, athletic residence halls and floors,

private rooms, 12-month options, married student/family housing, single parent/family housing, housing for special academic programs students, and honors areas. Nearly 4 of 10 presidents responding indicated that their campus leaders lived in their on-campus housing. Surprising to the author was the fact that on-campus childcare was found at only 41% of the reporting rural-serving colleges. It should be noted, however, that this finding was consistent with Hardy (2005), who found that the smaller and more rural the community college, the lower the percentage of on-campus childcare to be found.

The future of residence halls and their management and operations on publicly controlled community college campuses appears to be incontrovertible based on the reporting of 87% filled to capacity and 32% possessing waiting lists. With proposed new residence hall construction or remodeling of existing structures reported by 96 of the 126 respondents (76%), also bodes well for the existence of on-campus housing at publicly controlled community colleges.

Finding #4: Community colleges operating on-campus housing do so for reasons related to bolstering student development, increasing student diversity and access, extending academic program diversity, and ameliorating the "missing male" imbalance.

Bolstering student development was a key reason offered by responding presidents as to why their colleges offer on-campus residential housing. Over 9 of 10 respondents said offering a "true college experience" was very important or important; a point reinforced by the fact that 94% indicate on-campus housing increases the number of full-time student enrollments. To participate in curricular as well as extra-curricular activities, students must be able to attend. If they live in residence halls on a rural campus, it is usually as simple as a quick walk to be present at concerts, athletic

events, student forums, guest lectures, campus art exhibits, visit the library, make or keep an appointment with an instructor, receive academic counseling and tutoring, attend celebrations, special events, plays and other student performances, tail-gate parties and other common college student pastimes that are so widely celebrated and create lasting memories and bonds. Nearly 4 of 10 responding presidents indicate their student campus organizations are led by students who live on-campus, and it is possible that this estimate may be low. Student services professionals spend a tremendous amount of time and energy attempting to offer student activities that seek to promote discussion, challenge thinking, motivate, diversify, and inform the college enrollment. Residence hall life can accomplish all of these.

Increasing access and student diversity was also cited as a major reason for operating on-campus residential housing. Rural-serving colleges have long been challenged to overcome the remoteness of the location of their colleges in providing access. By offering housing for students on athletic scholarships, the colleges can recruit men and women athletes to play for their teams. Castaneda (2004) found that nearly 60,000 students at US community colleges are involved in intercollegiate athletics at community colleges, and most of them under scholarship attended full-time and lived on-campus. Since athletic sports and attending athletic events are historically an integral component of the student services in higher education, and may well be the most popular leisure interest of college students, it is advantageous for a college to have the ability to offer housing as a factor in extending its athletic scholarship opportunities. Besides the obvious fact that many athletes will accept the best scholarship offer presented to them, community colleges must be competitive in the

resources they offer athletes. Besides the best training equipment, the best facilities and the best coaches, they are challenged to provide quality housing and food service.

The rural locale of the largest number of colleges with residence halls limits commuter students to either living in on-campus facilities and becoming campus residents or driving distances to and from campus each day. If terrain, road conditions, or weather is a factor, commuters can decide against attending classes, thereby failing courses or receiving poor grades that reflect badly on a college transcript. Sometimes, commuting students may choose not to attend college for the above reasons. On-campus housing can ameliorate all of these problems and challenges.

For international students to attend college in foreign countries, residential facilities must be made available. Many foreign students do not bring transportation with them, or buy cars once they arrive. If community colleges, especially in rural locations, wish to diversify their student body with those representing and practicing other cultures, religions, and customs, there must be on-campus housing accommodations for them. This can also be true of minority students who do not reside near the college.

A harmonious gender mix will improve student life as much as cultural diversity, student activities, and other student services. There can be no doubt that the existence of on-campus housing bolsters the male student enrollments, an issue of longstanding concern among practitioners, scholars, and policymakers. In supporting the existence of intercollegiate athletics, which are predominantly male, it follows that since athletic scholarships typically include room and board, males occupy more beds. Castaneda (2004) reported that the vast majority of scholarship athletes at community colleges are traditional 18 to 24 college-going age. This study found 90% of the residence hall

population is between 18 and 24, taking a full-time load of 12 credit hours or more, with nearly 7 in 10 residence hall students enrolled in transfer curricula.

Finally, nearly 6 of 10 respondents indicated offering on-campus residential housing making it possible for students to complete programs in critical areas of need to the college's service area, including nursing and allied health. Since these programs historically attract more female students, orienting housing to nursing and allied health students may offset the male-dominated football team and thus promote gender equity. And by bolstering the college's ability to contribute to its area's healthcare workforce, the presence of on-campus housing may assist in the college's achievement of regional economic development goals.

Finding #5: Rural-serving community colleges financially benefit by operating on-campus housing.

According to Hardy, the average total revenue from all sources for rural-serving small, medium, and large community colleges was \$9,983,606, \$20,404,801, and \$48,044,093, respectively. While only 32 responding presidents were willing to share or could gain immediate access to the financial bottom line of the housing on their campus, the total annual income for the 32 reporting institutions was \$32,392,400. This averages to over \$1 million in annual income per college, with an average number of beds equaling 350. Just one institution of the 32 reported an annual loss (\$60,000) with no explanation of the cause. Given the ratio size of income from residence halls to the total income from all sources, it should come as no surprise that 90% of the colleges are planning to build new halls and/or remodel existing ones in the next 5 years. In an October 2004 survey, state directors of community colleges reported that rural

community colleges were facing the greatest fiscal strain among all types of community colleges (Katsinas, Palmer, and Tollefson, October 2004). In these fiscal hard times, the profit generated by on-campus housing is a rural-serving community college administrator's delight.

It also follows that with the increased enrollment of full-time students, the college receives more state reimbursement funding to finance all of its operations. This includes student services that offer a true college experience. By increasing the full-time campus enrollments, the colleges are able to offer a wider range of cost-effective services such as bookstores and foodservice to their non-residential populations. This in turn improves economies of scale. Specialized academic programs such as nursing, firefighting, allied health, police academy, and others bring well-trained professionals into area health care and security facilities. This improves the quality of life and the economies of scale of the service area of the college.

