

# ***Kenai Peninsula College Student Housing Potential Market Demand Study***

*Prepared for:*  
***Kenai Peninsula College***



***Juneau • Anchorage***

***May 2008***

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Executive Summary.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Literature Review Research Findings.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Rural-Serving Community Colleges.....	10
Role in Easing the Transition to College Life.....	10
Prevalence of On-Campus Student Housing at Community Colleges .....	11
Characteristics of On-Campus Residents .....	12
Characteristics of On-Campus Student Housing.....	12
Reasons for Providing On-Campus Housing .....	12
Impacts on Persistence and Performance .....	14
Enhances Adjustment to College Life .....	15
Conclusion .....	16
<b>Executive Interview Findings.....</b>	<b>17</b>
Perceived Need for On-Campus Student Housing.....	17
Student Housing Eases the Transition to College.....	18
Student Housing Offers Convenience .....	18
Student Housing Leads to Increased Enrollment .....	19
Student Housing Impacts Retention and Performance .....	19
Student Housing Enhances the College Experience.....	20
Property Managers’ Perspectives .....	20
<b>KPC Housing Demand Survey Findings.....</b>	<b>21</b>
Importance of Attending College.....	22
Interest in Attending College.....	22
College Choice Factors .....	23
Importance of Affordable On-Campus Housing .....	27
Agreement with Statements about On-Campus Housing .....	27
Interest in Attending Colleges in Alaska .....	31
Alaska Colleges Considered .....	32
Why Alaska Colleges Are Considered .....	33
Why Alaska Colleges Are Not Considered .....	34
Familiarity with Kenai Peninsula College .....	35
Impact of On-Campus Housing Availability on Interest in Attending KPC.....	35
Household Respondent Demographics .....	36

<b>KPC Student Survey Findings .....</b>	<b>38</b>
Enrollment Status .....	38
KPC Campus .....	39
Current Residence .....	39
Home Community .....	40
Relocation to Attend KPC .....	41
Previous College Experience .....	41
Reasons to Attend KPC .....	43
Importance of Factors in Choosing KPC.....	44
Need for On-Campus Housing .....	45
Current Housing.....	45
Current Housing Costs .....	46
Satisfaction with Current Housing .....	47
Housing Availability .....	47
Interest in On-Campus Housing.....	48
On-Campus Housing Amenities.....	50
Demographics.....	51
<b>Potential On-Campus Housing Demand Estimates.....</b>	<b>53</b>
Estimated Demand from Household Survey Communities .....	53
Conversion Adjustments for Household Survey Results.....	54
Estimated Demand from KPC Student Survey Results.....	55
Summary Estimates of Demand .....	55
<b>Appendix A: Bibliography.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Appendix B: List of Interviewees .....</b>	<b>58</b>

# Executive Summary

---

Kenai Peninsula College (KPC) contracted with McDowell Group, an Alaska research and consulting firm, to prepare an assessment of the potential demand for on-campus housing at KPC's Kenai River Campus. As KPC seeks to gain budget and administrative support for housing development, an assessment of demand is helpful in addressing the need for student housing.

## Methods

The study team utilized four research methodologies used to prepare this assessment:

- **Literature Review Research** – to demonstrate the impacts of student housing and understand the broader context of factors contributing to student success, including academic performance, retention, and enhanced college experiences.
- **Executive Interview Research** – to gather information and gain insight into the housing challenges and successes of students on small rural campuses.
- **Telephone Survey of Potential Student Households in the Kenai Peninsula Borough (KPB) and selected rural Alaska communities** – to gather information about the process families undergo when choosing institutions for further education. Specifically, the survey was intended to assess awareness of KPC in rural areas of Alaska and in the Kenai Peninsula Borough, as well as the potential interest in attending KPC if on-campus student housing were available. A total of 76 household surveys were conducted in the selected rural communities (Dillingham, Kotzebue, and Nome), and a total of 128 households surveys were conducted in selected KPB communities.
- **Online KPC Student Survey** – to assess student opinions on the need for on-campus student housing and desired student housing amenities, and to examine current housing status, availability, and affordability. A total of 203 students, of which 100 were full-time students, responded to the survey.
- **Assessment of On-Campus Housing Demand** – to quantify the approximate level of demand from the three specific groups surveys. These are current full-time students, households with high school age students in selected communities in the West Kenai Peninsula, and households with high school age students in three selected rural communities.

## Key Findings

***Special note regarding methods and findings:*** The findings generated by the four differing research methods utilized in the *Kenai Peninsula College Student Housing Potential Market Demand Study* are remarkably consistent. Regardless of method, findings are universally supportive of the positive value of on-campus housing on student performance, retention, and recruitment. Consistency of findings among multiple research methods lends additional credibility to the data, especially in the case of the relatively small survey sample sizes in this study.

A review of academic research, executive interview research, and survey research reveals the following advantages of on-campus housing on student recruitment, retention, and performance, and the estimated potential demand for on-campus housing on KPC's Kenai River Campus.

### ***On-campus student housing contributes to student success.***

- Academic research shows that students who live in on-campus housing perform at a higher level academically, compared to their counterparts who live off-campus (Thompson, et al.). National surveys indicate that students who live in on-campus housing maintain higher grade point averages, even when differing levels of academic ability are taken into account (Catt). In addition, students who live on-campus tend to be more satisfied with their college experience (Barthelemy & Fine, 1995). Interviewees echoed this finding, as one points out, "Students are part of a community and engaged in a dynamic, social and academic lifestyle that they would not have the same access to if they lived off-campus."
- Of the rural households surveyed, 79 percent either agree or strongly agree, "Living on-campus enhances student performance in school." Just under half (49 percent) of KPB households agree with this statement.

### ***On-campus student housing on rural community campuses provides students living outside of commuting distance with the opportunity to access post-secondary education and increases their chances for success in college.***

- The academic research shows that student housing can enhance diversity on a college campus by providing an opportunity for students who live a long distance from campus to attend (Moeck, 2005). On-campus housing at rural colleges benefits rural and Native students in particular, for whom the transition from village life to an urban campus can be overwhelming.
- As an interviewee states, "Many rural students are unlikely to pursue post-secondary education at an urban campus. With the availability of on-campus student housing at rural colleges, more options would be open to rural students." Another interviewee adds, "There is no question. Without housing, in many cases it is impossible for rural students to attend college." Another explains that, "Without on-campus housing at rural colleges, it becomes too challenging or even impossible for many rural students to attend and they never pursue post-secondary education. Even though they may want to, the opportunity just isn't there."

- Most rural households (89 percent) agree that, “Students from small communities are better able to transition from home life to college life if they live on-campus.” Three out of four KPB households also agree with this statement.
- Three-fourths of KPB households (75 percent) and almost all rural households (93 percent) either agree or strongly agree that, “Living in on-campus housing enhances the college experience.” Most households also either agree or strongly agree that, “A college can attract more students if it has on-campus housing” (93 percent of KPB households and 90 percent rural households).
- Almost all rural households surveyed (95 percent) feel that affordable on-campus housing is either important or very important when making a decision about which college to attend. Eighty-two percent of KPB households also feel it is important.
- Interviewees believe that on-campus housing at rural college campuses in Alaska is absolutely necessary, emphasizing that there is already a high demand for student housing in Alaska. An interviewee states, “Many of the universities with housing in Alaska are filled to capacity and have waiting lists.”

