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The majority of North American towns and cities have witnessed increasing populations of students over the last two decades. This has created many challenges, as well as opportunities, for local organisations as student populations often require temporary rental accommodation during their studies, as well as student-oriented services (e.g. retail and leisure).

Although some students are accommodated on campuses, many students live off-campus. This can disrupt the balance of local communities and neighborhoods, and potentially undermine positive town and gown relationships. Many of these issues are debated at the International Town and Gown Association (ITGA) Annual Conferences, and delegates articulate and share their good practices for effectively integrating and managing student populations into settled residential populations.

In the UK context, these processes of urban change are widely described as ‘studentification’. Recently, there has been an uptake of the term in North America and other international contexts, within both academic and policy arenas. Studentification is an international phenomenon, as higher education systems extend across the globe.

The key aim of the Studentification Guide for North America is to stimulate the sharing and uptake of international good practice for the effective integration and management of student populations within off-campus, settled residential neighborhoods. The Guide presents examples of leading good practices to foster positive town and gown relations, presented by delegates at the ITGA annual conferences. We are grateful to the ITGA Executive Board and its members for their support and encouragement in producing this Guide.

Professor Darren P. Smith
Professor Michael Fox

May 2019
1. Introduction

1.1 Why is a Guide needed?
Over the last decade, the Annual Conferences and surveys of the International Town and Gown Association has consistently served to demonstrate how and why some North American towns and cities have been transformed by processes tied to growing student populations and the expansion of universities in off-campus locations. This is in a similar vein to towns and cities across the globe, despite different systems of higher education and very diverse student lifestyles in different national contexts. Outside of North America, the social, cultural, economic and physical changes to university towns and cities have been widely understood using the concept of studentification. Adopting the term studentification has provided a valuable framework for policy makers, universities and other stakeholders across the globe to find more effective ways of integrating students into the physical and social fabric of university towns and cities. At the same time, this has enabled more harmonious town and gown relations to be fostered, as well as more fully unlocking the undoubted benefits of universities and students for regional and local economies, societies, cultures and environments (see below).

Our aim in this Guide is to draw upon evidence from contributions at recent International Town and Gown Association Conferences, and our own results from surveys and content analyses of relevant literatures, to showcase examples of leading practices in the context of studentification. Although there is a rapidly increasing uptake of the term studentification by North American researchers, a broader overview of studentification in the North American context is lacking.

Of course, evidence from the recent Annual Conferences of the International Town and Gown Association reveals that there are marked differences in expressions of studentification in North America. It is clear that the effects of studentification are place-specific, and are tied to the specifics of universities, housing and labor markets, local cultures, and so on. As a result, this Guide emphasises the need for partnerships and strategic relationships and strategies that are tailored to local contexts, between university administrations, faculty and staff, student governments, local government, local communities, and other stakeholders over the longer term, rather than traditional episodic moments in the wake of an issue or crisis.
1.2 Who should use this Guide?
This Guide is aimed at professionals in both higher education and local government, including Off-Campus Housing Managers/Officers, Community Liaison Officers, Student Affairs Officers, Strategic Planning and Marketing officials, with an interest in university-community relations and student housing and the creation of balanced communities, and a range of actors from local government including Planning, Housing, Environmental Health, Infrastructure and Re-development, Community Relations, police and emergency services and enforcement, etc. The Guide will also be relevant to local community groups, and private sector commercial organizations, particularly land developers and landlords. The leading practices highlighted should not be treated as a prescriptive list. Instead, the examples referenced should be viewed as a starting point for activities related to building relationships and on-going partnerships. Universities are in place for the long-term, so it is critical to treat the flow of students coming and leaving the community as an essential element of community planning and development. Here, we view “town and gown” relationships as part of the overall reality of the community, with both challenges and opportunities. The Guide concludes with a series of recommendations to address the challenges of studentification in North America.

1.3 What is ‘studentification?’
The term ‘studentification’ was coined by Smith (2000) to describe the processes of urban change tied to growing residential concentrations of students in the localities of institutions of higher education. There are four simultaneous dimensions to the process:

- **Social:** the replacement and/or displacement of a group of settled residents, leading to new patterns of social concentration and segregation;
- **Cultural:** the growth of concentrations of young people with shared cultures and lifestyles, and consumption practices, which in turn results in the growth of certain types of retail and service infrastructure;
- **Physical:** the upgrading or downgrading of the physical environment, depending on the local context; and
- **Economic:** the inflation of property prices and a change in the balance of the housing stock resulting in neighborhoods becoming dominated by private rented and shared housing in a wide variety of structural types and densities.

1.4 What are the benefits of studentification?
The broad macro-level benefits that universities and students bring to towns and cities are expected to ‘trickle down’ to local neighborhoods. These can include:

- A more flexible local workforce of young and educated people.
- Potentially raising the aspirations and expectations of the local young population.
- Creating a potentially healthier and active population, and the provision of athletics facilities.
- Increasing levels of volunteering (via student governments and other clubs and volunteer groups) in local communities for social and environmental programs.
- Enhancing spending power for the purchase of goods and services in the local economy, and sustaining local retail and leisure businesses and jobs.
- Creating demands to sustain public (e.g. transport/health care/dentists) and private services (e.g. pubs/clubs, cafés, restaurants, retail, leisure), and jobs in these sectors.
- Adding more diversity and vibrancy (e.g. music, art, festivals, sporting events) to local cultural offerings, and supporting the development of local creative economies.
- Supporting buoyant (rental/owner-occupied) housing markets and associated trades (e.g. building, plumbing, property maintenance), as well as rental and real estate agency/insurance/finance markets.
- Acting as a catalyst for urban regeneration and capital investment programs.
- Driving-up the demand for the provision of high-quality modern accommodation and better-managed housing and residential environments.
- Making places, directly and indirectly, more appealing for tourists, visitors and investors.
- Sustaining the business of universities and higher education institutions (and secondary services/industries) and a range of jobs in these sectors.
- Sustaining the demographic structures of populations through in-migration and retention.
1.5 What are the challenges of studentification?

The research for this Guide shows that the disadvantages of studentification are experienced differently in different parts of North America. This Guide summarises and addresses the main generic disadvantages of studentification in terms of overarching structural issues and the practical cultural, social, physical and economic effects that are the root causes of the phenomenon.

1.5.1 Structural issues

Studentification is occurring across North America as a result of a number of wider, often unrelated, policy drivers and imperatives including:

- the growth of knowledge-based economies and societies, and the imperatives of economic competitiveness;
- the expansion of higher education by government in pursuit of a vision of a well-educated and highly-skilled workforce;
- an increased supply of economic capital and mortgage finance, in conjunction with relatively low interest rates;
- the deregulation of the private rented housing sectors, and the encouragement of the private sector to meet current and future housing demands;
- a regression of statutory enforcement and planning powers to regulate the operation of free-market economies;
- the rise of ‘investment cultures’ of particular social classes, and the creation of ‘retirement pots’ via various entrepreneurial strategies;
- ideological shifts in the life course transition between childhood and adulthood; and
- an assumption of the right to participate in higher education.

It is valuable to acknowledge these conditions when considering issues of studentification.

1.5.2 Practical challenges of studentification

Studentification manifests itself negatively in a number of practical, and often interrelated, ways in some contexts. These are summarised below

Cultural

- Expansion of shared, multi-person student housing in traditional family areas leads to change in nature of communities.
- Lack of social mix where high concentrations of students.
- Gradually self-reinforcing unpopularity of area for families wishing to bring up children.
- Conversion of houses into student residences, often precludes transformation back into family homes.
- Transient occupation engenders a lack of community integration and cohesion and less commitment to maintain the quality of local environment.
- Turnover and short stay are disincentives and a barrier to self-policing and aversion of crime.
- Different ‘standards’ of what is considered acceptable behavior by different social groups.
- Lifestyle conflicts – late night student culture disturbs children and working people.
- Different perceptions of what constitute communal obligations’ ‘Thoughtlessness and inappropriate behavior’.

Social

- Increase in low-level anti-social behavior such as noise and related nuisances.
- Concentration of vulnerable young people with low awareness of security leading to increased levels of crime.
- Decreased demand for some local services leading to closure – particularly health and educational services. Gradual reduction in catchment areas for local schools.
- Residents feel pressure to move to avoid becoming marginalized and isolated as permanent residents – from majority to minority situations.
- Displacement / replacement of established residents
- Increased competition for private rented housing.

1 Based on Smith AND Holt (2003)
Pressure for greater provision of establishments catering to night time entertainment and consequent detrimental impact on residential amenity.

Seasonal availability of some retail and service provision – development of a ‘resort economy’.

**Physical**

- Reduction in quality of housing stock, due to lack of investment by absentee landlords.
- Neglect of external appearance to properties attributable to unconscientious landlords and absentee landlords.
- Neglected gardens and lawns or replacement of planting by inert surfaces contributing to declining standard of the streetscape.
- Turnover of properties and a preponderance of property rental boards/advertisements - recurring annually, detract from streetscape.
- Increased population density.
- Increased pressures on services (policing, waste management, highways, planning).
- Pressure on public transport.
- Seasonal traffic congestion (e.g. at graduations, end of term).
- Low awareness of garbage/recycling systems and collection timetables.
- Increase of squalor (litter/garbage), as infrastructure is designed for lower density usage and different conceptions of neighborhood spaces.
- Accumulations of garbage/waste (including bulky items) in back lanes.
- Dumping of household furnishings at the end of term.
- Noise between dwellings at all times especially music and at night – parties and gatherings.
- Late night street noise disturbance from revellers returning home.
- Damage and littering resulting from late night revelry.
- Increased and unsightly posters and ads around the neighborhood.

**Economic**

- High demand for student housing and the stimulus to private rented sector leads to a rise in house prices, deterring access to affordable housing for other sections of community.
- A concentration of students in particular streets acts as a strong inducement to owner-occupiers of non-student properties to take advantage of a lucrative sale to private student landlords.
- Changes in type of retail and entertainment services available – e.g. local shops becoming take-out and cafes.
- Fluctuating demand for private rented housing.
- Seasonal employment (in shops, restaurants, pubs/bars).
- Representation without taxation – students exempt from local taxes and status as a citizen/resident of the community.

It is clear from this listing that many of the challenges and issues linked to studentification are the product of wider societal processes of change, and also that many are not confined to students as a group – they could equally apply to concentrations of young people, or to tenants, generally. However, as the Guide shows, there are actions that universities, in partnership with local government and other stakeholders, can take to help prevent or ameliorate concerns.

Many of the listed disadvantages are linked and it is often their combined effects that can cause concern and resentment in local communities. Whereas certain concerns can be tackled individually, this Guide also suggests ways that universities can also deal more holistically with the overall issues, in partnership with individuals and community groups and authorities.

**1.6 What is the scale of the issues?**

The research for this Guide suggests that the challenges of studentification are perceived across North America, and many of the challenges parallel expressions of studentification across the globe, yet the scale of the issue in the North American context is massive, in terms of social and economic impact and spatial extent of the phenomenon. There are close to 5,000 colleges and universities in the United States with a record 21.6 million students (National Center for Education Statistics 2011), while there are 150 communities across Canada, both large and small, that act as home to colleges and universities with 840,000 full-time university students and an additional 460,000 full-time college students registered in various programs of study (Statistics Canada 2009). From 1999 to the most recent statistical reports in 2009, student enrolments have increased over 40 percent across the post-
secondary sector in Canada, and close to 30 percent in the United States, where universities and colleges have seen higher percentages of their student population living off-campus in local communities, where student discipline codes and student activities and behaviour are usually not supervised or regulated. Each September, local residents brace themselves for the various move-ins, orientation activities and homecoming parties that spill-over into the various near-campus neighborhoods (Fox 2012).

There is no doubt that colleges and universities present some significant challenges for municipal governments that must deliver municipal services, such as policing, fire-fighting, water and sewerage, and garbage/recycling pick-up to this annual influx of student residents. However, students and their lifestyle needs also mean big economic impacts and business opportunities and investments. In Canada, the economic investments in higher education are significant, employing 376,000 people and totalling more than $28 Billion in investments and $37 Billion in revenues and economic impact in Canada each year (Statistics Canada/CAUBO 2012). In the United States, the numbers are staggering, with close to $600 Billion in annual expenditures on post-secondary education (National Center for Education Statistics 2011). Each of these educational institutions represents a major economic force in the community over many decades and centuries. Indeed, many municipalities owe their very founding and economic growth and development to these institutions. Could we ever imagine places like Boston, Chicago, New York, or even smaller places like Ann Arbor, Stanford, Clemson, Boulder, Bozeman, Eugene, or Columbus, without their universities and colleges? The International Town and Gown Association (ITGA) has members from a wide range of communities across North America and we have been able to analyse the leading practices of many of these places in understanding the role of studentification in town and gown relations.

Based on the perceptions of ITGA members, findings from the survey questionnaire revealed that the majority of universities perceive that studentification is unfolding in their locality, and a small percentage of just over 10 per cent of respondents stated that no concerns had been raised by local community groups. However, the research also found that the incidence of local community groups raising concerns associated with student populations is more widely distributed than university responses acknowledged.
2. Preventing and responding to the challenges of studentification: Structural issues

This section considers the overarching structural issues which studentification engenders. As described earlier, the structural effects of studentification are the outcome of a combination of a range of wider circumstances and much of this occurs without the direct influence of universities or local governments – such as the policy of marked expansion of post-secondary educational institutions or the maintenance of low interest rates for buy-to-rent properties in near-campus neighborhoods. Despite the fact that one task of the research project underpinning this Guide was to map out but not to review or critique the current legislative and statutory frameworks of central and local governments, many of those we interviewed believed that preventing or alleviating the challenges of studentification will only be realised in the longer-term if some of the legislation underpinning the wider causes of studentification is amended or changed. This Guide concentrates on the short-to-medium-term gains which can be achieved from changes to and/or the introduction of these practices.