This study found that nearly all of small and medium rural-serving community colleges, as well as the two-year colleges under four-year universities that responded to this study possess annual unduplicated enrolments below 3,000 students. Beyond doubt, these are smaller-sized colleges. Long ago higher education scholars including Howard Bowen and Kent D. Halstead recognized that smaller-sized institutions of higher education would have higher per-student costs of operation, and have great difficulty in achieving economies of scale as compared to larger institutions (Katsinas, 2003). Improving economies of scale, an area on which additional research is needed, may well be one of the most important reasons for rural-serving community colleges to

offer on-campus housing. That said, there can be no doubt as to the positive impact on institutional finances that on-campus housing brings.

It should be noted that while more than 9 in 10 indicate they operate their own on-campus residential housing; there is a significant minority who have privatized portions of their operations. Of the 126 responses to the privatization of services question, 37 or 29% responded with a reason for moving toward privatization. Seventy per cent indicated that cost was the motivating factor, and all who chose to write a qualitative note of explanation, indicated that their experience had been positive.

Finding #6: The student development emphasis of residence halls at publicly controlled community colleges is reflected in their administration by experienced, well-educated deans or directors in divisions of student services.

The administration of residence halls falls under the division heading of Student Services in 90% of the responses, and the lead administrator carries the title of Dean or Director in 66% of the rural-serving colleges.

The highest level of education on average is a Master's degree. Most administrators with this responsibility have over 5 years of experience. With few exceptions the titles carried by the housing officers are Dean of Student Services, Director of Student Life, or Director of Housing. These titles seem to be different iterations of the same basic job description. Some colleges alter the wording of the title, but combine all the same responsibilities to put the bulk of the student contact and communication into one area.

The housing staff number is relatively impressive. A total of 116 college presidents responded to the survey question requesting full and part time staff numbers.

A total of 1,550 employees were reported, or a mean of 13 housing personnel per campus. It was not conclusively determined whether this number includes student residence hall advisors, janitorial staff, other student service division employees, or residence hall cafeteria employees if food service is not privatized. Some campuses reported only one full time employee. This is probably a misrepresentation, because multiple and diverse housing issues such as student discipline, maintenance, cleaning, supervision, finances, orientations for new residents, operations, and utilities require the services and talents of more than one individual. Someone would need to have psychology, mechanical engineering, business management, technical expertise, accounting, and counseling skills to tackle all the responsibilities of the position. On the other hand, one full-time manager could supervise a number of part-time workers in the various fields required. Regardless, the individual who oversees the on-campus housing must be multi-skilled and possess diverse talents to handle all the tasks. No request for annual salary amounts of these individuals was made.

Conclusions

Conclusion #1. Publicly controlled community colleges, particularly rural community colleges, are involved in the operation of on-campus housing to a significant extent.

Of the 922 rural community colleges according to Hardy and Katsinas (2005) 21% have reported to IPEDS that they are involved in on-campus housing. As there is data to support the belief that IPEDS information is undercounted, this percentage could very well be larger. A telephone survey of 16 randomly selected states that have rural community colleges reveals a discrepancy between those who reported housing on

their Websites and housing reported to IPEDS. This undercounting must be addressed to provide an accurate picture of on-campus housing at US community colleges.

This negates Reindl's (2003) unsubstantiated declaration that community colleges do not have fixed housing costs, dispelling the myth that residence halls do not exist in community colleges. Rural-serving publicly controlled community colleges in the South were found to have the largest number of beds, as well as the largest number of actual colleges offering residence halls on campus. Unfortunately, misunderstandings of previously reported data may be occurring. The two largest regional accrediting agencies, SACS and NCA, which are responsible for sanctioning 75% of the colleges in this study, cover more than just the South and Midwest. NCA accredits colleges and schools in 18 states, including non-Midwestern states such as Arizona and Arkansas. This suggests a national phenomenon, one that is not regionally based.

Conclusion #2: Residence halls in publicly controlled community colleges are fundamental components of the campus life of the institutions that have them.

While residence hall operations are financially profitable, their primary importance lies in the advantages they bring to the improved campus life of the community colleges that operate them. Much more good and accurate information is needed on the extent of involvement by all community colleges in the operation of on-campus housing facilities, however. Rural community colleges, particularly the small rural community colleges, have higher full-time enrollment costs. Trying to offer the same services to a smaller population increases the per-student rate. As previously stated, on-campus housing represents a respectable profit to the finances of community colleges. Besides producing net revenue from the room charges, on-campus housing

increases enrollment. The profits generated from student housing can even the playing field for rural community colleges to be able to put forward to their students the same opportunities in the student service venue that colleges in urban and suburban locations offer on a regular basis. State legislatures should consider steps to enable their rural community colleges to accomplish this student-centeredness by clearing the way for rural campuses to achieve low cost bonds for their on-campus residence hall facilities.

The typical rural community college has 350 beds. Of those colleges with on-campus housing 20% had specialized academic programs such as nursing and allied health programs. Dr. Joseph Sertich, President of the Northeast Minnesota Higher Education District, which operates six colleges, each of which have residence halls, has created a new learning community around engineering technology, where the first two floors of a new building are devoted to academics, and the top floor is on-campus apartments (personal communication, 2005). This may be a wave of the future. State legislatures desire to have well-trained health care professionals in their workforce. By lowering the expenses for facilities in higher education, rural community colleges can justify more housing, and, in turn, offer more allied health and nursing programs. The results will benefit the entire population, while fulfilling their economic development and workforce training missions.

Community colleges reporting residence halls were extremely positive in their responses concerning the motivation for offering on-campus housing. Without exception the presidents responded that diversifying the student body was a motivating factor in offering them to students. A diverse student body contributes to the true college experience so desirable in community colleges.

As rural community colleges constantly battle an undeserved image of economically low-end, second rate, vocational/technical, watered-down alternate to university attendance, the community colleges attempt to offer their students a comparable experience in higher education, which includes academics, activities, programs, and student services, residential living is an added advantage for students, and allows the colleges to offer a dynamic assortment of student activities for the entire enrollment, but especially the on-campus students.