***On-campus student housing also provides an additional source of revenue for colleges, with rural colleges reporting average annual revenues of \$256,900 from the operation of on-campus housing.***

- In addition to producing revenue from room charges, on-campus housing also increases enrollment. It follows that with increased enrollment of full-time students, colleges will receive more state reimbursement funding to finance its operations (Moeck, 2005).

***Many believe that student housing would benefit KPC, in terms of increased enrollment and retention.***

- One interviewee notes, “Those students who live outside commuting distance of KPC and are not willing to attend a large urban campus would have the option of attending KPC if housing were provided. I expect enrollment would increase significantly.” Another interviewee adds, “Housing at KPC would likely help to retain local students as well as increasing the ability to attract rural students from other regions to a campus situation that is conducive to their success.”
- Most rural households (80 percent) are not familiar with KPC. Conversely, most KPB households are familiar (88 percent). When asked about their level of interest in attending KPC if on-campus housing were available, 62 percent of rural households and 48 percent of KPB households state that students in their household would be either very interested or somewhat interested in attending KPC’s Kenai River Campus.

*There is solid interest among KPC's current students for on-campus housing.*

- Two out of five (42 percent) KPC student respondents believe that KPC needs on-campus housing on the Kenai River Campus.
- When asked how interested they would be in living on-campus if student housing were provided at KPC, nearly half of all students (full-time and part-time) report that they are either "very interested" (23 percent) or "somewhat interested" (24 percent).
- Focusing only on *full-time* students as the primary market for on-campus housing, 29 percent of them said if on-campus housing were available on the Kenai River Campus, they would be "very interested" in living on-campus.
- Full time students interested in on-campus housing appear to be significantly price-sensitive. At the medium price, 13 percent of full time students were willing to rent, but at the lower price, 21 percent were willing to rent on-campus. For purposes of the following demand estimate, demand at the medium price is used.

## Summary Estimate of Demand

*The study team estimates that initial demand for KPC student housing would range from 75 to 150 full-time students with a mid-point of approximately 110 students.*

This estimate is limited to demand supported by the research results of the three populations surveyed for this study:

1. Current full-time students
2. Households with high school students in selected KPB communities
3. Rural households with high school students in three remote communities

Readers should understand this estimate is meant only as a preliminary indication of potential demand from these specific populations, which by no means constitute the entire market for KPC student housing. The table below details study team estimates by group surveyed.

### Summary Estimate of Potential Kenai Peninsula College Student Housing Demand

Survey Population	Percent	Number	Conversion Adjustment (-%)
Current Full-time Students ("Very likely" at medium price)	13%	58	(-20%) = 46
Selected KPB Households w/ HS Students ("Very interested" in on-campus housing)	21%	94	(-50%) = 47
Selected Rural Households w/ HS Students ("Very interested" in on-campus housing)	16%	33	(-50%) = 17
<b>Total Potential Demand</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>110</b>

Factors that will likely increase KPC student housing demand beyond the above estimates include:

- The longer-term impact of a successful KPC marketing program.
- Demand from populations not included in this analysis, including:
  - Rural Alaska students from the many remote communities not surveyed.
  - Students from un-surveyed communities in the Kenai Peninsula Borough.
  - Urban Alaska students desiring a smaller, more intimate Alaska campus experience.
  - Part-time KPC students converting to full-time students due to new housing availability.
  - Other students from Alaska and beyond attracted by KPC's academic and training specialties, such as process technology and digital arts.
- Additional demand if KPC chooses a lower price level for its on-campus housing. Student survey results show significant price elasticity.

A full review of the demand estimate methodology is presented in the final section of this report.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The methodology results in what can be considered a realistic, and likely conservative, estimate. The estimate is limited to survey respondents saying there were "very likely" (full-time students at medium price level) or "very interested" (KPB and rural households) to utilize on-campus housing. In addition, a conversion adjustment accounts for the common discrepancy between intended future behavior as expressed in a survey interview and actual future behavior. Current full-time student responses were discounted only moderately (-20%) as they are better able to predict their own short-term behavior than parents predicting the longer-term behavior of their children still in high school (a -50% conversion adjustment). Finally, demand from un-surveyed markets is not included.



# Methodology

---

The study team employed four methodologies to develop the *Kenai Peninsula College Student Housing Potential Market Demand Study*.

## **Literature Review**

To prepare the research literature review, McDowell Group reviewed research abstracts and articles using on-line search engines and other Internet resources, such as the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). The research team also reviewed research articles provided by Kenai Peninsula College staff.

The team searched for academic articles related directly to on-campus student housing on small or rural campuses and its impacts on student performance, retention, and recruitment. The purpose of the research was to demonstrate the impacts of student housing and contextualize student housing within a broader set of factors contributing to student success. A bibliography of literature reviewed is found in Appendix A.

## **Executive Interview Research**

Executive interview research was conducted to gather insight and information into the housing challenges and successes of students on small rural campuses. Interview protocol was developed by McDowell Group. A total of 17 interviews were conducted during the month of March. Interviewees included University of Alaska and school district officials, high school principals, and other community members. In addition, Kenai Peninsula Borough (KPB) area property managers were interviewed regarding the local market for student housing and renting to students. A list of interviewees is found in Appendix B.

## **Household Telephone Survey**

McDowell Group conducted surveys of randomly selected households from two distinct samples: 1) selected rural communities (Dillingham, Kotzebue, and Nome) and 2) selected KPB communities (Kenai, North Kenai, Homer, Sterling, Soldotna, Nikiski, Anchor Point, Kasilof, and Ninilchik).

The purpose of surveying households in selected rural communities outside of KPB was to gather information about the process of rural families choosing institutions for higher education. Specifically, the survey was intended to assess awareness of KPC in rural areas of Alaska outside of KPB, and the potential interest in attending KPC if on-campus student housing were available. Currently, the majority of KPC students are from the Kenai Peninsula Borough.

In consultation with KPC staff, McDowell Group designed a telephone survey instrument that was used in both sample areas. Surveyors screened for households with high school age children. Survey content included household demographics, opinions regarding the importance and likelihood of children attending college after high school, factors affecting decisions regarding choice of college, the potential demand for a rural campus with student housing, and awareness of and interest in attending KPC.

Survey data was cross-tabulated by age, education, income, ethnicity, and gender. Mentions are made throughout the survey report where opinions were significantly different based on these factors.

A total of 76 surveys were conducted with adults in rural community households (in Dillingham, Kotzebue, and Nome) with high school-age children. The maximum margin of error at the 95 percent confidence level is  $\pm 10.9$  percent for this sample. A total of 128 surveys were conducted with KPB households with high school-age children. The maximum margin of effort at the 95 percent confidence level is  $\pm 8.5$  percent. The survey was fielded from late-March through early-April 2008. The table below shows the percentage of surveys conducted in each community.