2.1 Acknowledging the issues

Nonetheless, there are actions that can be taken by colleges and universities and local governments, as well as the individual and groups of students and their student leadership groups. As the research and leading practices in this Guide reports, cities and towns, post-secondary institutions and other stakeholders are already making use of existing planning and development powers, housing and environmental health legislation – some quite creatively – in addressing the challenges of studentification. Colleges and universities and the range of constituencies within these places should be fully part of any such local dialogue. As a prelude to this, all educational partners need to become aware of studentification as an issue in North America and to recognise that negative effects might be occurring in contexts, or in danger of occurring, in their community, even if there is no organised community resistance or media attention. Many ITGA members we heard from cautioned: “don’t assume that because things are quiet there is harmony. There can be seething discontent even if there is not open warfare.”

Leading Practice: Clemson, South Carolina – A Long-term, Integrated Approach to Town and Gown Issues and Founding Member of ITGA

Within the world of university-community relations, and one of the original North American communities identified with the processes involved in studentification, ITGA members consistently look to Clemson University and the City of Clemson as a model of leading practice in an overall, long-term investment in town and gown relations, from strong leadership from the mayor and the university president and the formation of a Joint City-University Advisory Board in 1986, to becoming a founding member of ITGA in 2008. Current leading practices include: an alcohol and drug strategic plan that targets high-risk drinking and illegal drug use through prevention, protection, intervention, treatment, and environmental management. Clemson has developed a Community Coalition, made up of community and university students and administrators, with a mission to promote cultural change by engaging in education, coalition building, environmental management, and other activities to reduce high risk behavior, such as alcohol and drug use among college students in the community.

Clemson has a well-established Party Registration System aimed at reducing the negative consequences of excessive noise and other nuisance incidents associated with parties in residential neighborhoods. This has been added to with the development of an Environmental Context for Safety, with water risk and safety plans, integrated campus-community fire response, and law enforcement agreements and shared activities, such as downtown street cameras, improved street lighting and critical event scenario planning, including bar crawls.

A major difference to other international communities with a university is the significant attention to sporting events, particularly Clemson’s city-university football planning scenarios and preparation. A town with 15,000 residents plays host to 100,000 guests on 7 or 8 week-ends each fall season.

Clemson also has an integrated public transit and parking system shared between town and gown. Bus transit is free of charge for all and 25% of students are regular riders. This is part of an integrated sustainability planning approach and there has been a significant level of leadership and outreach in sustainability education, including making it an integral part of the curriculum and civic service learning and civic engagement practice.

Clemson demonstrates that no president, mayor or community can rest on their laurels, as the on-going pressures of the studentification process are always present and may flare-up at any time. Clemson is currently addressing a significant number of land-use issues, as both on-campus and off-campus housing developments continue to place pressure on the relationships between town and gown. Having a longstanding relationship and solid partnerships, in good times and bad, will surely prevail in this latest test.

are apparent. The evidence suggests that if these post-secondary institutions do not acknowledge and act, it can entrench resentment on the part of the local community that will be more difficult to address at a later date. Having accepted that it would be fruitful for some form of intervention to bridge the gulf between the profit-maximisation strategies of the free-market and the wider societal costs, it is critical that educational institutions in the community be involved in developing and implementing the initiatives. Positively, there has clearly been a marked shift in the cultures of university leadership, students and faculty since the late-1990s, with many places increasingly accepting the presence of studentification, and formalising their responsibilities within local Housing and Community Planning Strategies, acknowledging a role for students who live and socialize off-campus. Successfully addressing a higher concentration of off-campus student housing and social activities often includes police and other first responders and their understanding of the town and gown relationship.

Leading Practice: Enhancing Neighborhood Livability Through Town and Gown Relations: Normal, Illinois and the University of Illinois Community Relations and Off-Campus Life “Neighborhood Action Team”

Near-campus neighborhoods in Normal have become increasingly studentified, with a community of just over 50,000 residents as home to a centrally located university with 21,000 students. The Neighborhood Action Team (NAT) is an excellent example of leadership and consistent attention to quality of life and interaction issues between both residents and students through a series of town and gown partnerships. The NAT brings together university representatives from the housing office, off-campus services and the student conduct/Dean of Students offices. The City of Normal representatives include police and legal department offices, as well as the building and zoning and communications departments. The key to success has been joint leadership and action from the Mayor and the University president and Dean of Students Offices, as well as regular, on-the-ground planning sessions that include a strategic tiered approach to behavioral issues, problem properties, on-site inspections of all rental units, rapid response to complaints and concerns, a code of conduct that extends off-campus, as well as by-law enforcement for trash, parking, noise and outdoor activities. The key to success of the enforcement side of the program has been an equally important positive engagement strategy side, where the team engages in off-campus welcome activities, an “I Am Normal” community standards information program, a “Bring it Back to Normal” student engagement/service learning projects that give back to the neighborhoods, as well as a range of family events and celebrations through-out the year.


At the same time, it is crucial for local governments to recognize the phenomenon of studentification within their localities, and for this to align itself with the perceptions of colleges and universities located there. Local government is often the pivotal ‘neutral’ broker when issues of studentification are addressed. This requires a joint partnership approach – most notably between the Planning, Housing and Environment Departments of the local municipality, as well as an established town and gown committee with university students and officials.

2.2 Partnerships are key to addressing studentification

It is clear from the research that the challenges of studentification are most effectively tackled through a range of stakeholder groups working together on an on-going basis. All institutional staff and community representatives we interviewed stressed the need for joint partnerships, shared resources and working regimes and shared common visions, as well as organisational structures which foster such arrangements. The research indicates that, where relationships between the colleges and universities and their local communities have been particularly difficult, this has often been a function of a lack of a meaningful channel of communication or simply a failure to maintain regular discussions on important issues.

Leading Practice: University of Colorado and the City of Boulder – Leadership in Building a Strong City-University Partnership

In any discussion of leading practices in addressing the social, cultural, economic, and physical dimensions of the studentification process in the North American context, the long-time leadership of both institutional and civic representatives at University of Colorado–Boulder and the City of Boulder must be acknowledged. In various ways, shapes and forms, direct and meaningful relations have existed between university and civic personnel and their offices since 1988. Over the years, individual and institutional leadership has been nurtured and supported, with a deep commitment to enhancing the overall quality of life for everyone in this community. These issues have included groundbreaking practice in such areas as parties, noise, over-occupancy, parking, excessive littering, to the complex relationship and societal issues of alcohol and drug use, sexual assault and the educational aspects of legal and judicial systems, landlord-tenant issues and personal codes of conduct and responsible behaviour. As founding members of the International Town and Gown Association (ITGA), they have been leaders in developing and sharing joint city-university programs that provide students with a better understanding about their rights and responsibilities of living off-campus and becoming positive members of the community. A wide number of leading practices have been developed here, including programs such as rental housing services, restorative justice, community living classes, party registration programs, move-in workshops, neighborhood walkabouts, lease disclosure and review processes, student honor codes and sexual assault awareness. Through a strong relationship with the City of Boulder University Liaison, they have been able to enhance strategic partnerships among CU,
city agencies and neighborhood groups, managing joint university-city, interagency and community work teams in addressing commonly identified goals, including assisting students in becoming good neighbors and contributing to the community.

One of the most important features of the leadership and impact of this relationship is the early adoption of representatives and functional offices from both the city and the university, both of whom have been long-time employees and champions of town and gown relations. The Director of Off-Campus Housing and Neighborhood Relations at the University of Colorado-Boulder has been at the university for close to 30 years. The City of Boulder’s University Liaison has been in place for 15 years. Together, the city-university commitment has created one of the leading organizational approaches to studentification that we have seen in the North American context.

More details available at: University of Colorado-Boulder Off-Campus Housing & Neighborhood Relations http://ocss.colorado.edu
Community Coordinator – City of Boulder https://bouldercolorado.gov

2.3 Common vision

A shared common vision is not easy to realize, especially if relations have deteriorated and some parties feel aggrieved. As a starting point for a positive working partnership, existing evidence points to the need to identify shared and common overarching principles. These can be derived through consultation and discussions between the different organisations and stakeholders, and, evidence suggests, will require perseverance and commitment by all organisations and stakeholders - while ‘the City Council can exercise its community leadership role through brokerage and arbitration between stakeholders, it is clear that unless there is a balanced and wide-spread consensus on the way forward, such brokerage and arbitration is fruitless.’

Leading Practice: Blurring borders between town and gown: Amherst, Massachusetts and the University create a strategic approach to a long-term, sustainable community through enhanced communications and partnerships

“Physically disconnected and disengaged over time” was a recent summary observation made on the relationship between the Town of Amherst and its university. How does a community that has been home to a state university campus for over 150 years find itself at this point of benign neglect, where the presence of the university is often identified with the physical, social, cultural and economic issues at the root of the studentification process. Amherst is certainly not alone, in terms of a real or perceived gap in university-community relations, yet its recognition of the need to identify and take action on the issues associated with studentification are noteworthy. In 2013, the university chancellor and the Town of Amherst committed to a long-term analysis of the key issues associated with the relationship and the creation of a “University/Town Collaborative”. Beyond dealing with the daily, more immediate issues of large, unruly gatherings, student behavioral issues, noise and parking infractions, a consulting firm was engaged to work with the Collaborative in addressing short and long-term strategic issues by examining planning documents, transportation plans, housing market supply and demand data, as well as strategic economic development goals and innovation plans as the key to realizing the underlying causes of the episodic problems of student attending university and living in the community with their neighbors.

The University/Town of Amherst Collaborative, supported by civic and university leadership, have recognized some significant ways forward by addressing the recommendations for change, including a focus on mixed-use housing and planning for land use compatibility as a key area, as well as fostering local innovation, start-up and creating an entrepreneurial community. Recognizing a shared responsibility for town and gown relations, the Committee has now taken the lead on creating an “innovation ecosystem”, where there is recognition of the high value of research activities, creative fields and activities, entrepreneurship and start-up activities, as well as advanced manufacturing. Including the innovation and economic drivers within the university is a key change, as is sharing the university’s housing and services needs with the larger community.

In the months since its inception, the Collaborative has now created sub-committees with co-chairs from the town and university, to identify key goals, initiatives and interventions within the community. In particular, there have been three key areas addressed: 1) Housing (including student housing, housing for faculty and staff, and affordable housing); 2) Economic Development (including university partnerships, entrepreneurship and start-ups, food retail, and amenities); and 3) Quality of Life (including public safety and student behavior). All of these developments represent a significant cultural shift in university-community relations in Amherst and this approach represents a leading practice in addressing the root issues associated with studentification. Both town and university are confident that they have created a shift in the culture that engages old and new stakeholders in shaping their long-term town-gown success.

An important underpinning principle, and one that may be difficult to establish, is that a balanced view is taken about the issues including a recognition by all stakeholders that studentification per se does not ultimately lead to detrimental outcomes and does also result in many benefits and positives for their home communities. Another critical principle that often seems to be absent in the university-community relationship is the actual principle that students are central to the entire studentification process, so must be included as a key stakeholder group. They have to be at the table, no matter how transient this group might appear to be, while other stakeholders are longer-term, often paid employees of the university or the local government.

One of the areas of most debate within towns and cities is establishing a mutually acceptable and shared definition of a ‘balanced community’. Existing practice here suggests that parties and unruly behaviour and noise can, in part, begin to overcome such ambiguities by striving for agreement on indicators.

**Leading Practice: Achieving Community Together – San Marcos and Texas State University take a research-based approach to common sources of conflict in a university town**

Many university towns place enormous amounts of funding into fighting the usual outcomes of studentification, rather than the core issues. The City of San Marcos was dealing with large numbers of students living in the community through an over-reliance on police enforcement, especially patrolling, investigating, arresting, and prosecuting without detailed understanding of the specific social, economic and physical nature of the studentification process. In 2008, realizing that noise complaints were the #1 call type for police officers, the city decided to deal with the core issues of the problems through a detailed understanding of the research and planning required in dealing with these complex problems. ACT has been developed as a collaborative effort between the City of San Marcos and Texas State University to reduce common sources of conflict in the community: noise, parking, trash and the upkeep of rental property.

ACT is overseen by the ACT Committee, comprised of representatives from the university, city and community. The Committee includes the Vice President for Student Affairs, Dean of Students, Director of Housing and Residential Life, offices of Off Campus Living, Attorney for Students, Student Health Center, University Police Department, Student Diversity and Inclusion, and Parent and Family Relations. Representatives also include the City of San Marcos Assistant Chief of Police, Community Liaison, offices of Code Enforcement/Neighborhood Services, the Central Texas Dispute Resolution Center plus members of the Council of Neighborhood Associations and community-at-large. ACT represents a significant change in the way in which communities deal with the impacts of studentification by integrating research, planning, education, innovation, and relationship building between the key actors across the community. The symptoms of the problems are now dealt with by understanding the core characteristics of the dimensions of the process, with a focus on the occupants and the places they occupy – noise and housing have become the focus.