A national study on student engagement would be helpful if performed to include community colleges management and integration of housing in consideration of student life. The housing associations could perform this study to incorporate research on selected amenities that rural community colleges now have. This study could enlighten the decision makers on the necessary housing renovations needed to bring the rural institutions into conformity with other higher education facilities that offer housing. The determination would be to discover the amenities that are sufficient to assure the meeting of student basic needs, compare those in rural locations to those offered in other areas, and contrast the offerings of all. These amenities could then be compared to basic services offered to students in urban and suburban community colleges to determine evenhandedness and equity of amenities.

By offering athletic scholarships the publicly controlled community colleges not only enrich the campus activities for the students, but they also justify the scholarship granting requirements for housing. The commuter students could very easily not choose to attend college if it were not for the opportunities afforded by on-campus housing. Athletes in many instances would likely go elsewhere. International and minority

students would likely not favor institutions not offering on campus housing for a variety of reasons. Unless they had a local residence, the minority and international students might have a difficult time securing affordable, safe, culturally acceptable living accommodations in the adjacent vicinity.

Regardless of whether the students live in rural, urban, or suburban locales, commuting to college can be a challenge. By offering an option to live on the campus the publicly controlled community colleges supply an incentive to students who live out of the primary service area to attend their institution. Traditional aged, single students yearn to have a true college encounter involving social as well as academic experiences. By extending to the students an opportunity to live away from home while attending college, the institutions are able to recruit, retain, and offer an enhanced educational experience.

As time management is always a challenge for college students, the options to be immediately “where the action is” may ameliorate the monetary cost of housing and attract out of district students by selling them on the advantages of being in close proximity to all the college services 7 days and nights a week. This possibility enables the students to use the time and money they would spend on fuel commuting, to their academic and/or social advantage.

At a mean of \$1,000,000 annual income from those reporting dollar figures to the survey question, residence halls in publicly controlled community colleges generously contribute to college finances. This figure does not take account of the increases in the economies of scale of the local businesses that provide clothing, incidentals, gasoline, health care services, food, entertainment, repairs, and other options. For example, in a

rural-serving medium sized community college environment, an influx every school year of between 2,500 and 7,000 college students contributes significant financial resources not only to the college itself, but also to local businesses and service providers throughout the primary service area.

If the college offers specialized academic and technical programs such as allied health and nursing, the area health facilities are strengthened by the presence of the possible student internships. Local professionals profit from the additional help from the students and by the most modern, up-to-date techniques taught in the programs. Other specialized programs offering both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards to the college and community are police academies, fine arts, athletics, firefighter programs, and agricultural sciences.

Conclusion #3. The organization and administration of on-campus housing at community colleges reflects the strong student development orientation for the colleges that operate them.

The title commonly given to administrators of on-campus housing in publicly controlled community colleges reflects the very strong student development orientation of delivering on-campus student services. The majority of individuals directing on-campus residential life at community colleges hold the titles of either deans or directors. They typically possess more than 5 years of professional work experience. The majority of these deans or directors oversee a division with "student services," "student life," or "housing" as part of the title. Most of the reporting institutions indicated that their residence hall administrators held a doctorate or master's degree, although some did indicate that the bachelor's degree was the highest degree earned. These most likely

are *not* the staff directly responsible for housing, but for the division that includes housing. This is an indication that student services and residence life are considered a priority of the college, and that the administrators responsible for the operations of the halls are given a title appropriate to their responsibilities. This also suggests the importance that the colleges themselves attach to the student development/student life function that on-campus housing allows to occur at the colleges.

Recommendations

Several recommendations for expanding and improving the research and literature on the topic of publicly controlled community colleges with residence halls are forthcoming as a result of the findings of this study. As the scope of this study is narrow, some of the recommendations are proposed to continue the research and add to the data collected herein, thus broadening the range of coverage of the subject. The recommendations are presented below.

Recommendations for Policy

Recommendation #1: Conduct a funded national census of publicly controlled community colleges with residence halls, paying special attention to the rural-serving institutions.

A complete census with accurate data is needed. It is extremely important to have factual information to base future policy regarding financial support, allocations, grants, and opportunities to improve and expand existing data. As stated earlier in this study, college presidents were somewhat reluctant to divulge sensitive information to a humble student researcher on the subjects of annual income from the residence halls, privatization, actual number of beds allotted for specialized housing, and other financial

issues. If this census could be funded and sponsored by a well-endowed, recognized entity, and tied to state reimbursement, public board of trustees' minutes, federal student aid, or Title IV funding, for instance, the answers might be more forthcoming. Taking the time and energy to locate the appropriate person or persons that would be in a position give insightful, well-documented answers to the census inquiries, acquiring factual data from secondary sources, documenting that data, and comparing it with answers to the census, making telephone calls to ascertain receipt, follow up and follow through procedures leaving no gaps, and researching the institution Web pages for additional information would be some of the directives of this well funded study. Close attention to detail and a penchant for dealing with minutia would be needed to accomplish this clearly valuable effort. This should be an ongoing study. Double and triple checking mailing addresses, internet addresses, telephone numbers and names of personnel responsible for various services and keeping this information current would be part of the census. As the force of educational professionals in the US faces a projected mass retirement over the next decade, it is imperative that the census be carefully monitored and maintained if it is to be a valuable tool. In the case of this study, several college presidents had retired or left for another position. Those colleges did not reply, even when they were contacted through email, because the name of the addressee was not the current president.

The National Center for Educational Statistics, RUPRI, RCCI, Department of Education, or any of the popular higher education funding foundations could well fund and perform this study as well as continue to update the data as an ongoing project.

Recommendation #2: Tie the annual IPEDS report to some kind of funding requirement, and hold an administrator at each institution responsible for the accuracy of the report.

Institutions that issue athletic scholarships, for example, must report certain statistical information annually to IPEDS if they desire to continue the practice. Some of the data that is released by IPEDS is glaringly incorrect, even to the most casual researcher. If the submission of annual reports were tied, for example, to a college's Title IV funding, an improvement in the quality and quantity of information would occur.