**Household Survey Respondents, by Residency**

	Number of Completed Surveys	% Of Total
<b>Kenai Peninsula Borough Communities</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>100%</b>
Kenai and North Kenai	38	30
Homer	25	20
Sterling	18	14
Soldotna	17	13
Nikiski	16	13
Anchor Point	7	5
Kasilof	4	3
Ninilchik	3	2
<b>Rural Communities</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>100%</b>
Dillingham	26	34
Nome	25	33
Kotzebue	25	33

## KPC Online Student Survey

McDowell Group conducted an online survey of KPC's current student population. The survey was designed by McDowell Group, in consultation with KPC staff. The main purpose of the survey was to assess student opinions on the need for on-campus student housing at KPC, examine current housing status and housing availability, spending capability, desired student support services/amenities, and other related campus life issues.

The University of Alaska provided a database containing 1,470 KPC students enrolled full-time and part-time, and their email contact information. McDowell Group prepared a cover email and a link to a web survey. KPC Information Technology staff issued the email, notifying students of the survey and the survey web-link. The first email was issued April 10th, with subsequent reminder emails sent on April 15th and April 18th. To encourage higher responses, a drawing of a \$500 cash prize was offered. By the end of April, 178 responses were received. McDowell Group followed up by telephone with full-time students, completing an additional 25, for a total of 203 responses.

The table below compares demographics of the survey participants to demographic information contained in the KPC student database, showing that the survey sample is somewhat representative of the student body in the areas of ethnicity, gender, and age.

**Student Demographics**

	% of Student Database	% of Respondents
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
White/Caucasian	80%	76%
Other	20	24
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	57%	68%
Male	43	32
<b>Age</b>		
<19	10%	6%
19-21	19	24
22-24	11	15
25-29	13	16
30+	47	39

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

Survey data were cross-tabulated by respondent age, income, ethnicity, gender, enrollment status (part-time or full-time), campus currently enrolled in (Kenai River or Kachemak), and current community of residence (Kenai Peninsula community or other Alaska community). Mentions are made throughout the survey results where opinions were significantly different based on these factors.

## **Demand Assessment Analysis**

During the process of estimating potential demand, the study team used a relatively conservative approach in order to ensure that demand estimates were realistic and supported by research results. For example, high school students per household were adjusted to 1.00 while survey data from the relatively small samples suggested 1.25 high school students per household. Only those households that said they were “very interested” were used in the estimates. While those that stated “somewhat likely” and “somewhat interested” were not used in the estimates, there is the possibility that some additional demand may come from these households.

Further, a conversion adjustment was applied to the actual survey results to compensate for the common discrepancy between intended future behavior as expressed in a short survey and actual future behavior. In the experience of the study team, actual behavior, at best, matches the “very interested” (KPB and rural households) or “very likely” (full-time students at the medium on-campus housing price) group’s expression of intended future behavior. Most often, respondents are overly optimistic about their future behavior. In the case of asking parents about the intended post-secondary educational behavior of their children some years into the future, it is even more important to temper survey responses on the conservative side. This is also supported by recent data showing Alaska high students have difficulty staying in college once they attend.

The section “Potential On-Campus Housing Demand” provides a step-by-step discussion on how on-campus housing demand was determined. The demand estimate was based on survey results (both telephone and online), current high school enrollment and graduation rates obtained from the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, and University of Alaska estimates of high school graduate enrollment in post-secondary education.

# Literature Review Research Findings

---

The literature review summarizes the small number of journal articles directly devoted to on-campus student housing at community colleges. This review also examines studies on the impacts of student housing on retention and performance at four-year universities, with the assumption that this research is important and relevant to consider in relation to community colleges.

Although extensive research has been carried out to examine issues related to the advantages, management, administration, operation and impacts of on-campus student housing at four-year universities in the United States, research related to on-campus student housing at community colleges is very limited. Little of the available literature focuses on studies that exclusively concentrate on community colleges. This literature review will begin by providing a definition and basic classifications of rural-serving community colleges, and examine the prevalence of on-campus student housing at community colleges in the United States. Following this, the impacts of student housing on retention, performance and adjustment to college life will be examined, based on existing research. A bibliography of literature reviewed is found in Appendix A.

## **Rural-Serving Community Colleges**

Rural-serving community colleges are defined as public two-year institutions with a physical address outside the hundred largest standard or consolidated metropolitan statistical areas. Rural-serving community colleges make up 60 percent of all two-year institutions in the United States and educate one-third of all community college students each year (Katsinas, Opp & Alexander, 2003). In 2005, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching released basic classifications of rural-serving community colleges, distributed across the categories of small, medium and large rural-serving community colleges. Small rural community colleges are those with enrollments under 2,500 students, mid-sized community colleges are those with enrollments between 2,500 and 5,000, and those with enrollments greater than 7,500 are considered large (as defined by Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2005).

## **Role in Easing the Transition to College Life**

Rural-serving community colleges provide an important opportunity for rural students to pursue post-secondary education in an environment that is less intimidating than a large urban campus. For some rural students, meeting educational goals in an unfamiliar urban setting can be very challenging. The unique nature and mission of rural community colleges often poses geographical challenges. Rural-serving community colleges often serve a relatively small population located within a large geographic area. Rural-serving community colleges have long been challenged to overcome the geographic remoteness of their campuses to deliver access and diversity.

Regardless of whether students live in rural, urban or suburban areas, commuting to college can be a challenge, particularly with high gas prices. The distance between the campus and current and prospective students is a challenge that often leads to the need for on-campus housing. By offering on-campus student housing, community colleges provide an incentive to students who live outside commuting distance to attend their institution.

## **Prevalence of On-Campus Student Housing at Community Colleges**

One primary source of information on the prevalence of on-campus housing at community colleges is Moeck's 2005 dissertation, which drew data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) in 2001-2002. Moeck also reported the results of a survey of the presidents or chief housing officers at 206 two-year community colleges that, according to the IPEDS database, had on-campus housing in 2001-2002.

Research indicates that a significant number of community colleges currently provide on-campus housing in the United States. On-campus housing at community colleges across the country is increasing, with 206 community colleges currently providing on-campus housing (Moeck, 2005). The majority of the community colleges reporting on-campus student housing to IPEDS in 2001-2001 were members of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (45 percent) or the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (31 percent), the two largest of the six regional accrediting bodies.

Most of these community colleges serve rural America, with over 90 percent located in rural settings. The presence of on-campus student housing at rural-serving community colleges is significant. In general, remote colleges are more likely to offer on-campus student housing. Midsized rural-serving colleges most commonly provide housing. Among the 206 community colleges with housing, 51 (25 percent) were small rural-serving colleges, 107 (52 percent) were midsized rural-serving colleges and 32 (15 percent) were large rural-serving colleges.