In terms of dealing with housing, “ACT Ally” is a program of ACT in collaboration with the Department of Housing and Residential Life at Texas State. Through ACT Ally, innovative approaches are used to address quality of life issues for a successful off campus living experience. Resources are available to assist with roommate disputes, landlord disputes, maintenance concerns and leasing issues to help resolve conflicts. ACT Ally connects students to the rental housing industry through ACT members and affiliates, who promote a healthy living environment plus demonstrate a pattern of fair and equitable business practices in the delivery of related services and products. As a participant in ACT Ally, an apartment complex, rental property, product or service provider is included in a select group to help students and parents make more informed decisions when choosing off campus housing.

A key issue in dealing with the effects of studentification is truly understanding the complexities of housing and student behaviour in those off-campus structures and neighborhoods where students choose to live. By dealing with those directly responsible for the ownership, planning, occupation, and behavior of student occupied structures, San Marcos has been able to establish expectations on the overall quality of life of these areas through a model for both students and businesses that are engaged with students living in the community. Through ACT, the university administration works directly with San Marcos police and code enforcement officers on issues with students living off-campus, including follow-up with student noise violations and housing property maintenance standards. They work with housing providers and other businesses to create a balance of power between landlords and tenants, as well as event management that does not market using excessive alcohol consumption, as well as planning, zoning and inspection of rental properties.

The results of the ACT program have been impressive, with a 34% reduction in noise complaints from 2008-2015 and noise complaints no longer the most frequent police call type, dropping from 6.1% of total calls to just 3.4%. Arrests and citations have been reduced by a staggering 63.4%, allowing police resources to be devoted to other issues and areas of the city. San Marcos has shifted the allocation of resources from dealing with the symptoms of the problems to delving into the core issues behind the studentification process. Through a shared response, both city and university have made an enormous improvement in the overall quality of life, created positive off-campus living arrangements, reduced citizen complaints, and created patterns of fair and equitable housing and business practices as the core issues.

Crucially, it is essential that any initiatives, which seek to encourage a spatial solution through the dispersal of students away from existing residential student clusters, are well planned, coherent and built into the wider strategic visions of all partners. Parties would wish to avoid the disadvantages which a loss of critical mass provided by students can accelerate in terms of economic recession and a fall in demand for transport, retail businesses and services.

2.4 Mutual respect

A common theme of the research findings is that there needs to be mutual respect between established residential neighborhoods, local governments and students. In this context the use of ‘us and them’ terminology such as ‘host’ or ‘locals’ from the community, or perhaps the more derogatory reference to ‘townies’, as opposed to students who are viewed as ‘guests’ or even referred to as ‘tourists’ or ‘transients’ in the community can be divisive. Much of our research reveals that even the term ‘student’ has many negative stereotypes attached to it, especially amongst long-term residents of a college town (Smith 2006; Fox 2012).

One of the central issues in understanding the complexities of who we label as a ‘student’ in the North American context is the underlying fact that there is no legal basis for even identifying or classifying an individual or group as a ‘student[s]’, in terms of their land using status, their economic classification or their ability to locate and associate freely with others in a given community. Even though the classification of a ‘student’ is only about their personal activity and registration in a post-secondary institution, the larger stereotype of a student has taken on the role of a de facto land-use function and an identifiable segment of the local population. The episodic events associated with the academic calendar of an educational institution has become the associated behavioural pattern of this particular demographic and occupational group in these places, which is obvious in terms of the various cultural, economic and behavioural characteristics we have identified as studentification.

With a substantial amount of negative attention associated with students living in neighborhoods off-campus and in the community, development proposals for various types of housing and apartments, as well as areas with a sizeable proportion of residents who are students, quickly become NIMBY [Not-In-My-Backyard] issues (Smith & Fox 2017). Long-time residents often look to land-use zoning for protection from their neighborhoods becoming dominated by students. According to Bickford and Blake-Dixon (2008), it becomes extremely difficult for municipalities and planners prepare by-laws to address these issues, they must remain cognizant of local, provincial/state and federal laws, rights, and freedoms protecting individuals from discrimination.

What our research interviews of ITGA members reveal is that we must acknowledge that it ‘takes two to tango’ in the town and gown relationship, so the role of the educational institution and its administration, faculty and student affairs personnel must also be part of the municipal government’s response to the challenges and opportunities of having a post-secondary institution within the community, all focused on the users of those services that connect campus to community. Much of the action discussed in the practical issues section below is, rightly, concerned with educating and integrating ‘traditional’ students into the ways of the community. However, the evidence suggests that in some cases there is a corresponding need for the local community to fully respect the citizenship rights of students and the right of students to reside within any part of the city or town. Zoning is a restrictive tool for the actual use of the land, not those who are using it. In addition, it is important to bear in mind, as was highlighted earlier, that such ‘us and them’ divisions are artificial when many members of the community happen also to be students or alumni, as well as working and living in the community. In areas of conflict and resentment between and within student and non-student populations it may be worth both student and non-student populations signing up to off-campus renter’s courses, local citizenship education programs, or civic engagement agreements, with fully engaged student governments and the creation of a welcoming community, open to all.

Leading Practice: Cal Poly Offers Educated Renters Certificate Program

The Educated Renters Certificate Program is an online program that helps students get prepared to be renters and live off campus in the San Luis Obispo Community. Students who go through this online program have the benefit of submitting a certificate with their rental application to participating landlords for consideration during the application process. Since the San Luis Obispo rental market is extremely competitive, the Off Campus Housing Program acts as a resource to help students secure housing. The program offers tips and information about the search and application process, such as home security and fire safety issues, tenant rights under California law, budgeting, and a complete renter inventory checklist. Knowing how to live in the community as a full participant enables students to overcome many of the stereotypes that sometimes exist within the near-campus neighborhoods and media accounts of late-night behaviour and rental housing in high concentrations.

Source: https://deanofstudents.calpoly.edu/content/offcampusprograms/housing

It is valuable for mutual respect to be extended to organisations and this will include recognition of universities and colleges as autonomous institutions with a right to pursue their core business and residents’ groups as expressing legitimate concerns about their neighborhoods.
2.5 The Need for a Student Housing Strategy

The research revealed that there has recently been a dramatic growth of student housing strategies in many towns and cities. A high proportion of survey respondents noted that their institution has an official strategy for student accommodation. However, some of institutions reported that they did not have an official strategy. This seems to point to the value of well-established official campus and off-campus student housing strategies for alleviating or counteracting the disadvantages of studentification in specific locations. On the other hand, having a strategy alone may not be sufficient. Over half of all respondents that stated that studentification disadvantages were being felt in their locality, even though they had an accommodation strategy. However, the institutions that are clearly at the forefront of tackling studentification disadvantages were being felt in their locality, even though they had an accommodation strategy. The key is having the personnel to operate and actualize these plans. Too often, the plans are created and then starved of those who would be needed to put it into action and provide it with ongoing evaluation and revision. One of the most innovative solutions we heard about were places where the university and the municipality created joint off-campus housing offices, with shared roles and responsibilities.

The research revealed that there has recently been a dramatic growth of student housing strategies in many towns and cities. A high proportion of survey respondents noted that their institution has an official strategy for student accommodation. However, some of institutions reported that they did not have an official strategy. This seems to point to the value of well-established official campus and off-campus student housing strategies for alleviating or counteracting the disadvantages of studentification in specific locations. On the other hand, having a strategy alone may not be sufficient. Over half of all respondents that stated that studentification disadvantages were being felt in their locality, even though they had an accommodation strategy. However, the institutions that are clearly at the forefront of tackling studentification disadvantages were being felt in their locality, even though they had an accommodation strategy. The key is having the personnel to operate and actualize these plans. Too often, the plans are created and then starved of those who would be needed to put it into action and provide it with ongoing evaluation and revision. One of the most innovative solutions we heard about were places where the university and the municipality created joint off-campus housing offices, with shared roles and responsibilities.

Best Practice: Building Strong Town and Gown Relations – The Community Liaison Officer at Colorado State University and the City of Fort Collins

Created in late 2001, the Community Liaison position was the result of a university-community committee’s work that studied the impact of student life in neighborhoods surrounding the University of Colorado campus. The City ultimately created a public nuisance ordinance and an identified need for increased university-community communications on dealing with the negatives associated with the studentification process. This jointly funded position had a mandate to promote “positive relationships between students and long-term residents through education, outreach, partnerships and connections.” This type of position represents a leading practice, in that it provides equal responsibilities to the city and the university, with an open and flexible approach to the issues that are root causes to town and gown conflict. With over 15 years of experience, the positive and sustained presence of such an office has a highly successful record, addressing the communications required between the various boards, committees, structural intricacies, and on-going attendance at meetings and public sessions, as well as a real presence at the table for critical issues in planning and land-use issues, neighborhood issues and task forces, student governance and university educational efforts, as well as housing and student party policies and advisory services. Having the right people in place has proven to be key to this position, including those in leadership positions, as well as the high-energy, high-touch and highly visible role of the liaison officer. ITGA members have looked to Colorado State and the City of Fort Collins in modelling this leading practice in their own town and gown relations.

Source: Jeannie Ortega, Director, Off-Campus Life, Colorado State University and Emily Allen, Community Liaison, City of Fort Collins & Colorado State University (2016). Presentation at the United Kingdom Town and Gown Association Conference, November 15-16, 2016, Nottingham, U.K.

As discussed earlier, many of the structural issues – relating to population density, for example – are beyond the university’s role to tackle. However, they could consider the effects of other policies and strategies and apply these in an intelligent way to their housing strategy. For example – many institutions are reshaping their recruitment patterns to attract more graduate students. Such students are likely to be more mature than undergraduates with different behaviors and lifestyles. A major implication of widening access policies is that more people drawn from the local community, as well as those coming into the community, will be engaged in higher education. It also recognizes that this will be a much more diverse set of individuals, which further questions the notion of a “typical” student. These changes will have an effect upon the pattern of the student population living in a community and should feed into the overall planning and housing strategy. Diversity in residents and location create a planned approach to studentification.

Places of higher learning may wish to use their housing strategies to consider the supply, management, control and demand for student accommodations. Student demand is likely to be diverse and evidence suggests that preferences shift over the student lifecourse. Different approaches will suit different student communities. Some respondents were sceptical about the suitability of so-called ‘student villages’, and the increasing development of large-scale, purpose-built student apartments for second-year and third-year students. It is likely that, in many cases, the supply of student accommodation for second-year and third-year students will continue to be met by the private rental sector, and in particular the supply of purpose-built structures.
### 2.6 Community strategy

Several universities and colleges have also developed community strategies that seek to widen the engagement of students in the community. This has been shown to be particularly effective in helping communities to understand the many positive aspects of attracting younger, healthier and highly engaged individuals to study in their community. One of the most notable aspects of our research on North American studentification has been the lack of attention to the positive attributes of the process, including volunteerism, student service learning and experiential learning opportunities that help the entire community.

**Leading Practice: University of Maryland’s Annual Good Neighbor Day Unites the Community Through Service**

Over 700 volunteers participated in 11 community service projects across Greater College Park during the University of Maryland’s Sixth Annual Good Neighbor Day on April 1st. The event, which doubled its number of volunteers from last year, is a day of service learning that brings together the greater College Park community to beautify shared spaces, educate and engage in sustainable practices, and take pride in the city.

Good Neighbor Day is a partnership between the University of Maryland, the City of College Park, and The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The event began in 2011 with 50 volunteers and one service project, and has grown steadily ever since. "The University of Maryland became the nation’s first Do Good campus last fall, and since then, we’ve seen a major influx in the number of students, faculty, staff, and alumni who are eager to work together to positively impact the community," said Gloria Aparicio Blackwell, director of the university’s Office of Community Engagement. "I’m so thrilled that we saw such a spike in volunteer participation at Good Neighbor Day and that the message to ‘do good’ is resonating with our community."

This year’s service projects focused on environmental efforts and social impact in support of a “healthy community.” Service projects included litter clean-ups in waterways that affect the Anacostia Watershed, native flower and tree plantings, invasive plant removal, the College Park Parkrun 5k, landscaping work at Cherokee Lane Elementary School, as well as many others. A youth bicycle safety demonstration and a community expo were also organized, as well as food and clothing drives to benefit the College Park Community Food Bank and GreenDrop.

"The best thing about Good Neighbor Day is the camaraderie between students and the community," said UMPD Chief David Mitchell. "We have a saying: ‘You only get out of a community, what you put in.’ And this is an investment. Once again this year we’ve done an amazing job with the City of College Park."

"Throughout the day, I was impressed and pleased to see so many smiling faces working together to benefit the community where we live, work, and play," said Carlo Colella, vice president of the university’s Division of Administration & Finance. In total, over 2,000 trees, shrubs, and flowers were planted, nearly 100 bags of debris were collected, about 1,500 square feet of weeds were pulled, a pollinator garden was created, and Terps Against Hunger, a student-led group from UMD, packaged 22,000 meals for individuals and families in need. The event collected 3,500+ pounds of food for the College Park Community Food Bank and diverted 93 percent of its waste from the landfill by providing monitored recycling and composting waste stations at the College Park Community Center. "Good Neighbor Day is an important event," said Mayor Patrick Wojahn. "Every year we top the previous year and the event keeps growing. It really brings everyone from the community together—the university, long-term residents, faculty, local agencies—in order to make a positive impact on the community and the neighborhoods. It’s something we can be proud of."