On several reports documented in the database, the exact number of students was attributed to a community college for multiple semesters in multiple years. This simply cannot be perceived as correct. Information of this type is vital to good research, and all institutions should be vigilant in the accuracy of their reporting procedures. Allowing important reports to be generated and submitted by under-prepared staff or student helpers, without a warranty from responsible administrators, invites confusion, misinterpretation, and error. Furthermore, the practice by IPEDS of merely repeating the previous data received from the institution's preceding reports in the event that a college fails to submit annual information is not a sound course of action for the organization to observe.

Recommendations for Practice

Recommendation #3: As the results of this study conclude a highly significant motivation for rural-serving publicly controlled community colleges to offer residence halls, a funded study is needed to establish and document best practices.

The possibilities are very optimistic that the Rural Policy Research Institute, Rural Community College Initiative, the US Department of Education, the Kellogg or Ford

Foundation, Association of College and University Housing Officers-International, or any number of well-endowed agencies might see this as a cause for further research.

If there existed a nationally generated and sponsored residence hall handbook, or policies and procedures manual, that outlines a business plan for success or offers a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis of on-campus residence hall administration in community colleges, more college presidents would have a clear pathway to pursue well-managed, profitable, student-centered residence halls.

Merely taking a collection of graduate courses focusing on student services does not effectively prepare a college administrator (however qualified) to successfully tackle the challenges of managing an on-campus residence hall. Having access to a step-by-step directive manual would be extremely valuable to any administrator! This benchmarking tool could be the result of the funded study. Residence hall officers, part and full-time staff, deans and directors of student services, counselors, specialized academic program directors who are focused on the “whole” student in their areas of study, and a host of auxiliary staff members dedicated to student services would benefit.

Recommendation #4: A study on the challenges, habits, and concerns of commuter students would lend great insight to the existing literature.

The data in this study reveal that many of the key issues surrounding residence halls in publicly controlled community colleges revolve around commuter students. It has been gratifying to read the evidence confirming the student-centeredness that is in place in most community colleges. Repeatedly the survey respondents focused their replies on the needs of commuters, and how to ease the challenges they face by

offering living accommodations on the campus. A mixed methods study that focused special attention on individual challenges faced not only by community colleges but also by the commuters themselves, would increase the knowledge base of counselors, administrators, other college personnel, and students who commute to class. ACUHO-I and/or SWACUHO would be the most logical associations to fund, perform, and distribute results of this study. Besides either of these, SACS and/or NCACS would benefit from this kind of information by funding this study.

Recommendation #5: A more exhaustive study should be performed focusing on the needs of residential students.

This study could center on their choices and needs as motivating factors for living in residence halls. Like the recommendation above, this study could also be mixed methods research that would consist of interviews, surveys and database searches to compare the information garnered from all three sources with the present available information. In this manner, it could become clearly apparent if the solutions in place are solving existing problems. While it is important to consider the commuters as outlined above, it is also vital to fill the needs of the athletes, international students and minorities who inhabit the residence halls. Again, SWACUHO and/or ACUHO-I would be the appropriate organizations to administer this study, as their focus is on the needs of student residents.

Recommendation #6: Fund national training seminars for housing staff.

With policies and procedures manuals written by the best practices study, there could be a very effective curriculum in place for training the individuals who live and work with the students in on-campus housing. This could be a perfect outgrowth of the

study, and offer a national perspective to the skills needed to be an effective student services manager, staff, or any professional associated with residential living. ACUHO-I, SWACUHO and other regional housing associations are in the best position to relay the findings of the policies and procedure. National Council of Student Development (NCSD) is another association that could participate in the study. Also, a combined effort with the college business officer's associations and the American Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers (APPA) could combine a study of practice with funding. Recent tabulation of the membership of SWACUHO noted that of the 625 institutional members of the organization, only 36 were from community colleges. This represents 6% of the total membership.

Recommendation #7: Study the financing of on-campus housing.

A study conducted by community college business officers could determine the number of additional student services that could be financed by housing profits. The affiliated council of Community College Business Officers that is in alliance with the American Association of Community Colleges should conduct this study, in cooperation with experienced officials from the Association of Physical Plant Administrators and the National Council of Student Development. Such a study should specifically address financial methods and techniques by which on-campus housing can best be renovated, as well as constructed.

Closing Remarks

For the over 37,000 students who live in on-campus residence halls in publicly controlled community colleges, there can be no acknowledgment of the myth that they do not exist. The presence of dormitory rooms, apartments, suites, or whatever the

college offers to its residential students is of central importance to both the college and the students. Primarily located in the South and North Central agricultural regions of the US, rural-serving colleges make up the bulk of publicly controlled community colleges offering residence halls on campus. The residence halls represent a healthy annual income to the colleges they serve. At a reported average of \$1,000,000 per year per school responding to the research question dealing with finances, it comes as no surprise that plans for new construction and remodeling of existing structures are ongoing. Most schools cite motivating factors as athletics, offering a true college experience, responding to the needs of the commuting students, diversifying the student body, and improving the full time enrollment as the top choices for having the residence halls. As a result of this study, the mythology in literature regarding the lack of on campus housing for publicly controlled community college students is hereby dispelled.

APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

October 12, 2004

Dear Campus Housing Official:

Based on evidence that a surprisingly large number of publicly controlled community colleges have residence hall systems, yet virtually nothing is widely known about this phenomenon, this survey has been developed.

Are the priorities and challenges of residence halls in two-year colleges the same as those at universities and other four-year institutions? What housing needs and services are most important in two-year college residence halls? Which services characterize the two-year institutions? This survey has been structured to collect data to answer these and other questions specific to publicly controlled community colleges.

Your campus has been identified through the review of IPEDS data as a publicly controlled two-year institution that possibly has a residence hall system. If you do not operate a housing system, please so indicate and return this survey to me in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. If you DO operate a system, would you please forward this survey to the appropriate staff person for completion and return it to me by November 1, 2004?