Of the 9.4 million students attending U.S. community colleges, as measured by an unduplicated annual headcount in 2000-2001, about 3.2 million attend rural-serving community colleges, compared to 3.0 million attending suburban-serving and 3.2 million attending urban-serving institutions. The vast majority of small and medium rural-serving community colleges have annual unduplicated enrollments below 3,000 students. Larger percentages of first-time, full-time students are served at rural-serving community colleges than at community colleges in urban and suburban settings (Katsinas, Lacey & Hardy, 2005).

## **Characteristics of On-Campus Residents**

According to survey results (Moeck, 2005), the typical rural-serving community college with on-campus student housing has 350 beds. Moeck's survey results show that the typical community college student living in on-campus housing was an unmarried male in the traditional college-going age group (18-24 years), who attended on a full-time basis. At small rural-serving community colleges, 60 percent of the occupants were male; at medium rural-serving community colleges, 56 percent were male; and at large rural-serving colleges, 54 percent were male. The disproportionately large number of men attending rural-serving colleges contrasts the national profile of all enrolled students (those who live on-campus and those who do not) across all community colleges, which typically shows that approximately 60 percent are female students (Hardy, 2005).

## **Characteristics of On-Campus Student Housing**

Community colleges with on-campus student housing often own and operate their student housing and offer a number of amenities, which may increase as the amount of construction and renovation of housing increases. Of those rural-serving community colleges with on-campus housing, an overwhelming majority (87 percent) owns their own housing. Five percent reported that an outside interest owns their housing and four percent reporting dual ownership between the college and an outside contractor.

Amenities offered include non-smoking rooms, private rooms, married student/family housing, single parent/family housing, laundry facilities, cable TV, telephone service, computer connections, tutoring, and fitness centers. The most common amenities provided in community college on-campus housing are laundry facilities (80 percent), cable TV (77 percent) and telephone service (76 percent). Seven in ten community colleges with student housing reported providing computer connections. Tutoring and fitness centers were less common (49 and 34 percent respectively). Other amenities such as swimming pools, health centers and maid service appear to be low priority. With lower than 25 percent of survey respondents reporting these amenities, they are not considered as important as others (Moeck, 2005).

## **Reasons for Providing On-Campus Housing**

Presidents or chief housing officers of rural community colleges responding to a 2005 survey (Moeck, 2005) offered a number of reasons for providing on-campus housing. Rural community colleges were very positive in their responses concerning motivation for offering on-campus housing.

## **INCREASED ENROLLMENT**

Over 90 percent of survey respondents listed increased full-time enrollments and the desire to offer a true college experience as motivations to provide on-campus housing. Because rural community colleges are often viewed as vocational/technical alternates to universities, community colleges attempt to offer their students a comparable experience in higher education, which includes academics, activities, programs and student services.

## **STUDENT COST FACTORS**

Other reasons mentioned include offering convenience and potential savings to those students living on campus. With high gasoline prices, many rural-serving community college students may realize cost savings by living in on-campus housing. Additionally, survey respondents mentioned the desire to make it possible for students to complete specialized programs in high-demand areas such as nursing, and to diversify the student body by increasing access for students who live a long distance from the college, including international students.

## **SOURCE OF COLLEGE REVENUE**

Respondents also reported an increasing demand for on-campus student housing and a positive impact on the ability of colleges to generate unrestricted revenues. Rural colleges reported a mean income of \$256,904 annually from the operation of on-campus housing - a significant amount of income for rural-serving community colleges. Non-rural serving community colleges reported a comparatively similar mean annual income from on-campus housing at \$261,400. In addition to producing net revenue from the room charges, on-campus housing increases enrollment. It follows that with increased enrollment of full-time students, colleges will receive more state reimbursement funding to finance its operations. This improves economies of scale and allows colleges to offer a wider range of services such as bookstores and food services to both their residential and non-residential populations (Moeck, 2005).

These factors help to explain why one half of the rural-serving colleges surveyed indicated that they were considering new housing construction. Of those rural community colleges with on-campus housing, 80 percent indicated that on-campus housing was filled to capacity, and 32 percent indicated that they have waiting lists (Moeck, 2005).

## **INCREASED PARTICIPATION IN CAMPUS ACTIVITIES**

Another reason given for providing on-campus housing is the desire to support student development activities such as clubs, organizations, teams and other student groups. These programs and services may make a difference in student recruitment, retention, and overall satisfaction with their college experience (Moeck, 2005). Feeling that they are part of a community college is a fundamental need for a large number of first-time college students, and may be a strong factor leading to success (Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005).



## **Impacts on Persistence and Performance**

Much of the research related to on-campus student housing focuses on the impact they have on student persistence and performance. Research has shown that living in on-campus housing at a 4-year college or university has a positive impact on student retention, performance and adjustment. Without further research on the impacts of student housing at community colleges, it can only be assumed that the same benefits would occur at community colleges. For example, a study by Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) references over 100 separate studies related to on-campus housing, but none of these studies relate to the 867 districts and 1,552 campuses of two-year community, junior and technical colleges in the United States. An overview of the literature on retention and performance impacts of on-campus housing at 4-year colleges and universities are presented below.

Living on-campus has been shown to correlate positively to improved academic performance, student persistence and higher levels of student involvement in on-campus and extracurricular activities. Student persistence and retention are a major concern for higher education institutions, both in urban and rural settings throughout the United States. Past research on this topic has indicated that the freshman year is the most critical in terms of persistence. Currently, 15 to 19 percent of each year's freshmen class is lost during or at the end of the first year. Reasons for this vary, but a lack of a strong connection to academic and social support services are believed to be strong contributors (Lowther and Langley, 2005).

Research shows that students living on-campus are more likely to complete their degree programs and graduate than students living off-campus. According to the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, living in on-campus housing during a student's first year increases their chance of finishing college by 12 percent. Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) found strong support for the idea that living in on-campus housing increases persistence and degree attainment, even when differing levels of academic ability are taken into account. Therefore, students defined as high risk, meaning they have lower academic credentials, may benefit from living in on-campus housing. Thompson, et al. (1993) also found that retention is significantly higher for on-campus students regardless of race or gender. This study showed that dormitory residents were more likely than commuters to obtain a degree, report higher levels of social interaction, have higher levels of self-confidence, and have a higher level of satisfaction with their college experience.

In a study of adjustment problems of freshmen attending community colleges without on-campus student housing, Catt (1998) found that students who attend distant community colleges that do not offer on-campus housing have less academic success than those living in on-campus housing at community colleges. Unlike the commuter student, a student who resides in on-campus housing can participate easily in campus activities and clubs.

In addition, when student leaders live on-campus, they are more available to members of their organizations, faculty sponsors, administrators, and other interested parties. Catt (1998) found obstacles to student success and retention such as loneliness, housing problems and an inability to bond with the community to be threats to student success in community college.

Shapiro and Levine (1999) found a higher rate of retention among students living in residence halls and these students were more likely to report satisfaction with their first-year experience, more likely to contact professors, more likely to act in leadership capacities, and less likely to suffer declines in academic self-esteem compared to those living off-campus. Harvard statistician Richard J. Light has spent more than ten years studying the college student experience. In *Making the Most of College* (2001), he says that first-year students who struggle academically are frequently isolated, both socially and academically. Other researchers concur that a connection between a sense of belonging and student success and retention is clear.