Most post-secondary institutions facilitate student volunteering and there are examples of students taking part in a wide variety of local community projects which may or may not form part of a formalised institutional community strategy. Some interviewees reported that the positive atmosphere engendered by such activities is very valuable when problems arise, stating that ‘it brings us a lot of goodwill with the city’. Sometimes such projects are deliberately aimed at tackling the negative effects, or promoting the benefits, of studentification.
2.7 Local student housing strategies

The research revealed that, unfortunately, the development of many student accommodation strategies has often been uncoordinated with the wider locality. As a result, there are some contradictory statements and visions within the breadth of off-campus housing strategies affecting students within particular neighborhoods. This is unsurprising given the different vested interests within and between higher education institutions, local government and the private sector, as well as the different local neighborhood organizations. Indeed, within the context of local government the research revealed significant differences of opinion between the strands of environmental health, housing, and planning and revitalization, especially in near-campus concentrations of rental housing.

Ideally, common overarching principles should be enshrined within wider housing strategies, and couched within appropriate structural documents. Interview evidence from the research project has consistently pointed to student accommodation being jettisoned from wider housing strategies of local government, and/or was not included within algorithms for forecasts of local housing supply and demand. The municipal government could provide the momentum for the creation of local strategies, including student accommodation. At the same time, many university administrations continue to resist being involved in off-campus housing, leaving leadership opportunities for student government groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading Practice: Off-Campus Students’ Associations Take on the Challenge of Balanced Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the studentification process becomes better known in the North American context, it is important to point out that it is often the student government leadership at colleges and universities that takes on a leading role in developing policies, practices and resources aimed at creating a balance between students and local residents, including housing and responsible civic behavior. For example, the Mount Allison Students’ Union has taken on the issue of off-campus housing, while the university student services focuses on those university-owned residences that are on-campus. The student government hosts annual housing fairs on-campus, as well as providing a student ombuds-office and Vice President for external relations with the local government and the provincial Rentalsman Office. For universities and communities where there is no official off-campus student services function, the student government can certainly take on a leadership role in providing housing and community relations functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: <a href="http://masu.ca/housing">http://masu.ca/housing</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students at the University of Kentucky have established the Off-Campus Student Association, a registered student organized association dedicated to helping all students that live off-campus in building connections between the student government and the larger Lexington community. Student governments can be powerful agents in assisting in the education of student who wish to secure off-campus accommodations, tenant rights and responsibilities, as well as ways of living in neighborhoods and being ambassadors of the university. The Off-Campus Student Association hosts a student-authored website, including the Wildcat Guide to Off-Campus Life.

Source: https://ukwildcatguide.wordpress.com

Universities and colleges might wish to consider developing their own housing/ accommodation strategies [and strategic town and gown strategies and plans, if appropriate] and be prepared to share aspects of these and other strategies with the wider stakeholder groupings. This could include such sensitive issues as their growth aspirations, information on numbers, trends and expansion plans. A crucial precondition for this will be the need for honesty and transparency, and trust among the different stakeholder groups and would require the college/university itself to be at the table and to be fully transparent. Unfortunately, this continues to be one of the biggest challenges to the studentification process in the North American context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading Practice: Michigan State University Advances Community Relations and Planning by Mapping and Sharing Student Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A dramatic change in the relationship between universities, students and the larger community where they are located has been the transition to the Internet and the growth of privacy rights over student personal data and locational information. Most relationships have to operate in an atmosphere of technological anonymity in their work, where there is often just guess-work on where students live off-campus. Even when the university has the information, it is typically not shared, due to perceived confidentiality regulations and policies. In identifying a need to extend their community relations efforts with the Greater Lansing Community, Michigan State University officials have developed a leading practice in sharing vital information, while maintaining confidentiality of personal information. In developing a highly innovative student data mapping program, MSU has been able to collect data on year of study, gender, ethnicity, international student numbers, on- and off-campus numbers, as well as local and permanent addresses. Using a mapping program, they have been able to develop a series of spatial distribution maps that indicate numbers and densities of off-campus student housing across the Greater Lansing Area for a particular Term. These distributions are shared with the wider community, where they data tables and maps can be “sliced and diced” by planners and other officials in learning a high level of detail on student housing issues, such as percentages of neighborhood resident/student make-up, year of study distributions, graduate student locations, as well as international student distributions. The implications of providing this level of data has been an enormous boost to understanding the studentification process, with an ability to drill down to the individual apartment complex, neighborhood, municipal region and percentage of housing occupied my MSU students, all while protecting personal data and connecting individual names to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 Local student housing strategy groups

Ineffective and limited communication would appear to underlie many of the problems of studentification. The research showed that, while some areas have well-developed and established arrangements, resulting in effective communication channels to facilitate mutual working and multi-agency partnerships, others rely on informal arrangements, often only as strong as the individuals involved in the relationship. The research results reveal a need for improved communication between different organisations and stakeholders. In some places it may be appropriate that local governments – as ‘neutral’ brokers - take the lead in organising and maintaining effective communication channels, dialogue and opportunities for consultation between the different organisations and stakeholders. There are many examples of leading practice where key agencies meet and liaise at regular intervals to design and monitor plans of activities. This takes the traditional ‘town and gown’ committee to an entirely new level of interaction and effectiveness. This is perhaps the key partnership in an on-going relationship that deals with the wide range of issues in communities where there are universities and colleges.

Leading Practice: Increasing Neighborhood Livability Through Communications and Education on Rental Housing

The City of Columbia, South Carolina is home to multiple colleges and universities, where over 80 percent of students live off-campus in a range of near-campus neighborhoods. As a college town, university and community officials have identified all the classic conditions of studentification: constant student turnover, absentee landlords, high concentrations of students with resultant parking, litter, noise and parties, all causing much conflict. Local residents had no pathways to follow in addressing these issues, with diffuse communications between the five police jurisdictions, little student accountability and overall frustration and questions of trust. Data collected in 2014-15 indicated that there were thousands of code violations, with the root cause being rental properties and conflict between students-landlords and neighborhood residents. One of the major stumbling blocks with these negative aspects of studentification was the now typical over-reaction of police and civic officials in dealing with these issues, with little cooperation or communication from or between the colleges and universities. Of note was the fact that over half of the 3,000+ properties in the city were owned by absentee landlords, making it virtually impossible to deal with the housing issue in any effective manner.

Commencing in August of 2015, the University of South Carolina Community Outreach Officer joined with the Special Projects Office of the City of Clemson to work together in addressing the livability issues for both students and local residents through enhanced attention to housing issues. Together, this city-university partnership took a multipronged approach to housing livability issues, including meetings with neighborhood groups, city and university officials and the creation of a residents’ website. They also developed an educational outreach program with a range of student housing information tools, including “Ready to Move” and “The Art of Good Neighboring” programs. In tandem with the communications and education programs, the city implemented a new Rental Housing Regulations Ordinance that went into effect on July 1, 2016, repealing older, ineffective ordinances. This unique ordinance model creates a 15 point non-transferable Rental Permit system, where points can be suspended and then dropped in relation to landlord-tenant relationships, including steps towards eviction. The ordinance also requires a landlord or responsible local agent to be located within a 45-mile radius. The new housing ordinance process works with representatives from the colleges and universities in recording off-campus incidents, investigation and follow-up on the code’s enforcement, establishing itself as a leading practice in addressing studentification.

One year later, representatives of the town and the university report a high level of success with a greater level of communication, fewer complaints from local residents, as well as increased compliance from landlords. By focusing on the realities of off-campus housing, this university-city cooperation has increased trust between local residents, city and university representatives, with students as the focus. Students are being held more accountable, as well as being better protected in their housing needs and relations with landlords, as well as...
professionals who have specialized for decades in addressing the social, cultural, physical, and economic situations unique to communities that are also home to college and university campuses.

The purpose of this program is twofold: 1) To help all stakeholders understand and address complex challenges and processes associated with city and university relationships; and 2) to identify, foster, and promote the skills necessary for the effective development of collaborative partnerships and alliances throughout college towns.

The program is designed for: University/college professionals, City/county officials, and staff, community leaders, (under)graduate students interested in town-gown relations, public service, political science, and other fields.

Benefits:
1) Develop a deeper understanding of the issues that strain town-gown relationships so they can be resolved. 2) Learn to identify collaborative partnerships and practical solutions that benefit all “sides” of town-gown issues. 3) Network with and learn from counterparts in other communities around the country that are working to improve town-gown relations. 4) Cultivate professional excellence and opportunities for career advancement.

Program Structure for Level 1 and 2:
The professional expertise of instructors and students from across the country and internationally ensure an interactive exchange of ideas, solutions and challenging topics. You will be awarded your Certificate of Completion at the conference in a special ceremony.

Strategic Proposal:
The Strategic Proposal is a formative assessment that demonstrates the knowledge and skills of students completing the Certificate program. Two months after the conference, participants are required to submit a community-based, collaborative strategic plan that meaningfully synthesizes, evaluates, analyses, and applies knowledge gleaned from the modules.

Although there is currently a plethora of official working groups and committees which are scrutinising issues of student accommodation in many towns and cities, the membership and participation of many of these official groups tend to involve only local government officers and officials from the student affairs or external relations departments of the college, with differing levels of involvement from senior management in different locations and at different times. In some contexts, there is also involvement from local community representatives, primary care trusts, police and elected ward councillors and provincial or state officials associated with the post-secondary sector, yet this breadth of involvement is extremely limited, and is not uniform throughout towns and cities that act as homes to these institutions. Local circumstances will dictate the composition of local groups but the local government might standardise opportunities for improved communication between different organisations and parties. Our research identified the development of professional associations like the ITGA as a major agent of change for the hundreds of individuals and small groups of individuals charged with enhanced relationships. It is in gathering these leading practices where university and municipal officials can develop a stronger understanding and effective management approach to the unique set of issues and responses to the town and gown relationship.

Leading Practice: The ITGA Certificate Program in Town and Gown Relations

A collaborative relationship between the community (town) and local college or university (gown) contributes to an overall quality of life for everyone. Issues such as local budget cuts, off-campus student conduct, and campus expansions too often cause strained relations between town and gown. Initiating a dialogue and opening up the lines of communication between the campus and its neighbors can foster a positive relationship based on a common understanding of the role that each plays—or can play—to promote a healthy and thriving community.

The International Town and Gown Association (ITGA) brings its industry experience in the world of town-gown relations to a new comprehensive Certificate in Town-Gown Relations offered at the annual conference. Designed for busy university professionals, community leaders, city officials and their staff members, and students, this program uses real-world experiences to inform practical solutions. The modules are led by
2.9 Student-community liaison managers and off-campus housing offices

Town and city officials, as well as student service professionals at colleges and universities, are deploying a number of strategies to combat the adverse effects of studentification and, importantly, promoting community cohesion and an enhanced experience for everyone concerned. At the local government level, evidence from many contexts suggest that relations are best managed and co-ordinated by a designated individual, who has relative seniority within the local organisational structures, and who can effectively feed back into senior management networks and policy formulation.

Although there is a long-standing recognition, from many universities, of a responsibility to accommodate first year students, wherever this is feasible, they are increasingly supporting, guiding and advising latter year students, as well as supplying institution-owned accommodation for students in their later years of study. In some places, institutional housing offices can be a key mechanism for regulating residential geographies of students, in both the on-campus and off-campus worlds. The research shows that influencing the search and residential processes for upper-year accommodation is an important way in which universities and colleges can mitigate the adverse effects of studentification. This is most effective when controlled and co-ordinated by an institutional housing office with trained professionals. Such an organisation, either within the structure of the institution, or at arms-length, provides a reputable central point for students searching for private rented accommodations. Working closely with students’ unions, and in partnership with local government and local communities, as well as external agencies such as the police, local media, private agencies, and landlords, can implicitly influence the production and consumption of student housing, as well as the relations between students, residents and neighborhood communities, through the dissemination of information and advice and a clear set of strategies for being good neighbors. It is one major way in which the effective management of students and housing in local communities can be achieved through non-legislative, non-regulatory solutions.

It is our conclusion that housing is the core root of so many of the associated issues that arise with the studentification process. Indeed, the idea of a ‘balanced community’ is now the operative term for dealing with the concentration of students in near-campus neighborhoods and the unique housing markets that are created when almost exclusive types of individuals are identified, forming ghettos in specific locations... so-called ‘student housing’ concentrations associated with parties, noise, litter, excess parking of vehicles, and a lack of long-term, owner-occupied housing stock.
2.10 Student housing handbook guides and guidance

One of the most effective forms of practice is the production of student housing handbook guides, with some excellent current collaborative examples being produced by students’ unions, student housing offices and local governments. This is particularly effective when they are widely distributed to all students when enrolling and registering at the beginning of each academic year. In addition, more and more institutions are offering housing education sessions, such as house-hunting talks (incorporating ‘being a good neighbour’ information) to students as they near the end of their first year of studies. It has become an important part of a freshman or junior’s overall education and maturation process, rather than a poorly planned and informed process of rushing to find a place to live with room-mates or associates that are not well known to them. Again, our interviews with student affairs and housing professionals reveal that such programs are only as good as the time, energy and on-going funding that allows them to take a long-term management approach to student housing and community balance, from on-campus to off-campus locations and lifestyles.