Many institutions and organizations have indicated their need for information on this topic, and look forward to a report of the findings. Thank you for helping with this project.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF ON-CAMPUS HOUSING AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

SURVEY OF ON-CAMPUS HOUSING AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The purpose of this research study is to determine the extent of involvement, motivation, and administration of on-campus housing at community colleges. You are being asked to complete a survey that will take approximately 20 minutes of your time. Completion of the survey involves no foreseeable risks; participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time. You give consent by completing the survey. No individual responses will be reported to anyone other than the researchers because data will be reported on a group basis. If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Pat Moeck, Doctoral Student in Higher Education, University of North Texas, at 214/860-2328. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board (940) 565-3940. You may print a copy of this notice for your records.

SECTION 1: Type and extent of on-campus housing

1. Who owns and operates the on-campus housing at your college?
 - College owns/operates all housing (includes residence halls, apartments, or both)
 - Third party operates all housing (private contract, typically apartments)
 - Both (college operates some housing and leases some to third party)

2. Please indicate the total number of beds at your college's on campus housing (includes housing leased by college to third party operator): _____

3. Does your college offer specialized housing for... *(please estimate # of beds)*
(please check all that apply)
 - First-Year Experience....._____
 - Honors....._____
 - International House....._____
 - Quiet or Intensive Study....._____
 - Non-Smoking....._____
 - Smoking....._____
 - Athletics Residence....._____
 - 12 Month (open at breaks)....._____
 - Married Student/Family Apartment(s)....._____
 - Single Parent/Family Apartment(s)....._____
 - Private Rooms (at an extra cost)....._____
 - Housing for specific academic programs
[specify program(s)....._____]
 - Other, please specify....._____

4. What percent of the students in the Residence Halls come from the college's primary service area?..... _____%

SECTION 2: Motivation for college involvement in operating on-campus housing

13. What motivates your college to be involved in residence halls? (check all that apply)

- provides a positive impact on institutional finances
- increases the number of full-time student enrollments
- allows the college to provide a true college experience with a broad array of programs and services (effectiveness, breadth)
- allows the college to better serve students in its service area who find it difficult to commute to the college
- improves economies of scale thereby allowing efficient delivery of a broader range of services to on-campus students (efficiencies, breadth)
- provides a cost-effective base of services to full-time students that allows the College to offer a broader range of services to its non-traditional commuter students
- provides a vehicle for the College to diversify its student body (check all that apply)
 - international students
 - athletes
 - minority students
 - students who live far away from College
- provides a vehicle that makes it economically possible for College to deliver specialized academic programs including allied health and nursing that serve the college's service area and beyond.

14. Please rate the importance of these reasons for offering on-campus housing by indicating Very Important (**VI**), Important (**I**), or Unimportant (**UI**) in each instance.

	VI	I	UI
Provides a positive impact on institutional finances.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increases the number of full-time student enrollments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Allows College to offer true collegiate experience, including broad mix of programs/services, that otherwise would be unaffordable.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
By lowering transportation costs/barriers, allows College to better serve students in its service area with commuting difficulties.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
By providing cost-effective services to its full-time students, the College is able to offer a broader range of services to its non-traditional part-time and commuter students.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides a vehicle making it possible for the college to diversify its student body (mark all that apply).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
international students.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
student-athletes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
minority students.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
students who live a long distance from the College....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
All of the above apply at this College.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Makes it possible for students to complete specialized academic programs that the College's service delivery area needs, such as nursing and allied health.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION 3: Operations of On-campus housing

15. From an economic perspective, how are residence halls operated on your campus?

Operated on a cost per bed basis..... Yes No

Operated on a semester/annual total revenue generated basis..... Yes No

If data are readily available, please estimate the total revenue generated: \$ _____

16. What division on campus does administration of on-campus housing report to?

Student services Business services

Other, please specify: _____

17. What is the title held by person with day-to-day administrative responsibilities for supervision of on-campus housing at your College? (please check one, or specify)

Dean of Student Services

Director of Student Life

Director of Housing

Other, please specify: _____

18. What is the highest degree earned by the on-campus housing director at your College?

Doctorate Masters Bachelor's Other _____

19. How many years of experience does the director of on-campus housing at the College have?

0-2 years 3-4 years 5-7 years over 7 years

20. Please estimate the total number at your College of....

a. Full-time staff involved in operating on-campus housing _____

b. Part-time staff involved in operating on-campus housing
(includes part-time residence life advisors) _____

c. Does full time staff estimate in (a) include janitorial/maintenance? Yes No

21. At your College in the next five years....

a. Is it likely new residence halls will be constructed?..... Yes No

b. Will major renovations occur to existing residence halls?..... Yes No

Responding Institution: _____

City & State: _____

Name of Respondent: _____

Title of Respondent: _____

Email Address: _____

If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please provide a name/ mailing address:

APPENDIX C
COMMUNITY COLLEGES REPORTING TO IPEDS 2000-2001 THAT THEY HAD
ON CAMPUS RESIDENCE HALLS

SUB-CLASS	IPEDS INSTITUTION REPORTING UNIT NAME	INSTITUTION CITY	STATE
RS	ILISAGVIK COLLEGE	BARROW	AK
RM	PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	VALDEZ	AK
RM	BEVILL STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SUMITON	AL
RL	GADSDEN STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	GADSDEN	AL
RM	GEORGE C WALLACE STATE COMMUNITY COLL-HANCEVILLE	HANCEVILLE	AL
SM	JAMES H FAULKNER STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BAY MINETTE	AL
RS	JEFFERSON DAVIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BREWTON	AL
RM	NORTHWEST SHOALS COMMUNITY COLLEGE-MUSCLE SHOALS	MUSCLE SHOALS	AL
RS	SNEAD STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BOAZ	AL
RM	SOUTHERN UNION STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	WADLEY	AL
2U4	ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY-BEEBE BRANCH	BEEBE	AR
RL	ARIZONA WESTERN COLLEGE	YUMA	AZ
SM	CENTRAL ARIZONA COLLEGE	COOLIDGE	AZ
RL	COCHISE COLLEGE	DOUGLAS	AZ
RL	EASTERN ARIZONA COLLEGE	THATCHER	AZ
RL	NORTHLAND PIONEER COLLEGE	HOLBROOK	AZ
RL	YAVAPAI COLLEGE	PRESCOTT	AZ
RL	COLLEGE OF THE REDWOODS	EUREKA	CA
RM	COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU	WEED	CA
RL	COLUMBIA COLLEGE	SONORA	CA
RM	LASSEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SUSANVILLE	CA
UM	REEDLEY COLLEGE	REEDLEY	CA
RL	SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE	SANTA ROSA	CA
RL	SHASTA COLLEGE	REDDING	CA
SS	SIERRA COLLEGE	ROCKLIN	CA
SS	TAFT COLLEGE	TAFT	CA
SM	WEST HILLS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	COALINGA	CA
RL	YUBA COLLEGE	MARYSVILLE	CA
RL	COLORADO MOUNTAIN COLLEGE	GLENWOOD SPRINGS	CO
RM	COLORADO NORTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	RANGELY	CO
SS	COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF AURORA	AURORA	CO
RS	LAMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE	LAMAR	CO
RL	NORTHEASTERN JUNIOR COLLEGE	STERLING	CO
RS	OTERO JUNIOR COLLEGE	LA JUNTA	CO
RM	TRINIDAD STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE	TRINIDAD	CO
RM	CHIPOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE	MARIANNA	FL
RM	LAKE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	LAKE CITY	FL
RM	SOUTH FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AVON PARK	FL
RM	ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE	TIFTON	GA
RM	GORDON COLLEGE	BARNESVILLE	GA
RM	MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE	COCHRAN	GA
RS	NORTH GEORGIA TECHNICAL COLLEGE	CLARKESVILLE	GA
RS	SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE	DOUGLAS	GA

SUB-CLASS	IPEDS INSTITUTION REPORTING UNIT NAME	INSTITUTION CITY	STATE
RS	SOUTH GEORGIA TECHNICAL COLLEGE	AMERICUS	GA
2U4	MAUI COMMUNITY COLLEGE	KAHULUI	HI
RL	EASTERN IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT	DAVENPORT	IA
RM	INDIAN HILLS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	OTTUMWA	IA
RM	IOWA CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE	FT DODGE	IA
RM	IOWA LAKES COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ESTHERVILLE	IA
RS	IOWA VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT	MARSHALLTOWN	IA
SM	IOWA WESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	COUNCIL BLUFFS	IA
RM	NORTH IOWA AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	MASON CITY	IA
RS	NORTHWEST IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SHELDON	IA
RM	SOUTHEASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	WEST BURLINGTON	IA
RS	SOUTHWESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	CRESTON	IA
RM	WESTERN IOWA TECH COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SIOUX CITY	IA
RL	COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN IDAHO	TWIN FALLS	ID
2U4	VINCENNES UNIVERSITY	VINCENNES	IN
RM	ALLEN COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	IOLA	KS
RL	BARTON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	GREAT BEND	KS
SM	BUTLER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	EL DORADO	KS
RM	CLOUD COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	CONCORDIA	KS
RS	COFFEYVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE & AREA TECH SCHOOL	COFFEYVILLE	KS
RS	COFFEYVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE & AREA TECH SCHOOL	COFFEYVILLE	KS
RM	COLBY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	COLBY	KS
RM	COWLEY COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ARKANSAS CITY	KS
RM	DODGE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	DODGE CITY	KS
RM	FORT SCOTT COMMUNITY COLLEGE	FT SCOTT	KS
RM	GARDEN CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	GARDEN CITY	KS
RM	HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	HIGHLAND	KS
RM	HUTCHINSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	HUTCHINSON	KS
RS	INDEPENDENCE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	INDEPENDENCE	KS
RM	LABETTE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	PARSONS	KS
RM	NEOSHO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	CHANUTE	KS
RS	NORTH CENTRAL KANSAS TECHNICAL COLLEGE	BELOIT	KS
RS	NORTHWEST KANSAS TECHNICAL COLLEGE	GOODLAND	KS
RS	PRATT COMMUNITY COLLEGE	PRATT	KS
RS	SEWARD COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	LIBERAL	KS
RM	HAZARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE	HAZARD	KY
2U4	LEXINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	LEXINGTON	KY
RS	GARRETT COLLEGE	MCHENRY	MD
RS	CENTRAL MAINE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	AUBURN	ME
RS	EASTERN MAINE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	BANGOR	ME
RS	NORTHERN MAINE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	PRESQUE ISLE	ME
RM	SOUTHERN MAINE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	SOUTH PORTLAND	ME
RS	WASHINGTON COUNTY TECHNICAL COLLEGE	CALAIS	ME

SUB-CLASS	IPEDS INSTITUTION REPORTING UNIT NAME	INSTITUTION CITY	STATE
RM	ALPENA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ALPENA	MI
RM	BAY DE NOC COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ESCANABA	MI
RM	KIRTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ROSCOMMON	MI
RM	NORTH CENTRAL MICHIGAN COLLEGE	PETOSKEY	MI
RM	NORTHWESTERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE	TRAVERSE CITY	MI
RM	FERGUS FALLS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	FERGUS FALLS	MN
RS	MESABI RANGE COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE	EVELETH	MN
RS	MESABI RANGE COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE	VIRGINIA	MN
RS	RAINY RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	INTERNATIONAL FALLS	MN
RM	RIVERLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	AUSTIN	MN
RS	VERMILION COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ELY	MN
RM	CROWDER COLLEGE	NEOSHO	MO
SM	JEFFERSON COLLEGE	HILLSBORO	MO
RS	LINN STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	LINN	MO
RM	MINERAL AREA COLLEGE	PARK HILLS	MO
RM	MOBERLY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	MOBERLY	MO
RS	NORTH CENTRAL MISSOURI COLLEGE	TRENTON	MO
2U4	SOUTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY-WEST PLAINS	WEST PLAINS	MO
RM	STATE FAIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SEDALIA	MO
RS	COAHOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	CLARKSDALE	MS
RM	COPIAH-LINCOLN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	WESSON	MS
RM	COPIAH-LINCOLN COMMUNITY COLLEGE-NATCHEZ CAMPUS	NATCHEZ	MS
RM	EAST CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE	DECATUR	MS
RM	EAST MISSISSIPPI COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SCOOPA	MS
RL	HINDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	RAYMOND	MS
RM	HOLMES COMMUNITY COLLEGE	GOODMAN	MS
RM	ITAWAMBA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	FULTON	MS
RM	JONES COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE	ELLISVILLE	MS
RM	MERIDIAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE	MERIDIAN	MS
RM	MISSISSIPPI DELTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	MOORHEAD	MS
RL	MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE	PERKINSTON	MS
RM	NORTHEAST MISSISSIPPI COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BOONEVILLE	MS
RM	NORTHWEST MISSISSIPPI COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SENATOBIA	MS
RM	PEARL RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	POPLARVILLE	MS
RS	SOUTHWEST MISSISSIPPI COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SUMMIT	MS
RS	DAWSON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	GLENDIVE	MT
RS	MILES COMMUNITY COLLEGE	MILES CITY	MT
2U4	MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BILLINGS-COLLEGE OF TECHN	BILLINGS	MT
RS	MONTANA TECH-COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY	BUTTE	MT
RM	BISMARCK STATE COLLEGE	BISMARCK	ND
RM	LAKE REGION STATE COLLEGE	DEVILS LAKE	ND
2U4	MINOT STATE UNIVERSITY-BOTTINEAU CAMPUS	BOTTINEAU	ND
RM	NORTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE OF SCIENCE	WAHPETON	ND