## **Adjustment to College Life**

Previous studies have suggested that relationships and making meaningful connections are important for students to adjust to the college environment. Students who have been able to establish bonds in their new environment adjusted better than students who were isolated and not as successful at establishing new friendships (Enochs, 2006). Students living in on-campus housing, compared to those living off-campus reported a higher level of involvement in campus life and more friendships on campus (Barthelemy & Fine, 1995).

Living on-campus appears to be a major factor in a student's overall adjustment. Those living in on-campus housing were involved in more campus activities and clubs, and felt as though they were part of the college community more so than students living off-campus. On-campus housing environments have been likened to families, in terms of rules, boundaries and an atmosphere of care and concern for other members. The sense of community that a residence hall has is similar to a family unit, with students developing care and concern for other students.

The social climate has also been deemed important in assisting students with adjustment to college. In their study of 121 undergraduate students living in residence halls, Barthelemy and Fine (1995) found that social support was significantly related to adjustment to college life. Students who felt that they had a high level of support from members of the campus community had significantly higher levels of adjustment than students who felt that they did not have the support of others. The climate of social support, supervisions and order often seen in on-campus living can influence a student's positive adjustment to college. Residence halls can provide students with an environment in which they can grow personally. Environment is a very important factor in assisting college students to appropriately develop and adjust to college.

## **Conclusion**

It is evident that on-campus student housing is important, not only to 4-year college campuses, but also to community colleges as well. The research clearly shows that students who live in on-campus housing as a general rule perform at a higher level academically than their counterparts who live off-campus. National surveys indicate that students who live in on-campus housing maintain higher grade point averages and this tends to be true, even when differing levels of academic ability are taken into account. In addition, students who live on-campus tend to be more satisfied with their college experience.

In particular, on-campus housing plays an important role at America's rural-serving community college districts. Rural-serving community college campuses that provide housing can offer convenience and potential savings to those students living on-campus. With high gasoline prices, many rural-serving community college students may realize cost savings by living in on-campus housing. In addition, colleges may potentially increase revenues that can improve the quantity and quality of services for on-campus and commuting students.

On-campus student housing at rural community campuses provides rural students outside of commuting distance with the opportunity to access post-secondary education and increases their chances for success in college. Student housing can enhance diversity on campus by opening up the opportunity for students who live a long distance away from campus to attend. On-campus housing at rural community colleges benefits rural and Native students in particular, for whom the transition from village life to a big city and urban campus can be overwhelming. On-campus housing allows students to have a true college experience involving social as well as academic experiences. By extending to students an opportunity to live away from home while attending college, the institutions are able to recruit, retain and offer an enhanced educational experience.

On-campus student housing also provides an additional source of revenue for colleges, with rural colleges reporting a mean income of \$256,904 annually from the operation of on-campus housing. In addition to producing revenue from room charges, on-campus housing also increases enrollment. It follows that with increased enrollment of full-time students, colleges will receive more state reimbursement funding to finance its operations.

# Executive Interview Findings

---

Executive interviews were conducted with UA and school district officials, high school principals and other community members, to assess their opinions on the impact of student housing on student recruitment, retention and performance, particularly concerning students of rural origin. A total of 17 interviews were completed. A list of interviewees is found in Appendix B.

## **Substantial Need for On-Campus Student Housing**

Interviewees believe that on-campus student housing at rural college campuses in Alaska is absolutely necessary, emphasizing that there is already a high demand for more student housing in Alaska. “Many of the universities with housing in Alaska are filled to capacity and have waiting lists,” stated one interviewee. The majority of interviewees strongly believe that the availability of student housing at a rural campus influences a rural student’s decision to attend college, noting that many rural students are unlikely to attend an urban campus. As one interviewee said, “Many rural students are unlikely to pursue post-secondary education at an urban campus. With the availability of on-campus student housing at rural colleges, more options would be open to rural students.”

A majority of interviewees believe that the availability of housing not only influences prospective students’ decisions regarding choice of college, it may dictate whether or not they pursue post-secondary education at all. “There’s no question. Without housing, in many cases it is impossible for rural students to attend college.” Another interviewee commented that, “without on-campus housing at rural colleges, it becomes too challenging or impossible for many rural students to attend and they never pursue post-secondary education even though they may want to because the opportunity just isn’t there.” Many interviewees pointed out that students experience a significant adjustment period when they leave home to attend college for the first time and the transition to a large urban campus is often too challenging for rural students. As an interviewee stated, “The transition to an urban campus can be difficult and often rural students do not succeed in this setting. Without the option to attend college in a rural setting, in most cases they won’t pursue post-secondary education.”

Several interviewees specifically pointed out the need for family housing at rural colleges, in addition to traditional dormitory housing for younger students. To illustrate, one interviewee pointed out, “Students aged 18 to 22 should not be the only age group considered when planning on-campus housing. Many students over age 25 are also interested in attending college and many of those students have families.”

## **Student Housing Eases the Transition to College**

Overall, interviewees believe that on-campus housing creates a sense of community and belonging for students and increases access to student services. Interviewees pointed out that living on-campus allows for “built-in social support”, and increases the opportunity to become involved in campus activities, sports, and clubs. “Student housing is a definite asset for students, particularly those who are leaving home for the first time. It provides a sense of community, convenient access to student services and increased opportunity for social activities with peers,” said an interviewee. Many interviewees also believe that students living on-campus develop a stronger connection with their classmates and to the campus in general, which results in a stronger sense of belonging than those living off-campus. All interviewees agreed that student housing helps to ease the transition to college, and in the case of rural community colleges, student housing opens up the opportunity for prospective students who are not willing to leave rural Alaska to attend college.

## **Student Housing Offers Convenience**

Interviewees pointed out that housing close to campus is often not affordable for students, which can result in the need for students to work part-time in order to afford off-campus housing. An interviewee elaborated, “It is not feasible for students to work part-time in order to afford rent because this takes time away from their studies and can impact their grades.” Many interviewees emphasized that renting apartments or other housing off-campus is significantly more expensive than on-campus housing. “Rental rates for off-campus housing are more expensive and utility costs are rising.”

Interviewees also pointed out that off-campus housing close to college campuses is often scarce; for instance, an interviewee stated “On-campus housing provides convenience for students in rural areas where lodging is hard to come by.” Many also pointed out that living off-campus, particularly in rural areas where there is no public transport, results in the need for personal transportation, which may not be affordable, especially with high gas prices. Another interviewee stated, “Many students live off the road system, and therefore have no way to commute to college. Others live on the road system, within commuting distance, but not all students have transportation; even if they do, gas prices are high and often the commute is a significant distance.”