Leading Practice: An Integrated Approach to Off-Campus Living – Miami University and the City of Oxford

Many universities have now moved to a “one-stop shop” for the integration of off-campus living, outreach and community partnerships and communications. The Off-Campus Outreach and Communications Office at Miami University engages and supports off-campus students and commuters with events and opportunities, key campus information, and education about their rights and responsibilities as members of the Miami and Oxford communities. This office serves as a central resource for all students who do not live in the residence halls at Miami University. One recent partnership includes an off-campus housing service with Off Campus Partners, LLC to offer an Off-Campus Housing Service (offcampushousing.miamioh.edu). Each year, the office receives requests from students, parents, and faculty/staff for information and assistance finding off-campus housing. This new web-based service provides users with a searchable database to find off-campus housing in the Miami University area. Beyond being a listing service, the site includes educational components designed to help students prepare for their transition off campus and prepare to be good citizens of the Oxford community. The user-friendly site includes a fully searchable database that Miami University renters and buyers use to find off-campus housing. This includes photographs and floor plans, maps with proximity to campus, direct links to a property’s email, application/lease, and website, as well as text descriptions and lists of amenities. Additionally, students are able to create their own listings for finding sublease tenants, and one section of the site helps students who are seeking roommates.

Source: https://miamioh.edu/student-life/off-campus-outreach/housing-search/index.html

When first-year students leave their on-campus halls of residence, good practice can also include the use of housing events that profile reliable landlords and accommodation providers, advertisements in local and student newspapers, and leaflets to student and non-student populations. There is also increasing evidence that use of the Internet to disseminate advice and guidance, as well as housing forums and rating systems and locator applications are emerging as part of the arsenal of student housing strategies. And yet, many campuses still refuse to allow these types of events to take place, maintaining the now antiquated notion that the university has no responsibility for things that occur ‘off-campus’.

Leading Practice: Living Off-Campus 101: Montana State University’s Guide to Living in Bozeman

Every college town is unique, in terms of the location and the neighborhoods and types of housing available to those students who decide to live off-campus. Current leading practice in studentification includes a recognition on the part of the university in assisting students in a successful transition to off-campus housing accommodations, as well as ways in which those students become ambassadors of the university by becoming good neighbors. The critical need to find the right roommates and ways in which to deal with conflict is of particular importance in this successful transition, as is the relationship that these groupings of fellow students create with their neighbors. Montana State approaches this important educational process in a recognizable format by presenting these important details of community living as a course outline, known as Campus 101.

A broad education on the rights and responsibilities of living in the community has become an important part of the off-campus housing role at most universities and colleges across North America.

Source: www.montana.edu/reslife/documents/pdfs/OffCamusGuide.pdf

One of the most effective non-legislative, non-regulatory ways to influence the growth of residential student clusters is for the institutional housing offices to implicitly influence student demands, and widen preferences for a breadth of residential locations, via means such as the house-hunting talks and a student housing guide handbook mentioned above. There are many examples of housing offices deepening students’ knowledge and raising students’ awareness of options, in conjunction with promoting the appeals of alternative residential locations. Interviews with student affairs professionals revealed a deep commitment to these life skills as being a critical part of any student’s overall educational experience and certainly it is an essential responsibility for the university to uphold in providing an educational experience for the ‘whole person’.
Leading Practice: Off-Campus Student Services – Surveying Students for Living Well in Bowling Green, Ohio

One of the leading practices in dealing with the studentification of communities has been the recognition of the university’s responsibility to assist their students in living well in the host community. Bowling Green State University has joined many other institutions in devoting staff and resources to the provision of a range of student services for those who do not live on campus. In 2015, this Office partnered with the Undergraduate Student Government and the Graduate Student Senate to produce the BGST Renter’s Guide. The Guide is intended to provide information regarding off-campus and commuter student’s satisfaction with living in local area rental units. Survey participants were asked to consider their current or previous rental company and complete online questions relevant to their experience. University officials have tended to stay away from surveys of student opinions on housing satisfaction, yet BGSU hopes that, with the right legal caveats in place, their students will use this information, along with other resources, to make informed decisions when searching for rental properties. This approach utilizes student legal services at the institution and it has certainly become a leading practice in perhaps urging landlords to partner with the university, the city and the individual students involved. The survey, published online and in the Guide, reveal levels of renter satisfaction with such things as maintenance standards and timeliness in responding to issues, affordability and quality of the unit, landlord communication levels, and the overall positive attributes of living in the Bowling Green community.

Source: www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/off-campus-student-services/Renters-Guide.pdf

2.11 Local government planning and community engagement

This Guide has pointed out that dealing with many of the worst impacts of studentification lie outside the capacity of the universities themselves. There are, however, a number of powers available to local governments to ameliorate the worst excesses of studentification. The current legislative terrain across North America is changing and a number of these changes are likely to have a significant bearing on the constraints and incentives for private sector landlords to supply student housing, for students to participate in higher education and move into particular enclaves of towns and cities, for local governments to regulate and control processes of studentification, and for local community groups to resist negative processes of studentification. Legislation has provided for local governments to have a range of duties and powers to act (some discretionary) in the fields of local planning, housing management, housing quality, and in tackling a range of community services and problems including anti-social behaviour. Housing, Planning and Environment and Community Engagement are therefore the key departments where policies are brought to bear on the issues of studentification.

2.12 Areas of student housing restraint

One tool available to local governments is to use their powers to declare particular areas to density and tenure ordinances that prevent further concentrations of students through drawing a boundary around an area and declaring a number of restrictions will apply - determined by the local governing body - such as:

- purpose-built and managed student accommodation will be denied planning permission;
- extensions to accommodation which is already occupied by students will be denied planning permission;
- further licences will not be granted;
- where licences granted, these are subject to an occupation condition prohibiting occupation by full time students;
- conversions of retail properties to fast food outlets will be resisted;
- developers should seek to allocate a certain percentage of new build houses for family use.

The ideal university-community relationship is the development of an open, transparent and coordinated approach to the growth and future land use needs that the university envisions, in conjunction with the overall planning and development role that the home community offers in creating a roadmap for the future. As a very recent leading practice in identifying the studentification process, several North American universities are now openly working with their local planning departments to address areas of mutual concern, particularly the near-campus housing and expansion conflicts at the edge of campus – even having campus master plans integrated into the larger community plan and holding joint community information and consultation processes.

At the same time, the development of student accommodation outside of the designated area is often encouraged, particularly in sites which are well connected by public transport to the campuses, which are attractive residential locations for students, and which are able to sustain a modest student population without being detrimental to existing residential communities.

Leading Practice: Campus Master Plan Approved by the City Common Council (University of Wisconsin-Madison, July 20, 2017)

For the first time in its 169-year history, the University of Wisconsin-Madison has a Campus Master Plan approved by the City of Madison Common Council. This approval shifts the majority of campus zoning from residential, commercial or manufacturing to “Campus-Institutional (C-I)” zoning. The university also now meets the requirements of the City of Madison municipal zoning code and can utilize the C-I zoning to help guide redevelopment projects.
The master plan, approved by the council Tuesday, also allows the university to streamline its local entitlement process, saving six to nine months of development time. Each new university capital project — whether it be a new building, renovation or addition — will take less time and cost less money, reducing the impact on scarce state funding and private gift funds donated to the university for building projects.

“This is truly a momentous occasion not only for the university but for the entire city of Madison,” says Gary Brown, director of Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture in Facilities Planning & Management. “Thousands of stakeholders, from faculty, staff and students to our many interested neighbors and partners, have been involved with creating a roadmap for future development opportunities across our 936-acre campus.”

Several areas on campus will remain outside the Campus-Institutional zoning district, including any development associated with Camp Randall Stadium, the Kohl Center and the Wisconsin Energy Institute, which all have their own zoning requirements from previous approvals. In addition, the majority of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve and the far west recreational fields remain zoned “Conservancy.” Any significant changes to those areas would continue to require a full conditional use zoning review process with the city.

“I want to thank the university administration ..., the various citizen groups and the various campus planning groups that spent a good deal of time on these proposals,” said Mayor Paul Soglin during the council meeting. “I really believe that at this juncture, the university has done more to recognize its place in the city and I’m hoping the city, by adopting this (plan), will do the same.”

One of the main goals for the master planning process was to be open, transparent, engaging and participatory. The final plan was developed over the course of 260 stakeholder meetings starting in early 2015. The entire campus and all of the local neighborhood associations were fully engaged throughout the process. The development approval process will continue to include significant stakeholder input through the joint campus area planning committees, which have representatives from the university and local neighborhood associations.

This master plan update focused on the campus landscape and includes the first-ever campus landscape master plan, which was developed in conjunction with a comprehensive stormwater management/green infrastructure plan. Prior master plans for utilities, transportation and major building opportunities were also updated as part of this process. The new plan also includes a set of design guidelines and detailed planning information related to bulk, height and mass of new facilities. Sustainability is a key organizing principle for the entire plan.

“Even though this plan suggests potential growth of up to almost 5 million additional gross square feet of building space, it is important to remember that the university continues to focus on reinvestment in its existing buildings through renovation, reprogramming and renewal projects,” says Brown. “The most sustainable building is one you don’t have to build.”

Source: http://news.wisc.edu/madison-common-council-approves-uw-campus-master-plan/
3. Preventing and responding to the disadvantages of studentification: Practical Issues

This section considers the negative practical effects of studentification on local communities. The issues and leading practices outlined below should not be read as an exhaustive list. Rather, the discussion should be viewed as a starting point, or perhaps a source of inspiration, for educational institutions, local governments and others to seek innovative and effective strategies in addressing the perceived ills of studentification. This section therefore considers the key issues and cites specific examples where colleges/universities, and their various constituencies, as well as municipal governments and their officials might be able to draw upon when addressing the issues particular to their localities.

The issues and some possible solutions in terms of the negative cultural, social, physical, and economic effects of studentification are considered in this section.

3.1 Cultural effects

In many ways, the problems associated with studentification are a result of different cultures clashing. While social, economic and physical changes may be the key concerns of local community groups during the early phases of studentification, research has shown that when unmitigated studentification is deeply embedded within a location, significant cultural change may occur. The expansion of shared student housing in traditional, near-campus, owner-occupied, family homes and neighborhoods leads to a fundamental change in the nature of those communities. Transient occupation, usually seen in rental-style, multiple-unit developments or converted houses, engenders a lack of community integration and cohesion and less commitment to maintain the quality of the neighborhood environment and there develops a gradually self-reinforcing unpopularity of the area for families wishing to bring up children or live in peaceful retirement. The dynamics of creating a ‘cultural ghetto’ becomes a real issue in these near-campus neighborhoods.

Local governments and many universities have begun to recognise this wider issue that is being dealt with by structural means, through local ordinances and other student dispersal policies. There are some signs that attempts to educate students and dampen the excesses of student culture can also have a beneficial effect. The student population is transient and therefore its collective memory works differently from that of permanent communities. Post-secondary institutions therefore have to take responsibility for off-campus behavior and provide clearly articulated plans, being persistent in reinforcing messages of being a good neighbor, if they wish to achieve balance in the community. Simple, thoughtlessness and a lack of understanding about what other people find annoying or offensive is shown to be at the root of many problems (e.g. unsightly premises, excessive noise and late-night activities, public urination, litter, broken bottles, etc.) and can be addressed by targeted awareness-raising and attention to off-campus living.

3.2 Responsibilities and rights

Issues of student behavior are central to many conflicts between students and resident communities. In tandem with explaining their rights as tenants and landlord duties for maintenance and repair of accommodations, universities, through housing offices, or other off-campus services, can seek to raise student understanding of their responsibilities as tenants and good neighbors. Many already emphasise to students the need to respect the cultures of established residential communities, as well as the wider cultures of the student population as partners in the community. As suggested earlier, student housing guide handbooks and house-hunting talks can provide a major vehicle for students and their home institutions to achieve this goal within the larger community.

Linked to the above, there is a role for the university to promote neighborliness amongst the student population. One major example of good practice the research found here is asking students to introduce themselves to their neighbors, and to try to develop good relations, including volunteering in the wider community.

Leading Practice: Madison House – Public Service at the University of Virginia

With one of the oldest university-community public service offices in the North American context, Madison House serves as the student volunteer center at the University of Virginia. For over 40 years, they have worked to coordinate volunteers, develop leaders, build community partnerships, and promote lifelong volunteer service. The operating mechanism for Madison House is a leading practice, as it is established as a non-profit organization that is student-run and staff-supported with a direct connection to the University. Students are part of a culture that builds in volunteerism and mutual respect as part of the education process, with the expectation that there will be weekly and ongoing volunteerism, with programs that cover a wide range of interests and expressed needs, such as: Adopt-A-Grandparent, Big Sibling, Bridging the Gap, Day Care, English lessons, Holiday Sharing, Housing Improvement, Alterschool Programs, Recreation Therapy, Tutoring Services and Youth Mentoring. The program shares responsibility with the university and the local community for training, management and liability issues involved in volunteering. The fact that the student volunteer program has established over 100 community partners in the Charlottesville and Albemarle County areas is testament to the effectiveness of this approach.

Source: Bass, Elizabeth, Executive Director, Madison House, Public Service at the University of Virginia. ITGA Leading Practice Library, accessed on August 2, 2017 at www.itga.org/resource-center
3.3 Codes of behavior

Some institutions sign up students to a moral code of behavior, or codes on rights and responsibilities, as a prerequisite of registration, and have re-worded institutional regulations and ordinances so that if a student brings the university into disrepute, they can be disciplined.