SUB-CLASS	IPEDS INSTITUTION REPORTING UNIT NAME	INSTITUTION CITY	STATE
RS	WILLISTON STATE COLLEGE	WILLISTON	ND
RL	CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE	GRAND ISLAND	NE
RM	MID PLAINS COMMUNITY COLLEGE AREA	NORTH PLATTE	NE
2U4	NEBRASKA COLLEGE OF TECHNICAL AGRICULTURE	CURTIS	NE
RM	NORTHEAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE	NORFOLK	NE
RL	SOUTHEAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE AREA	LINCOLN	NE
RM	WESTERN NEBRASKA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	SCOTTSBLUFF	NE
RM	NEW HAMPSHIRE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE	CONCORD	NH
2U4	EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY-ROSWELL CAMPUS	ROSWELL	NM
RM	NEW MEXICO JUNIOR COLLEGE	HOBBS	NM
2U4	NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY-DONA ANA	LAS CRUCES	NM
RM	NORTHERN NEW MEXICO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ESPANOLA	NM
2U4	UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO-LOS ALAMOS CAMPUS	LOS ALAMOS	NM
RM	GREAT BASIN COLLEGE	ELKO	NV
SS	FARMINGDALE-STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	FARMINGDALE	NY
RM	HERKIMER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	HERKIMER	NY
RM	MOHAWK VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE-UTICA BRANCH	UTICA	NY
SS	SUNY COLLEGE OF AGRIC AND TECHN AT COBLESKILL	COBLESKILL	NY
SM	SUNY COLLEGE OF AGRIC AND TECHN AT MORRISVILLE	MORRISVILLE	NY
RM	SUNY COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY AT ALFRED	ALFRED	NY
RM	SUNY COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY AT CANTON	CANTON	NY
RS	SUNY COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY AT DELHI	DELHI	NY
RL	HOCKING COLLEGE	NELSONVILLE	OH
2U4	OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL INST	WOOSTER	OH
RM	CARL ALBERT STATE COLLEGE	POTEAU	OK
RM	CONNORS STATE COLLEGE	WARNER	OK
RM	EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGE	WILBURTON	OK
RS	MURRAY STATE COLLEGE	TISHOMINGO	OK
RM	NORTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECH COLL	MIAMI	OK
RM	NORTHERN OKLAHOMA COLLEGE	TONKAWA	OK
2U4	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-OKMULGEE	OKMULGEE	OK
2U4	ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY	CLAREMORE	OK
RM	SEMINOLE STATE COLLEGE	SEMINOLE	OK
RM	WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGE	ALTUS	OK
RM	CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BEND	OR
RS	COLUMBIA GORGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	THE DALLES	OR
RL	SOUTHWESTERN OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE	COOS BAY	OR
RS	TREASURE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ONTARIO	OR
UM	NORTHAMPTON COUNTY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	BETHLEHEM	PA
2U4	PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY	WILLIAMSPORT	PA
2U4	PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY-PENN ST MCKEESPORT	MCKEESPORT	PA
2U4	PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY-PENN STATE BEAVER	MONACA	PA
2U4	PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY-PENN STATE	HAZLETON	PA

SUB-CLASS	IPEDS INSTITUTION REPORTING UNIT NAME	INSTITUTION CITY	STATE
	HAZLETON		
2U4	PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY-PENN STATE MONT ALTO	MONT ALTO	PA
2U4	PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY-PENN STATE SCHUYLKIL	SCHUYLKILL HAVEN	PA
RS	THADDEUS STEVENS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY	LANCASTER	PA
2U4	UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH-TITUSVILLE	TITUSVILLE	PA
RS	DENMARK TECHNICAL COLLEGE	DENMARK	SC
RL	AMARILLO COLLEGE	AMARILLO	TX
RM	ANGELINA COLLEGE	LUFKIN	TX
RL	BLINN COLLEGE	BRENHAM	TX
SPECIAL	CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE	KILLEEN	TX
RM	CISCO JUNIOR COLLEGE	CISCO	TX
RS	CLARENDON COLLEGE	CLARENDON	TX
RM	COASTAL BEND COLLEGE	BEEVILLE	TX
RS	FRANK PHILLIPS COLLEGE	BORGER	TX
RM	GALVESTON COLLEGE	GALVESTON	TX
RM	GRAYSON COUNTY COLLEGE	DENISON	TX
RM	HILL COLLEGE	HILLSBORO	TX
RM	HOWARD COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT	BIG SPRING	TX
RM	KILGORE COLLEGE	KILGORE	TX
RL	LAREDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE	LAREDO	TX
RM	MIDLAND COLLEGE	MIDLAND	TX
RL	NAVARRO COLLEGE	CORSICANA	TX
RL	NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE	GAINESVILLE	TX
RM	NORTHEAST TEXAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	MOUNT PLEASANT	TX
RM	ODESSA COLLEGE	ODESSA	TX
RS	PANOLA COLLEGE	CARTHAGE	TX
RM	PARIS JUNIOR COLLEGE	PARIS	TX
RS	RANGER COLLEGE	RANGER	TX
RL	SOUTH PLAINS COLLEGE	LEVELLAND	TX
RM	SOUTHWEST COLLEGE INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF	BIG SPRING	TX
RM	SOUTHWEST TEXAS JUNIOR COLLEGE	UVALDE	TX
RM	TEMPLE COLLEGE	TEMPLE	TX
RM	TEXARKANA COLLEGE	TEXARKANA	TX
RM	TEXAS STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE-HARLINGEN	HARLINGEN	TX
RM	TEXAS STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE-MARSHALL	MARSHALL	TX
RM	TEXAS STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE-WACO	WACO	TX
RM	TEXAS STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGE-WEST TEXAS	SWEETWATER	TX
SM	TRINITY VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ATHENS	TX
RL	TYLER JUNIOR COLLEGE	TYLER	TX
RM	VERNON COLLEGE	VERNON	TX
SS	WEATHERFORD COLLEGE	WEATHERFORD	TX
RS	WESTERN TEXAS COLLEGE	SNYDER	TX
RM	WHARTON COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE	WHARTON	TX