Interviewees pointed out that on-campus housing eliminates the difficult process of finding off-campus housing and eliminates the need for transportation. For example, one interviewee explained, “On-campus housing allows for the process to be completed before the student arrives and transportation is not an issue; everything they need is within walking distance.” On-campus housing also provides convenience in terms of proximity to student services and resources. As another interviewee put it, “Students are more likely to attend campus events and use student services if they can access them easily.”

## **Student Housing Leads to Increased Enrollment**

Many interviewees believe that student housing would benefit KPC in terms of increased enrollment and retention, and it would also be a source of revenue for the college. The idea is that student housing would lead to increased enrollment at KPC because it would open up the opportunity for prospective students outside of commuting distance to attend the college. The statement, “Those students who live outside commuting distance of KPC and are not willing to attend a large urban campus, would have the option of attending KPC if housing were provided. I expect enrollment would increase significantly,” was a sentiment shared by other interviewees.

Many interviewees stated that housing at KPC could bring potential students in from other parts of Alaska, who are hesitant to attend urban universities. For example, one interviewee stated, “Housing at KPC would likely help to retain local students as well as increase the ability to attract rural students from other regions to a campus situation that is conducive to their success.”

Additionally, a number of interviewees commented that the access to specialized programs offered at KPC provides an added incentive for rural students to attend. As noted by one interviewee, “Specialized programs offered at KPC, such as welding programs, cannot be found at many other campuses in Alaska and this increases KPC’s appeal to rural students.”

## **Student Housing Impacts Retention and Performance**

Many interviewees believe that on-campus housing has a positive impact on retention and performance. One stated, “When students become actively engaged in the campus community and lifestyle, they are more likely to persist and complete their programs.” Many interviewees commented that living on-campus increases the likelihood that students will seek out student services and assistance with their studies from professors and other students. “Living on campus allows for easy access to student services, campus activities, professors and tutoring, and also saves time that would be spent commuting,” stated an interviewee. Another pointed out that living on-campus increases the opportunity to learn from other students and participate in study groups; “Involvement in study groups can result in a feeling of obligation and accountability to the other students.” Many interviewees said that student housing offers a setting that is less distracting, allowing students to focus on their studies, as well as providing access to a support network and student services.

A number of interviewees feel that on-campus housing would be particularly beneficial to rural students leaving home for the first time. As one interviewee pointed out, “The structure and social support that is created through on-campus housing increases a student’s chance of success. Rural students leaving home for the first time would benefit from the strong structure that would be provided by on-campus housing. It is the only way many of them will succeed. They need to be around role models and a support system to be successful.”

A majority of those interviewed believe that students living in on-campus housing tend to be more focused on their studies and are less likely to get distracted. However, several pointed out that in order for housing to be beneficial to the student, it needs to be the right kind of housing. An interviewee explained, “The availability of on-campus family housing is key for many rural students. Students need a stable, safe place to live in order to focus on their studies. This is the most important factor, whether they live on-campus or off-campus.” Additionally, many pointed out that on-campus housing is only one of many factors that contribute to retention and performance and “many other factors are involved in determining a student’s success.”

## **Student Housing Enhances the College Experience**

Overall, interviewees believe that living in on-campus housing has the potential to enhance the college experience for students, assuming that it is a safe and stable environment. Many stated that students living on-campus tend to have a stronger sense of belonging within the campus community. One example given was, “Students [living on-campus] are part of a community and engaged in a dynamic, social, and academic lifestyle that they would not have the same access to if they lived off-campus.” They are often more engaged in campus activities, develop closer relationships with their peers and often have a stronger support network than those students living off-campus. “Living on-campus increases the likelihood that students will form lasting friendships and get involved in campus activities and clubs,” explained one interviewee.

Again, several of those interviewed pointed out that on-campus housing needs to be the right kind of housing in order to enhance the college experience for students. One pointed out, “Students over 25 will not benefit from a traditional dorm setting with younger students. Therefore, other housing options need to be available for older students and students with families.”

## **Property Managers’ Perspectives**

Staff interviewed from property management companies in the Kenai area reported that they receive “quite a few” calls from students looking for rental properties near KPC. As one property manager stated, “We get quite a few calls from students but we do not keep track so it is hard to say how many we get; I would say there is a relatively high demand for student housing in the area.” Property managers also reported that there are “a few rentals near the college”, including apartments, duplexes and 4-plexes but they believe overall there is a shortage of student housing near KPC. According to those interviewed, one-bedroom apartments generally cost \$580 per month and duplexes, and 4-plexes cost \$700 and up. None expressed concerns about renting to students.

# KPC Housing Demand Survey Findings

---

A survey was conducted with 76 randomly selected households with high school age children in the three rural communities of Dillingham, Kotzebue and Nome (results are presented in the following tables under the “rural” column). The same survey was also conducted with 128 randomly-selected households with high school-age children in select Kenai Peninsula Borough communities, including Kenai, North Kenai, Homer, Sterling, Soldotna, Nikiski, Anchor Point, Kasilof, and Ninilchik (results are presented in the following tables under the “KPB” column).

The purpose of the survey was to assess awareness of KPC and the potential interest in attending the college if on-campus student housing were available. The survey gathered information on:

- Household opinions regarding the importance of high school-age children in the household attending college;
- The number of children in each household who are considering attending college in the next five years;
- Reasons for considering colleges in or outside of Alaska;
- Factors affecting decisions regarding college choice;
- Knowledge of Kenai Peninsula College;
- Interest in attending Kenai Peninsula College;
- Effect of housing on KPC demand, and
- Respondent demographics (e.g., gender, age, etc.).

In this section, survey results from rural communities and KPB communities are presented side-by-side for easy reading; however, caution should be used when interpreting these results because the two sample groups (rural communities and KPB communities) are not statistically comparable.



## Importance of Attending College

- While nearly all of those surveyed feel that it is important for the children in their household to attend college, 73 percent of households in KPB feel that it is very important, compared to 61 percent of households in selected rural communities who feel that it is very important.

*How important do you think it is for the children in your household to attend college after high school? Is it...*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Very important	73%	61%
Important	25	36
Not important	2	3
Not at all important	1	--

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

## Interest in Attending College

- There is a similar level of interest in attending college among households in KPB and in rural communities. Three out of four KPB and rural households report that at least one child in their household is considering attending college in the next five years (78 and 76 percent respectively).
- One out of five KPB and rural households say that two children in their household are considering attending college in the next five years (20 and 21 percent respectively).

*How many children in your household are considering attending college in the next five years?*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
One	78%	76%
Two	20	21
Three	2	3

## College Choice Factors

Households were asked about the importance of a number of factors that affect their decisions regarding choice of college.

### COST OF TUITION

- Three-quarters of KPB and rural households report that the cost of tuition is a major factor to consider when deciding which college to attend (73 and 75 percent respectively).

Choice Factor: Cost of Tuition

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Major factor	73%	75%
Minor factor	20	21
Not a factor	6	1
Don't know	1	3

### QUALITY OF EDUCATION

- The vast majority of both KPB and rural households say that the quality of education is a major factor to consider when deciding which college to attend (93 and 89 percent respectively).