Leading Practice: A Long-standing Code of Conduct that includes student behavior in the larger community

Bishop’s University in Lennoxville, Quebec became one of the first Canadian universities to address off-campus student conduct through the development of a Student Charter of Rights and Responsibilities, as well as a Code of Conduct. First adopted as a university policy in 1993, the Charter of Rights and Responsibilities was one of the first in Canada to identify off-campus student behaviour, as well as their rights as tenants and citizens as something that needs to be part of the university-community relationship. Its purpose is to serve as a tool to educate students about the values and expectations attached to being a member of the community, to state that there is a ‘moral contract’ between the University and its students. As a first in Canada, the policy states that the notion of “the Bishop’s Community” goes beyond the physical boundaries of the campus to include the individual and collective behavior of Bishop’s students, wherever they may be. Therefore, the University has the power and responsibility to deal with misconduct both on and off campus as it relates to any member of the Bishop’s Community and affects the educational mission and legitimate interests and responsibilities of the University.

Beyond the overall educational role of the Charter of Rights and Responsibilities, the university then introduced a Code of Conduct that each student is required to sign as part of the admissions and registration process. The code of student conduct is intended to identify behavior which the university considers inappropriate, to outline the procedures that the university will use to respond to this type of behavior and to indicate the possible consequences of such behavior. The Code has been used primarily as an educational tool, where the Dean of Students oversees the application and adjudication processes over the course of the year. The results have been impressive, with nearly 100 percent compliance, year over year. Students also report a high level of effective assistance with landlord-tenant issues, as well as a significant reduction in rowdy off-campus behavior and associated police intervention and legal issues.

Sources: Bishop’s University Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities: http://www3.ubishops.ca/administration-governance/university-policies/charter-of-student-rights-and-responsibilities


Leading Practice: University of Colorado-Boulder Student Conduct and Restorative Justice Program

Does crime really pay? That is the question asked in the development of a unique partnership between the UC-Boulder Off-Campus Housing and Neighborhood Relations Office, the university’s Student Conduct and Restorative Justice Program, and the City of Boulder Municipal Court. Together, the university and the community developed a Community Living Class that was designed to provide education and restorative justice approaches to a wide variety of city ordinances that were charged against students, so that they could avoid future tickets and legal proceedings through the court system. As of August of 2011 the Boulder Municipal Court began requiring students to attend the Community Living course and it later expanded to include both on-campus and off-campus infractions, with coordination by the Office of Student Conduct. Students are charged a $25.00 fee for the class, including sessions they miss. These fees assist in funding the program and make for a meaningful connection between student behaviour and the consequences in the community where they are living.

The Community Living classes cover a range of topics, including noise and party ordinances, nuisance parties, unreasonable noise, disruption of quiet enjoyment of the home, smart party tips, snow removal and lawn maintenance, and illegal dumping. The class reviews specific infractions based on certain types of behaviour, such as carrying open containers, public urination, yelling and screaming, fake identification, recreational marijuana, rioting, fighting and obstructing and resisting a police officer. The sessions also promote positive behaviors by focusing on avoiding conflict in the community and knowing of programs such as party registration, and working with law enforcement offices.

The results of this restorative approach to students living in the community and avoiding future court appearances are impressive, where there were close to 1600 students required to enrol in the class in 2011-12, dropping to about 300 students in recent years. Surveys of students in the program report very positive results, with 88 percent of students said they better understood the law they were ticketed for after taking the class and 93 percent said they thought attending the workshop will affect their future behaviour.

Leading Practice: Georgetown University’s Student Neighborhood Assistance Program (SNAP)

After many years of noise complaints, safety concerns, property damage and disregard for university student behavior codes, Georgetown University has invested significant time and resources to a wide range of partnerships programs with the Metro Police Department and student and resident groups. Known as SNAP, the program is aimed at off-campus student education and adjudication of student conduct, beyond enforcement of existing ordinances. On Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights during the Fall and Spring semesters from 10pm-3am, Georgetown University staff members, along with private security officers, patrol the West Georgetown and Burleith neighborhoods. During the summer months, one SNAP car patrols the neighborhoods on Friday and Saturday nights from 10 pm - 3 am. The SNAP representatives proactively identify student houses that may raise concerns and respond to an established Georgetown University Community Hotline. The SNAP representatives address the issue and provide a report to the University’s Office of Neighborhood Life the following Monday morning for follow-up. This Office has a staged approach to education and policy awareness, including a mandatory off-campus living course, issuing proactive warnings to prevent problems, assist in breaking up parties, responding to neighborhood complaints, as well as facilitating student conduct reports and working with police and university officials on enforcement proceedings, if needed.

Other universities, such as Boston College (known as the Community Assistance Program), have adopted this leading practice, sharing strategies and statistics to measure their effectiveness. The commitment demonstrated by each college is notable, in terms of a clearly stated role in student off-campus behavior, as well as the investment of resources in training and engaging dozens of professional staff, hiring city police on an overtime basis and the establishment of a Student Conduct Office with the ability to sanction students for off-campus behavior. The Georgetown Community Partnership Initiative has identified the social, cultural, physical and economic characteristics of studentification and reports highly positive neighborhood relations in near-campus neighborhoods.


3.4 Social effects

The negative social effects of studentification include an increase in low-level anti-social behavior (noise, litter, public nuisance, etc.) and the changing nature of the neighborhood and central business district, with pressure for greater provision of businesses catering to night-time entertainment and a consequent detrimental impact on residential quality and decreased demand for some local services, leading to closure – particularly health and educational services. Concentrations of vulnerable young people with low awareness of security also leads to increased levels of crime, in some instances. These social issues are compounded or repeated as the size of the community and the number of students and institutions increases.

3.5 Community liaison officers

As mentioned above, several colleges and universities at North American institutions have worked in partnership with municipal governments in appointing community liaison officers at strategic levels to relate to local neighborhoods and off-campus students, and this practice is welcomed by long-time residents and civic officials who value ‘a named person/office they can contact’. Evidence suggests that it is preferable for such a designated person to have a solid knowledge of the local context, and well-established relationships with external agencies and key stakeholders. More and more members of ITGA report that off-campus housing and community liaison offices, working with the municipal government and landlords and student governments, can effectively connect these important functions together and make a meaningful collective impact. This leading practice takes significant leadership to the overall studentification process, both positive and negative, where the city and the university make specific resource commitments, yet the rewards are also significant in creating an ongoing relationship and continuous attention to creating a balanced approach to the university-community reality.

3.6 Neighborhood helplines

As noted in the Georgetown University Leading Practice outlined above, one major development which has improved relations between universities, student and resident populations is the creation of neighborhood ‘helplines’ and social media contacts for both students and local residents. These have provided a means for universities and colleges to listen to their local communities, and to more fully understanding the dynamics between students and the community. Evidence shows that there is a need to monitor the use of the helplines and the nature of complaints being received, and to constantly improve the service in response to user satisfaction while respecting confidentiality regulations. Addressing studentification requires that universities acknowledge that they have a role and responsibility to the community, including off-campus student housing and related behavioural issues.
3.7 Off-campus security and outreach officers

More and more North American universities are moving to establish community patrols and security officers to respond to day-to-day concerns from off-campus students and the various traditional residential communities, such as noise infractions, garbage and unsightly premises, and crime-related problems, and other issues. In some cases, the designated individual lives in the ‘student area’, so that they can be contacted day and night by residents, and they can visit and discuss issues with recalcitrant students, as well as being proactive and helpful to students and promoting good behavior.

**Leading Practice: Washington University’s CARE Program**

After many years of living with the conflicts that arose through studentification, including increased off-campus student housing and changing transportation patterns, noise, late-night disruptive behavior and on-going resident associations and police enforcing a ‘zero tolerance’ program, Washington University, a private university of about 14,000 students in St. Louis has developed a multi-pronged neighborhood initiative that addresses a range of leading practices combined in what is known as the CARE Program:

**Connect**
- Connect students to neighbors, and neighbors to students
- Facilitate neighborhood access to the University and university-community access to neighborhood events and resources.

**Advocate**
- Collectively advocate for community needs, neighbor rights, student rights, neighborhood improvements
- Provide education around tenant rights and responsibilities, safety, law enforcement, and living safely in the neighborhood.

**Respect**
- Encourage getting to know neighbors and students as individuals
- Hold students accountable for actions and impact
- Educate all university students about respect in the neighborhood – Think Beyond the Bubble

**Engage**
- Promote being a good neighbor – Smart Students Make Great Neighbors
- Provide community service opportunities – students working in the community

Now in its sixth year, the Neighborhood Initiatives Team consists of 10 staff members across several departments. One of the most unique approaches has been cooperation with the housing market and neighborhood groups in creating a Neighborhood Liaison Officer who actually resides in one of the most studentified neighborhoods. According to officials at the university, this full-time staff member commits to an additional ten hours of work each week to serve as the university’s eyes and ears in the neighborhood. They serve as an advocate for both students and neighbors. This officer provides student education on neighborhood relations and also helps students get involved in the neighborhood through volunteerism. This liaison position was critical in the creation of The Neighborhood Voice Council, an organization formed to address on-going student and permanent resident relations. Council meetings were created to provide a forum for neighbors to communicate with Washington University officials and students throughout the neighborhood were encouraged to be a part of the process. The Neighborhood Voice Council members work with the Washington University students and administration to create a variety of events promoting positive relations, including a fall and spring block party, with food provided by the students, and games and activities for neighborhood children. Interventions also include adding aspects of neighborhood relations to a variety of student-based activities, including various student traditions and potential disruptive incidents, so negative incidents are less likely to occur. As large groups of students walk through the neighborhoods, staff and neighbors now welcome them, provide information and fun gifts, and help reinforce the idea that these neighborhoods have many families of all types and age ranges, and not just college students. Interventions also included improving the coordinated management of large university events that often impacted neighborhoods, such as the bi-annual WILD concert on campus and student move-in and move-out days.

While student turnover and participation continue to be a challenge, this multi-pronged ‘Think Beyond the Bubble’ campaign aimed at the negative effects of studentification seems to be having a significant impact on university-community relations in various St. Louis neighborhoods. It provides an enhanced level of community outreach and communications on the part of the university and sets a very high degree of commitment, both in personnel and resources, to the critical role of creating balance in the near-campus neighborhoods.

3.8 Crime prevention

Student households are likely to contain a high proportion of electronic consumer goods, and as such, they can attract burglars who see the lack of attention to environmental design and unfamiliar visitors to the neighborhood. In addition, students sometimes attract physical violence just because they are students, or because they have a presence of alcohol, drugs and strangers and a lack of vigilance. Much of this type of crime occurs when large, off-campus gatherings arise, often attracting unwelcome participants who take advantage of these situations. Of course, local residents do not like this being brought into their neighborhoods.

Most universities have good partnerships with local government and the police with the aim of heightening students’ understandings of crime-related prevention strategies. This is an example of where self-interest and community interests can coincide – student houses attract burglars so the less like a ‘student house’ their property looks, the better. Student Community Safety Strategies are valuable to run education and awareness campaigns relating to all areas of student safety and also good neighborliness and citizenship. Campaigns are run through student media and a student safety website to promote appropriate structural and neighborhood design principles and anti-crime campaigns with pictures of poorly maintained properties, doors and windows open, old couches or mattresses, excessive garbage, etc. A beneficial side-effect is that students will tidy up the appearance of their property, to avoid being burgled. These physical and social indicators of studentification are being addressed through leading practices on how law enforcement, institutions of higher education, and community partners can collaborate with off-campus neighborhoods.

Leading Practice: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in Amherst and UMass Amherst

Acknowledging that the University of Massachusetts-Amherst and the local Amherst community have had a long history of off-campus parties, including large daytime neighborhood gatherings and “night rages” at apartment complexes that spill-over into non-student residential neighborhoods, there has been a significant set of impressive leading practices that have emerged in response to these issues. The concentrations of student housing enclaves have tended to defy traditional crime prevention and enforcement efforts with strained relationships between local residents, student renters and law enforcement officials, with significant safety and liability risks, detrimental images of the town and the university, as well as the overall quality of life in the community.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is a multi-disciplinary approach to incorporating theories of design, psychology and sociology, where it is found that physical environments, structures and landscaping, can be designed to change behaviour, reduce crime and safety issues, and improve the overall quality of life there. Working together, various university offices and local government law enforcement agencies have shifted from response to reported crimes, to one of crime prevention through changes to the residential design and occupant behaviors. For example, natural surveillance is the placement of physical features, activities and people in ways that maximize the ability to see what is occurring in a given space. Territorial reinforcement uses the buildings, fences, signs, pavement, or other objects to express ownership or to clearly delineate the transition from public to private space. Access control is the physical guidance of people coming and going from a space by the appropriate placement of entrances, exits, fencing, landscaping, secure premises, and other barriers to open access. This approach relies upon regular maintenance of each of these measures, whether it is lighting, landscaping, or fencing, needs to be checked on a regular basis.

This has been an experiment in collaboration between the town and the university police, landlords, civic officials and inspectors, and university officials. Together, they have created a committee that studies and proposes Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Together, this group has changed the approach to crime by addressing the environment where students live and socialize, as well as the coordinated enforcement around these new design standards.

Source: Bill Laramee, Neighborhood Liaison Officer, Amherst Police Department; Eric D. Beal, Neighborhood Liaison, Office of External Relations, UMassAmherst; Sally Linowski, Associate Dean of Students, UMass Amherst; Damian DeWolf, UMassAmherst Police Department; Wendy Jones Boisseau, Partner, Jones Properties. Presentation at the International Town and Gown Conference, Eugene, Oregon, June 1, 2017.