SUB-CLASS	IPEDS INSTITUTION REPORTING UNIT NAME	INSTITUTION CITY	STATE
RM	COLLEGE OF EASTERN UTAH	PRICE	UT
RL	DIXIE STATE COLLEGE OF UTAH	ST GEORGE	UT
RM	SNOW COLLEGE	EPHRAIM	UT
RM	BIG BEND COMMUNITY COLLEGE	MOSES LAKE	WA
RM	PENINSULA COLLEGE	PORT ANGELES	WA
RL	SKAGIT VALLEY COLLEGE	MT VERNON	WA
RM	YAKIMA VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	YAKIMA	WA
RM	SOUTHWEST WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE	FENNIMORE	WI
2U4	UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN COLLEGES	MADISON	WI
RL	WESTERN WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE	LA CROSSE	WI
2U4	POTOMAC STATE COLLEGE OF WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY	KEYSER	WV
RM	CASPER COLLEGE	CASPER	WY
RS	CENTRAL WYOMING COLLEGE	RIVERTON	WY
RS	EASTERN WYOMING COLLEGE	TORRINGTON	WY
RM	LARAMIE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE	CHEYENNE	WY
RS	NORTHWEST COMMUNITY COLLEGE	POWELL	WY
RM	SHERIDAN COLLEGE	SHERIDAN	WY
RM	WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE	ROCK SPRINGS	WY

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. and Atelsek, F. (1982) An assessment of college student housing and physical plant. (Report No. ACEHEP55) American Council on Education, Washington, DC.
- Anderson Strickler, LLC. (2000, October). *Public/private partnerships for student housing*. Gaithersburg, MD.
- Boyer, E. (1991). *Campus life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Caro, R. (1991). *The path to power*. New York: Random House.
- Castaneda, Cindy. (2004). A national overview of intercollegiate athletics in public community colleges. Dissertation, University of North Texas.
- Catt, S. (1998) Adjustment problems of freshmen attending a distant, non-residential community college. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Doggett, B. (1981). A study to develop guidelines for enhancing student development through residence education in community colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 42(02), AAT8116857.
- Hardy, D. (2005) A two-year college typology for the 21st century: An update of the Katsinas-Lacey classification system. Dissertation, University of North Texas.
- Hutchins, S. (Ed.) (1986). *Trustee Quarterly*, Volume 10. Association of Community College Trustees. 10 (1-4).
- Johnson, G. and Anchia, R. (2003) Privatization: One answer for college housing needs. Patton Boggs LLP Report. Washington, DC.
- Jons, T. (1981, April). Study of student housing needs and availability in public institutions of higher education. (Report NO. CPE-81-13). Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education. Olympia, WA.
- Katsinas, S., Opp, and Alexander, (2003). Preserving access with excellence, financing for rural community colleges. Rural Community Colleges Initiative Policy Brief. Chapel Hill, NC: MDC, Inc. Retrieved February 28, 2005 from http://www.mdcinc.org/rcci/preserving_access.pdf.

- Katsinas, S., Palmer, J., and Tollefson, T. (2004) State funding for community colleges: Perceptions from the field. National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges. Retrieved March 1, 2005 from <http://www.unt.edu/highered/Priest/sd04.pdf> .
- Katsinas, S. Lacey, V. and Hardy, D. (2005). *A classification of two-year colleges in the United States*. In press.
- Lords, E. (1999). More community colleges are building dormitories. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 46(2), 54-55.
- Millschtein, A. (2003). Privatized housing dos and don'ts. *College Planning and Management* 6(4), 16-19.
- Pallack, B. (2004, January 11). An alternative to dorms. *Arizona Daily Star*. [Electronic Version] 1-3.
- Pascarella, E., and Terenzini, P. (1991) *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Phillippe and Patton (2002). *Fact Book*. National profile of community colleges: trends and statistics.
- Saffian, S. R. (2002). Making spaces: Two-year campus residential facilities. *Community College Journal*, 72 (5), 42-45.
- State of Arizona Office of the Auditor General. (1998, July). *Performance audit universities' auxiliary enterprises*. (Report No. 98-11). Phoenix, AZ: D. Norton.
- State University of New York. (1995, May) *Trends in tuition and other basic charges 1963-64 through 1994-95, with typical student costs 1980-81 through 1994-95*. (Report No. 19-95). Albany, NY: Central Staff Office of Institutional Research.
- Stout, R. (1996, May) Community attitudes about economic impacts of colleges: a case study. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Albuquerque, NM.
- Summers, P. and Budig, J. (1988, April). Residence hall systems at community and junior colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Las Vegas NV.
- Unruh, D. L. (1995). Preparing for a new generation of students. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*. 25 (2), 9-12.