Choice Factor: Quality of Education

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Major factor	93%	89%
Minor factor	5	8
Not a factor	2	1
Don't know	--	1

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

## PROGRAMS OFFERED

- Nearly nine out of ten KPB households (88 percent) and approximately seven out of ten rural households (72 percent) report that programs offered at a college is a major factor to consider when deciding which college to attend. One-quarter of rural households (25 percent) feel that programs offered are a minor factor, compared to one-tenth of KPB households (10 percent).

**Choice Factor: Programs Offered**

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Major factor	88%	72%
Minor factor	10	25
Not a factor	1	-
Don't know	1	3

## AVAILABILITY OF FINANCIAL AID

- Little difference exists between households in KPB and households in rural Alaska when looking at the importance of financial aid in deciding which college to attend. Seven out of ten KPB and rural households reported that the availability of financial aid is a major factor to consider when deciding which college to attend (72 and 74 percent respectively).

**Choice Factor: Programs Offered**

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Major factor	72%	74%
Minor factor	20	21
Not a factor	7	4
Don't know	1	1

## SMALL SCHOOL SIZE

- When considering which college to attend, approximately three out of five KPB households (60 percent) report that a small student population is a minor factor and one out of five (21 percent) say that it is a major factor. Another 17 percent of KPB households say it is not a factor in their decision process.
- Similarly, 57 percent of rural households report that a small student population is a minor factor and 18 percent say that it is a major factor. Approximately one out of five rural households (22 percent) believes that a small student population is not a factor to consider.

Choice Factor: Small School Size

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Major factor	21%	18%
Minor factor	60	57
Not a factor	17	22
Don't know	2	3

## SCHOOL LOCATED IN SMALL COMMUNITY

- Approximately one out of ten KPB households (13 percent) and one out of five rural households (22 percent) report that location of the school in a small community is a major factor to consider.
- Approximately three out of five KPB households (58 percent) and just under half of rural households (49 percent) report that location of the school in a small community is a minor factor to consider when deciding which college to attend. Another 26 percent of KPB households and 28 percent of rural households say it is not a factor in their consideration.

Choice Factor: School Located in Small Community

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Major factor	13%	22%
Minor factor	58	49
Not a factor	26	28
Don't know	3	1

## COST OF TRANSPORTATION

- Cost of transportation to and from school is a major factor to consider when deciding which college to attend for 35 percent of KPB households and half (50 percent) of rural households.

### Choice Factor: Cost of Transportation

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Major factor	35%	50%
Minor factor	45	39
Not a factor	19	11
Don't know	1	-

## AVAILABILITY OF ON-CAMPUS HOUSING

- When deciding which college to attend, the availability of on-campus housing is a major consideration for just over one-half of KPB households (52 percent) and approximately three-fourths of rural households (76 percent).
- Only 6 percent of KPB households and 3 percent of rural households believe that on-campus housing is not a factor.

### Choice Factor: Availability of On-Campus Housing

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Major factor	52%	76%
Minor factor	37	18
Not a factor	6	3
Don't know	5	3

## Importance of Affordable On-Campus Housing

- Almost all rural households (95 percent) feel that affordable, on-campus housing is either important or very important in terms of making a decision about which college to attend. Eight out of ten KPB households (82 percent) feel that it is either important or very important.

*When your family makes decisions about which college family members might attend, how important is the availability of affordable, on-campus housing in your decision? Is it...*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Very important	43%	46%
Important	39	49
Not important	14	1
Not at all important	3	3
Don't know	1	1

## Agreement with Statements about On-Campus Housing

Respondents were read a series of statements concerning on-campus housing and asked for their level of agreement or disagreement with these statements.

### RETENTION

- Nearly six out of ten KPB households (59 percent) either agree or strongly agree with the statement that students who live in on-campus housing are more likely to stay in school, with 17 percent stating that they strongly agree.
- Just over four-fifths of rural households (84 percent) either agree or strongly with this statement, with one third (33 percent) stating that they strongly agree.
- Nearly three out of ten KPB households (28 percent) either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement. Only 9 percent of rural households disagree with this statement.

**Level of Agreement with Statement:**  
*Students who live in on-campus housing are more likely to stay in school.*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Strongly agree	17%	33%
Agree	42	51
Disagree	26	9
Strongly disagree	2	--
Don't know	13	7

## AFFORDABILITY OF HOUSING

- One-half of KPB households (50 percent) either agree or strongly agree with the statement that living in on-campus housing is more affordable than living off-campus, with 16 percent stating that they strongly agree.
- A higher percentage of rural households (63 percent) either agree or strongly agree with this statement, with 21 percent stating that they strongly agree.
- One out of four KPB households (25 percent) either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement, and one out of five rural households either disagree or strongly disagree.

### Level of Agreement with Statement:

*Living in on-campus housing is more affordable than living off-campus.*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Strongly agree	16%	21%
Agree	34	42
Disagree	23	17
Strongly disagree	2	1
Don't know	25	18

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

## COLLEGE EXPERIENCE

- Three out of four KPB households (75 percent) either agree or strongly agree that living in on-campus housing enhances the college experience for students. The vast majority of rural households (93 percent) either agrees or strongly agrees with this statement. Approximately one one-quarter of KPB households (24 percent) strongly agree, compared to 34 percent of rural households.
- Nearly one out of five KPB households (18 percent) either disagree or strongly disagree that living on-campus housing enhance the college experience. Only 3 percent of rural households disagree with this statement.

### Level of Agreement with Statement:

*Living in on-campus housing enhances the college experience for students.*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Strongly agree	24%	34%
Agree	51	59
Disagree	16	3
Strongly disagree	2	--
Don't know	8	4

## RECRUITMENT

- The vast majority of KPB and rural households either agree or strongly agree that a college can attract more students if it has on-campus housing (93 and 90 percent respectively). Nearly one-quarter of KPB households (24 percent) and approximately one-third of rural households (32 percent) strongly agree with this statement.

**Level of Agreement with Statement:**  
*A college can attract more students if it has on-campus housing.*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Strongly agree	24%	32%
Agree	69	58
Disagree	4	4
Strongly disagree	1	--
Don't know	2	7

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

## ENHANCING STUDENT PERFORMANCE

- Eight out of ten rural households (79 percent) either agree or strongly agree that living on campus enhances student performance at school, with 20 percent stating that they strongly agree.
- Only one-half of KPB households (49 percent) either agree or strongly agree with this statement, with 14 percent stating that they strongly agree.
- Just over one third of KPB households (36 percent) either disagree or strongly disagree that living in on-campus housing enhances student performance. Only 12 percent of rural households disagree with this statement.

**Level of Agreement with Statement:**  
*Living in on-campus housing enhances student performance in school.*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Strongly agree	14%	20%
Agree	35	59
Disagree	34	12
Strongly disagree	2	--
Don't know	15	9



## TRANSITION TO COLLEGE LIFE

- Three out of four KPB households (75 percent) either agree or strongly agree that students from small communities are better able to transition from home life to college life if they live on campus, with 17 percent stating that they strongly agree.
- Nine out of ten rural households (89 percent) either agree or strongly agree, with 34 percent stating that they strongly agree.
- Nearly one out of five KPB households (17 percent) either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement, and only four percent of rural households disagree.