3.9 Physical effects

The physical disadvantages of studentification can be extensive and include absenteeism of owners and occupiers, squalor, dereliction and street blight, overwhelming pressure on public services (policing, cleansing, etc), traffic problems and noise. Many of the complaints about studentified neighborhoods are aimed at bad landlords who neglect their properties. There is very little that universities and their off-campus housing officers can do directly to influence landlord behaviour although local governments may be able to counteract some of the worst excesses through licensing and joint efforts on renter awareness and rights policies.
3.10 Accreditation schemes
One area where universities and colleges can have an influence is in introducing and/or supporting accreditation schemes for private landlords. Universities have often been in the vanguard of developing such schemes and some are run in partnership with the local government. In some local areas, accreditation schemes apply more generally and encourage private landlords to supply high-quality student accommodation by rewarding private landlords who supply accommodation which complies with a code of standards. Accredited property receives priority on accommodation bureau lists, and this acts as an incentive for private landlords to obtain membership of the accreditation scheme. Accreditation schemes therefore have a dual benefit of affording students some protection from unscrupulous landlords as well as raising the quality of the housing stock. Universities could consider developing, reviewing and improving accreditation schemes, in partnership with local government, students’ unions and landlord groups.

Accreditation schemes are only successful if they are effectively policed on a regular basis by university housing officers and student governments, and students are encouraged to inform others of problems through self-policing and public information channels. It is therefore important that monitoring systems are effective and that sanctions are applied in cases of persistent non-compliance to standards. Although these types of codes and rating systems are not legally binding, if landlords are found to be in breach of the agreement, they may be prevented from advertising their properties or having access to various sanctioned websites, etc.

3.11 Good landlord schemes
A limitation of accreditation schemes is that it is actually the property that is accredited, and not the individual landlord. As a result, it is possible for students to identify an accredited property on the lists of the housing office and go to view this property. Upon viewing this property, the private landlord may offer other properties to the students that have not complied with the code of standards of the accreditation scheme. One way around this would be for housing offices to provide a list of reputable landlords, alongside the list of accredited properties.

3.12 Raising student expectations of quality of accommodation
Universities (through off-campus housing offices or other means) can improve the physical and management standards of student accommodations by enhancing the qualities of students as residential consumers. They can play a major role in raising student expectations of the quality of private rental housing via Housing Handbooks for example, and extend knowledge of housing legislation and ‘what to look for’. This, in turn, places pressures on private landlords to improve the quality of student accommodation for a more discerning clientele. This is another strand which can effectively be fed into house-hunting talks and included within student housing guide handbooks, as noted elsewhere in this Guide.

3.13 Property maintenance
Unsightly or untidy exteriors can be a source of annoyance to local residents. Although many off-campus housing offices do not expect students to be legally responsible for the upkeep of the property, many good neighbour practices and programs encourage students to keep their rental units free of litter, garbage and unsightly objects, such as couches and mattresses, etc.

3.14 Noise and late-night activity
What constitutes noise, and noise nuisance is often a subjective issue, yet it is one of the most highly contentious and widely held issues associated with the studentification process. Housing officers and good neighbour programs can stress the need for noise levels that do not cause conflicts with the wider student and established residential communities. This can be emphasised during house-hunting talks and within student housing guide handbooks, and can also be written into contracts of housing. Many students going home from campus events or late-night entertainment events in the downtown often take a route through residential communities, and campaigns can be undertaken to raise awareness by providing free merchandise including lollipops (‘if the students have something in their mouths they can’t be making noise’) and cards to hang on their door handles ‘we politely request that you respect your neighbors and keep noise to a minimum while walking home tonight’ and including a number of useful phone numbers. Some North American campuses have adopted ‘student patrols’ to walk in neighborhoods as a signal of the good neighbour and responsible behaviour concepts present in dealing with these issues. Still others have worked to develop leading practices on effectively getting students out of the business district and back into their neighborhoods using public transit and taxis.
Leading Practice: Project Safe Semester – Turning downtown Guelph, Ontario from ‘party town’ into a safe and enjoyable experience for everyone

The University of Guelph, in Ontario, Canada, with close to 15,000 students, is located closer to the edge of the city of just over 100,000 people. The issue that developed over the years is the “invasion” of the downtown area of the city and the proliferation of late night bars and street parties after they close – particularly during the start of the term, homecoming and the end of the year celebrations. Of particular concern was the late-night disconnect between the downtown and the university campus, due to the lack of late-night transit. Through a collaborative approach between the university and the community, “Project Safe Semester” was developed to promote public safety and to reduce the incidents of alcohol related crime and disorder that have a negative impact on the wellbeing of citizens and businesses. A planning approach to dealing with the issue of late night parties and a disconnect from campus was addressed by a joint Late Night Task Force, as well as a Joint Late Night Task Force, as well as a Joint Enforcement Committee that focused on developing a Safe Semester Operational Plan, as well as a Homecoming Operational Plan. The idea of this planning over the year was to focus on five key weeks of the academic term where there was a history of high numbers of incidents, noise and other related complaints to police and city officials. The planning process has been developed over the past four years and there have been many fewer incidents, especially injuries, car/pedestrian accidents, fewer hospital visits, reduced overtime for police, an increased perception of safety, and generally happier neighborhood residents. One of the key planning outcomes was the development of a late night bus service that carried students back to campus and high occupancy neighborhoods outside of the downtown. The entertainment district has been enhanced as well as a Homecoming Operational Plan. Of particular concern was the late-night disconnect between the downtown and the university campus, due to the lack of late-night transit. Through a collaborative approach between the university and the community, “Project Safe Semester” was developed to promote public safety and to reduce the incidents of alcohol related crime and disorder that have a negative impact on the wellbeing of citizens and businesses. A planning approach to dealing with the issue of late night parties and a disconnect from campus was addressed by a joint Late Night Task Force, as well as a Joint Late Night Task Force, as well as a Joint Enforcement Committee that focused on developing a Safe Semester Operational Plan, as well as a Homecoming Operational Plan. The idea of this planning over the year was to focus on five key weeks of the academic term where there was a history of high numbers of incidents, noise and other related complaints to police and city officials. The planning process has been developed over the past four years and there have been many fewer incidents, especially injuries, car/pedestrian accidents, fewer hospital visits, reduced overtime for police, an increased perception of safety, and generally happier neighborhood residents. One of the key planning outcomes was the development of a late night bus service that carried students back to campus and high occupancy neighborhoods outside of the downtown.


3.16 Garbage/recycling collection

Significant efforts have been undertaken which stress the need for student households to minimise their environmental degradation, garbage, litter and broken glass. Thoughtlessness plays a big part here because some students may not notice or mind about litter, or may feel that they are not part of the problem. In moving to a new apartment or house off-campus, they often do not know of, or how to find out about, waste and recycling collection dates or how to get rid of larger, bulkier items that they do not need, which can then lay around the property for long periods of time, annoying the neighbors and violating local ordinances. Off-campus housing offices can help by simply bringing the issues to students’ attention and disseminating information about waste and recycling regulations, pick-up days and other initiatives, such as bulky item and electronic waste pick-up dates. Public works departments can circulate information to housing offices and student government representatives and media outlets that reminds student of these various pick-up dates. Some have a regular feature in the student newspaper, local newspapers and social media sites. Many local governments have partnered with student governments and off-campus housing offices to arrange for convenient dates for public education programs and to arrange large-item pick-up dates, usually at the start and end of the academic term. Likewise, useful furniture and other goods might be collected and offered for re-use or sale. These types of events have often been used as ‘good neighbor’ events, where local residents join student groups in recycling materials and keeping the neighborhood clean.

3.17 Visual pollution

Rental housing markets are in constant flux, so there are often many different ‘for rent’ and apartment/housing advertisements posted in windows, on buildings, lawns, utility poles, all of which annoy local residents and detract from the overall local environment.

3.18 Parking

Car parking is an issue that flares up in many situations in life. In residential neighborhoods with limited and finite street parking, as well as growth in converted and shared housing, parking will inevitably become an area of conflict. There are many examples where local governments have implicitly encouraged students to limit their use of private vehicles through the strategic deployment of car parking permit schemes or strict parking enforcement procedures. Local governments are also well-placed to negotiate with providers of public transportation to ensure that there is an adequate level of service to areas of high student population and the university campus. In addition, universities are increasingly seeking to restrict the use of private vehicles by students, and encouraging the considerate parking of vehicles on off-campus properties. In order to restrict the use of private vehicle use by students, many university-community efforts are recognising the need to promote the use of public and active transport (bicycles, walking, transit).
Leading Practice: The City of Eugene Balances Neighborhood Identity with Economic Development: A Parking Story

One of the most overt indicators of studentification is the parking issue that emerges when there are high numbers of students living, and parking, in near-campus neighborhoods. The City of Eugene, Oregon has become a leader in dealing with town and gown relations between the University of Oregon, near-campus neighborhoods, and the city’s ability to effectively balance the demand for on-street parking. After a decade of communications and relationship-building, they have created North America’s only market-based pricing of residential parking permits and tailored parking districts to meet these university and community demands. The overall goal of the E-park program (eparkeugene.com) is to balance neighborhood liveability between long-time and short-term residents and those studying on campus with adequate parking in specific neighborhoods, and then re-investing the funds collected from parking in these various districts to the very neighborhoods where it is collected, thus encouraging economic activity.

Through the development of a residential parking permit program that is based upon the supply, demand and location of available parking in near-campus neighborhoods, so the closer one parks to campus, the more you pay for a monthly or quarterly parking pass. This has involved significant municipal enforcement of permits and support of long-term renter support for neighborhood livability and stability. This is done by creating a balance in each parking zone, allowing long term residents to purchase annual permits and restricting their overall percentage of on-street parking spaces for short-term permits.

Source: Jeff Petry, City of Eugene, Presentation to the International Town and Gown Conference, Eugene, Oregon, June 2, 2017

Leading Practice: Cornell University and the Town of Ithaca Joint Transportation Planning Initiative – Getting People, Not Cars, to Campus.

One of the more established leading practices in identifying, evaluating and planning for the impact that a university has on transportation land-uses and networks in a community has been a joint partnership between Cornell University and the Town of Ithaca, New York. The overall impact of transportation across the longer-term was first studied back in 2005 when the university and the town developed a 10-year plan that allowed them to work together to address population growth, university enrollment planning, transportation impacts, both environmentally and in terms of land-use and traffic scenarios across the region. This pro-active approach to long-term impacts of increased transportation demand is shared between various university-community research and planning committees, rather than one-off, individual projects and infrastructure locational issues. Dealing with the specific issues associated with the social and physical aspects of studentification are acknowledged as a system-wide set of issues that require an on-going relationship.


3.19 Traffic congestion

Traffic congestion is often experienced at specific times of year – such as the beginning and end of term and around major events such as graduation. University officials can help local communities to manage this problem by publicising term dates and dates of major events, as well as coordinating traffic flow in and around the campus. One of the emerging areas of university-community relationships has been around campus and community transportation planning, including traffic flow, near-campus and on-campus parking, enforcement, and revenue-sharing.

Leading Practice: Cornell University and the Town of Ithaca Joint Transportation Planning Initiative – Getting People, Not Cars, to Campus.

One of the more established leading practices in identifying, evaluating and planning for the impact that a university has on transportation land-uses and networks in a community has been a joint partnership between Cornell University and the Town of Ithaca, New York. The overall impact of transportation across the longer-term was first studied back in 2005 when the university and the town developed a 10-year plan that allowed them to work together to address population growth, university enrollment planning, transportation impacts, both environmentally and in terms of land-use and traffic scenarios across the region. This pro-active approach to long-term impacts of increased transportation demand is shared between various university-community research and planning committees, rather than one-off, individual projects and infrastructure locational issues. Dealing with the specific issues associated with the social and physical aspects of studentification are acknowledged as a system-wide set of issues that require an on-going relationship.


3.20 Economic effects

Many of the negative economic effects of studentification need to be dealt with at a strategic level, by a range of actors. Some effects are very difficult for any group or combination of groups to control, such as the effects on the market of high demand for student housing, leading to a rise in house prices, which might deny access to housing for other sections of community. Housing market dynamics are a concern of the entire community, where local, regional and national economic trends have an impact.
3.21 Local customs

A changing population leads to changes in the retail and entertainment services available locally. Most commonly-cited examples include local businesses becoming predominantly fast-food, pizza take-outs and cafés. Local governments can use their powers to limit changes of use of retail properties to certain categories such as fast-food outlets. Chamber of Commerce and economic development officials can only benefit from an ongoing relationship with the university and other economic engines within the community. An understanding of the local market is an important aspect of the ‘fit’ of college-style operations within the overall community.

**Leading Practice: Economic Development through Town and Gown Collaboration in Amherst, Massachusetts**

The University of Massachusetts-Amherst (UMass-Amherst) and its home community have already been identified as one of the North American college towns that have identified the overall studentification process through a complete overhaul in the relationship between town and gown actors. By recognizing that the establishment and devotion to an ongoing relationship, they have moved from episodic frictions between students and off-campus neighborhoods to a blurring of the borders between campus and community by the creation of a collaborative committee that includes economic development by embracing a neighborhood land-use ‘anchor strategy’ and economic development strategy that works with students, faculty, university administrators, as well as municipal planners and economic development officers. Collaborative sub-committees focus on three key areas: Housing (for students, faculty and staff and affordable units), Economic Development (university partnerships, entrepreneurship and start-ups, food and retail and the promotion of amenities), and Quality of Life (public safety and student behavior). By recognizing the social, economic, physical and cultural aspects of the studentification process, officials at UMass-Amherst are confident that they have created a shift in the culture that engages old and new stakeholders in shaping their long-term university-community relationship.

Source: Ziomek, David, Assistant Town Manager, Amherst MA, Buffone, Associate Vice Chancellor, UMass-Amherst, Maroulis, Tony, Director of External Relations, UMass-Amherst presentation "Blurring the Borders Between Campus and Community: Creating a Town-Gown Committee for Shared Success", ITGA Leading Practices Library, accessed August 2, 2017 at: www.itga.org/resource-center

3.22 Measuring the studentification process – Data-driven research and planning

The previous sections of this Guide have highlighted the important economic, social and physical ups and downs that occur between cities and towns and the colleges and universities located within their boundaries (Fox 2012; Kempt 2015). The so-called “town and gown” relationship is a difficult one to measure and there is a scarcity of both quantitative and qualitative measures devoted to understanding the relative health of these important relationships. In particular, municipal leaders often report a feeling of isolation and lack of understanding of what is going on at the local university or college, which seems to generate feelings of benign neglect or hostility towards students and the university over the years. Too often, a flash point incident, such as a wild party or neighborhood battle over housing sends town and university officials into opposing corners, rather than focusing on the enormous strengths that exist from an ongoing, harmonious relationship.

The various leading practices gathered from recent meetings of the International Town and Gown Association and their Leading Practice Resource Library highlight the many ways of addressing the issues, with a recent focus on generating a research and data-driven agenda as a basis for strategic town and gown relations and planning. Robust survey data of all of the various constituencies have been introduced in a number of locations across North America. Recognizing and identifying the elements of studentification have become key factors in the characterization of town and gown relationships, so that partnerships and communications can be informed of the actual issues in play in their communities.

**Leading Practice: Ohio State University-Mansfield and the Optimal College Town Assessment Tool**

A potential game-changer on measuring and planning for the studentification process can be seen through the introduction of the “Optimal College Town Assessment (OCTA)” by Dr. Stephen Gavazzi of Ohio State University at Mansfield. Based on previous work on identifying the various types of relationships that exist between universities and their communities (Gavazzi et al 2014), Gavazzi has moved a step further in developing an online assessment tool that adds significant scientific rigor to the analysis of the health of the relationship, providing a sound, evidence-based approach to improving the relationship, in both good times and bad. Fox (2014) was able to assist in this research, specifically in adding the Canadian perspective on town and gown relations across North America. Gavazzi chronicled the combined activities undertaken by a regional campus of a four-year university and a two-year technical college in the Mid-Western United States to gain a better understanding of the relationship between their institutions and the communities surrounding their shared campus. Most civic leaders and university administrators that attend the ITGA conferences are attempting to solve a problem that they often think is unique to their home community.
Before introducing his measurement tool for addressing town and gown issues, Gavazzi, himself a family and marriage researcher, outlined a typology for categorizing town-town relationships that works in ways similar to the various types of marriages and family relationships. The harmonious type of relationship consists of higher comfort levels and higher effort levels on the part of the partners. From a town and gown perspective it is the most desirable form of relationship. Partners are dynamically involved in a significant number of activities that are of shared benefit to both the campus and community, resulting in a sense of connectedness and joint purpose. In this way, high levels of comfort are maintained and enhanced by mutual exchanges of information and exertion. This is the optimal town-gown relationship for most campus and community partners.

The traditional type of relationship is a combination of higher comfort levels and lower effort levels. This type is thought to be the default state of affairs for most campuses and communities, and it generates modest amounts of relationship satisfaction. This town-gown category retains its desirable status in large part because it takes little work to create a comfortable if somewhat sterile separate yet equal relationship. Being relatively disconnected from one another, the main objective becomes the maintenance of the status quo, where town and gown assume an ‘I’m okay, you’re okay’ stance. As a result, campus and community leaders often as not simply ignore each other as they pursue their own individual goals.

The conflicted type of relationship is one of lower comfort levels and higher effort levels and it is one that generates overall reduced satisfaction levels, but partners are still engaged with one another in an attempt to work out relationship issues. The main difficulty for this town-gown relationship type involves the persistent nature of quarrels among the partners. The partners are not done with one another by any means; but the amount of effort needed to sustain these enduring struggles can be quite taxing, especially over time. This is a troubled town-gown relationship between and among campus and community partners and it seemed to be a prevalent type amongst those in attendance at the session. They seemed to be searching for answers to this troublesome relationship.

The devitalized type of relationship involves a combination of low comfort levels and low effort levels and it represents relationships with the least amount of overall satisfaction between campus and community members. The hallmark of the devitalized relationship is disappointment and loss, stemming from the fact that a more active and comfortable association had existed at some previous point. Hence, devitalized town-gown associations can be seen as the end result of a relationship that has soured, where there is disenchantment amidst a lost sense of connectedness. This is a troubled relationship with a great need for some sort of restorative direction.

In the next stage of his research project, Gavazzi introduced a mobilization cycle for advancing campus-community partnerships. He explained this as a series of steps that involve awareness raising, coalition building, data gathering, data interpretation and reporting, and evidence-based action planning to assist all of the partners through an easy-to-use, online survey tool that is tailored to their particular geographic location and situation. Using postal codes and cross-street locations, it allows the analysis to drill down to the neighborhood and individual street level for a read of the effort and comfort of residents, business owners and students.

In the pilot study, Gavazzi found a significant level of awareness raising and coalition building by employing OCTA, including particular attention paid to the responses of three specific groups of community stakeholders (business owners, leaders of non-profits, and local school district educators), whose perceptions were compared and contrasted in the data analysis procedures. In turn, the data interpretation and evidence-based action planning activities centered on the formation of a joint task force that was designed to focus on land use issues for the geographic area immediately surrounding the campus. The results of this survey took much of the guesswork and anecdotal nature of the relationship out of the equation, with some surprising results on the nature of the relationship:

- Greater contact between campus and community members was significantly related to higher overall relationship contentment, with the business community much less enamored with the relationship than the faculty and staff at the university and college.
- Community comfort levels were highest with students, indicating that students serve as a key connecting point between the campus and the community.
- Levels of effort and comfort were subject to distance decay, such that relationship contentment is highest for those living and working geographically closest to campus.
- Perceived comfort levels were highest among business owners, followed by non-profit leaders, and then educators, indicating that discriminating between and among different subgroups of campus and community membership really matters.

This results of this initial pilot project were very encouraging and it would certainly serve municipalities, colleges and universities well in their approach to the studentification process through a more strategic town and gown planning, economic impact analysis, and a more positive, data driven mobilization strategy for understanding and planning for the maintenance or enhancement of the relationship. OCTA seems well structured to assess perceptions about concerns that commonly arise in campus and community relationships and it provides data about the impact of issues such as student misbehavior, economic investment, educational access and affordability, public relations, volunteerism, and visibility in the overall community. It may even assist in retaining students in the community and alumni relations and loyalty to the university and the community.
Reaction to OCTA at the International Town and Gown Conferences is very positive, as it emerges as one of the very few mechanisms for simply and accurately measuring the university-community relationship in near-campus neighborhoods, as well as the overall dynamic of cyclical economic impacts that a college town may be experiencing. The critical point about town and gown relationships seems to revolve around the degree of effort and levels of comfort the partners exhibit in maintaining the relationship, or even enhancing it. This community analysis tool allows all of the partners to participate and to have the entire community surveyed on the relationship. A number of other communities have employed the OCTA tool, including Clemson, South Carolina.

More information on the Optimal College Town Assessment can be found at www.CollegeTownAssessment.com

References:
www.collegetownassessment.com

Fox, M. (2012) "Challenges of the town and gown relationship – as students return to school this September municipalities are becoming active partners” in Municipal World, September 2012, p. 23.


4. Key findings and conclusions

The research undertaken for this project has given rise to a number of overarching conclusions and findings on the studentification process in the North American context.

There is a need for each stakeholder group (universities/colleges, local governments, students’ unions, community groups, etc.) to recognise that:

- studentification is occurring;
- it can have positive and negative effects;
- each stakeholder group has responsibilities; and
- they have an active role to play in addressing studentification.

As a principle, best results will be achieved through working in partnership and there is a particular role for multi-agency partnerships in tackling the issues.

Achieving a consensual view of the issues and a common vision will require mutual respect and trust between the stakeholder organisations.

The local and/or regional context is crucially important in determining any action. The stakeholders need to decide locally in each case what the key issues are and how to address them in a way that is best for them, and at the appropriate scale.

The advantages and disadvantages of studentification are two sides of the same coin. Without detracting from the need to address the disadvantages, there needs to be more acknowledgement of the benefits of having one or more universities or colleges and a large student population in a given community.

There is a need for mutual respect between residential communities and students.

Communication, at a number of levels, is key and runs through many of the issues:

- there needs to be a means whereby all of the stakeholders can consider the issues at a strategic level;
- named contact people (in the university, the students’ union or the local government) can be beneficial;
- students need to know clearly what is expected of them and what their responsibilities are within neighborhoods;
- students also need to have the basic information which will help them to be good neighbours;
- helplines for residents can be useful;
- resident communities, and the students in them, need to communicate their needs to each other.
5. Checklist for stakeholders on measuring for studentification

This checklist poses a series of questions, in no particular order of priority, which have been drawn from examples of innovative practice in universities in the United Kingdom and Canada. The list provides a resource for those concerned with the challenges and opportunities of having a college/university in their community. It is not intended to be prescriptive, but rather, to stimulate consideration and discussion. Although some of the issues are clearly more relevant to particular organizations and locations, they are of general interest to all the stakeholders. One of the main findings of our research is the need for appropriate multi-agency partnerships and effective coordination. The checklist might therefore usefully form the basis for local consultation and the creation of multi-agency partnerships. It is also intended to help individual stakeholders seeking to develop their own strategies.

All stakeholders:

- Do stakeholders have firm evidence upon which they can base their understanding of the impacts of studentification within their community?
- Do stakeholders share a common understanding of whether the impact of studentification is/is not being felt in the community?
- Do stakeholders share a common understanding of the wider benefits and challenges of high concentrations of students in the community?
- Is there agreement and common ground about the causes and effects of studentification amongst stakeholders?
- Has a partnership framework been established for stakeholders to ensure there can be a coordinated approach to tackling issues of studentification?
- Have a shared vision and general principles been agreed between stakeholders?
- Is there evidence of respect and trust between stakeholders?
- Have stakeholders agreed on some objectives and exit strategies, and established mechanisms to review and monitor social, economic, cultural and physical changes within the community.

Universities/Colleges:

- Has the university considered and agreed upon its responsibilities to students and established residential communities?
- Has the university developed student accommodation strategies? If so, are they effective?
- Are the student accommodation strategies of the University and other local stakeholders consistent?
- Has the university and other stakeholders explored the scope for the dispersal of students from areas of high concentration where this may be desirable?
- Has the university and other stakeholders considered the promotion of alternative residential locations to encourage the dispersal of students?
- Has the university and other stakeholders considered the adoption of an accreditation scheme for off-campus student accommodation? If so, are mechanisms in place to monitor and review compliance?
- Has the university and other stakeholders encouraged students to move into accredited rental properties?
- Has the university considered the development of a central student housing office to advise students when searching for off-campus housing? Has the university and other stakeholders considered the production of a student housing guide or website?
- Has the university and other stakeholders provided effective house-hunting talks and education programs on a regular basis? If so, do these events reach the target student groups?
- Has the university encouraged students to think carefully about their choice of room-mates, in order to reduce conflict and turnover in student living arrangements?
- Has the university sought to promote and raise students’ expectations of the quality and affordability and suitability of accommodation?
- Has the university informed students of their rights and responsibilities as tenants?
- Has the university and other stakeholders considered preparing and issuing information directories detailing contact numbers and addresses of key services?
- Has the university and the local government considered the appointment of a community liaison officer or officers to foster cohesive relations between students and established neighborhoods? If so, are there mechanisms in place for the community liaison officer(s) to respond effectively to issues as they arise?
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- Has the university considered the development of neighborhood helplines? If so, is effectiveness monitored?
- Has the university considered the appointment of of-campus patrols/student leaders or dons to regulate student behavior?
- Has the university explored their powers to control and reprimand students who undertake anti-social behavior?

Town/City/Municipal Government:

- Has the Town established appropriate mechanisms and communication channels for stakeholders to discuss issues of studentification? If so, are these mechanisms open to all?
- Has the Town explored opportunities to share innovative and good practice with other university towns and levels of government [provinces]?
- Are the initiatives to regulate processes of studentification included in wider government structures and legislative frameworks?
- Are the activities of different departments within the Town government mutually supportive and integrated?
- Has the Town considered the implications of the powers included in provincial housing regulations and policies?

- Has the Town and the university considered implementing appropriate methods to inform residents of the services that are available in neighborhoods with high residential turnover and population change?

Towns and Universities/Colleges:

- Has the Town and the university and other stakeholders actively promoted crime prevention strategies to students?
- Has the Town and the university considered strategies to minimize problems of garbage collection and litter?
- Has the Town and university encouraged student volunteering and engagement within established residential communities?
- Has the Town and the university implemented schemes/annual surveys to encourage?
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