**Level of Agreement with Statement:**  
*Students from small communities are better able to transition from home life to college life if they live in on-campus housing.*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Strongly agree	17%	34%
Agree	58	55
Disagree	16	4
Strongly disagree	1	--
Don't know	8	7

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE

- One-half of KPB households (50 percent) either agree or strongly agree that students from small communities have better academic performance when they attend small college campuses, compared to nearly three-fourths of rural households (72 percent). Additionally, 26 percent of rural households strongly agree, compared to only 13 percent of KPB households.
- One out of four KPB households (27 percent) either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement, compared to 14 percent of rural households.

**Level of Agreement with Statement:**  
*Students from small communities have better academic performance when they attend small college campuses.*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Strongly agree	13%	26%
Agree	37	46
Disagree	25	13
Strongly disagree	2	1
Don't know	23	13

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

## Interest in Attending Colleges in Alaska

- Approximately three out of five KPB and rural households report that the high school-age children living in their household are considering attending college in Alaska (57 and 59 percent respectively).
- Approximately a quarter of KPB households (27 percent) and 16 percent of rural households report that the high school age children living in their household are not considering attending college in Alaska.

*Are any of the high school-age children living in your household considering attending a college in Alaska?*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Yes	57%	59%
Maybe	9	14
No	27	16
Don't know	6	11

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

## Alaska Colleges Considered

- Of those households with high school-age children considering college in Alaska, approximately two out of five KPB households report that they are considering the University of Alaska Fairbanks and the University of Alaska Anchorage (36 and 39 percent respectively). One third of KPB households (33 percent) report that they are considering KPC.
- Three out of five rural households (61 percent) report that they are considering attending the University of Alaska Fairbanks and almost half of rural households (46 percent) report that they are considering attending the University of Alaska Anchorage. None of the rural households report that they are considering KPC.

### *Which Alaska colleges are they considering?*

Base: Those considering an Alaska college (multiple responses accepted)

Campus Location	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
<b>University of Alaska Fairbanks</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>61%</b>
Fairbanks Campus	36	57
Bristol Bay Campus	--	5
<b>University of Alaska Anchorage</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>46%</b>
Anchorage Campus	39	46
<b>Kenai Peninsula College</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>--%</b>
Kenai River Campus – Soldotna	32	--
Katchemak Bay Campus – Homer	2	1
<b>University of Alaska Southeast</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>
Juneau Campus	1	2
<b>Non-University of Alaska Schools</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>
Alaska Pacific University	1	--
Other	4	4
Don't know	13%	14%

## Why Alaska Colleges Are Considered

- For those households with high school-age children considering college in Alaska, attending college close to home is the reason most commonly mentioned among KPB households (56 percent) and rural households (61 percent).
- Lower cost is the next most often mentioned reason, reported by 29 percent of KPB households and 21 percent of rural households.
- Programs and courses offered at respective colleges in Alaska are reported by roughly one out of five KPB and rural households (21 and 23 percent respectively).

### *Can you tell me the main reasons they are considering attending a college in Alaska?*

Base: Those considering an Alaska college (multiple responses accepted)

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Close to home	56%	61%
Lower cost	29	21
Offered courses/programs/needed/ wanted	21	23
UA scholar financial aid/saving plan	13	5
Want to attend school with family/friends	7	4
Good quality of education	5	4
Close to home but has campus housing	--	5
Assistance for AK Native	1	4
Small campus	2	--
Distance courses	--	2
Other	1	2
Don't know	5	2

## Why Alaska Colleges Are Not Considered

- Of the households with high school age children not considering college in Alaska, 37 percent of KPB households and 25 percent of rural households state the main reason is that their preferred programs and classes are not offered by the Alaska colleges.
- The desire to attend a school in a large community is the main reason mentioned by one out of five rural households (20 percent) and one out of eleven KPB households (nine percent).
- Desire to leave the state is the main reason for considering non-Alaska colleges by 14 percent KPB households and 10 percent of rural households.

### *Can you tell me the main reasons they are not considering attending a college in Alaska?*

Base: Those not considering an Alaska college (multiple responses accepted)

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Program/class preference not offered	37%	25%
Personal reasons	28	10
Want to leave the state	14	10
Family preference	12	--
Want to attend a school in a large community	9	20
Scholarship	7	--
Want to attend a large school	5	5
Quality of education is better	2	10
Other	12	10
Don't know	9	20

## Familiarity with Kenai Peninsula College

- Most KPB households (88 percent) are familiar with KPC, compared to only 20 percent of rural households.
- Those KPB households with members having at least some college education are significantly more likely to report that they are familiar with KPC (93 percent), compared to those KPB households with a high school diploma or less education (77 percent).

### *Are you familiar with the University of Alaska's Kenai Peninsula College?*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Yes	88%	20%
No	13	80

## Impact of On-Campus Housing Availability on Interest in Attending KPC

- One-half of KPB households (48 percent) state that students in their household would be very interested or somewhat interested in attending KPC's Kenai River Campus if student housing were available compared to 62 percent of rural households.
- Just under one-half of KPB households (47 percent) stated that students in their household would not be interested, compared to only one out of five rural households (21 percent).

### *If on-campus housing were available, how interested would students in your household be in attending the Kenai River Campus?*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
Very interested	21%	16%
Somewhat interested	27	46
Not interested	47	21
Don't know	5	17

## Household Respondent Demographics

Demographic characteristics of household respondents are found in the following tables.

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	57%	55%
Male	43	45
<b>Age</b>		
18-24	7%	5%
25-34	5	7
35-44	38	17
45-54	41	43
55-64	7	25
65+	2	3
Average age	44 years	48 years
<b>Education</b>		
Less than High School	5%	8%
High School Grad/GED	28	18
Some College	34	36
Associates Degree	9	9
Bachelor's Degree	16	16
Master's/PHD	6	13
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single/Divorced/ Separated/Widowed	27%	30%
Married	73	68
Refused	--	1
<b>Income</b>		
Less than \$15,000	2%	5%
\$15,001-\$25,000	4	3
\$25,000-\$50,000	18	16
\$50,000-\$75,000	20	18
\$75,000-\$100,000	18	21
\$100,000-\$125,000	15	9
\$125,000+	16	20
Average household income	\$82,500	\$83,800

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

*What ethnic group do you consider yourself?*

	% of Total KPB	% of Total Rural
White	87%	48%
Inupiat	--	25
Yupik	--	5
Other Alaska Native	6	21
Other	5	1
Refused	3	1

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

**Residence Location**

Kenai	% of Total
<b>Kenai Peninsula Borough Communities</b>	
Kenai and North Kenai	30%
Homer	20
Sterling	14
Soldotna	13
Nikiski	13
Anchor Point	5
Kasilof	3
Ninilchik	2
<b>Rural Communities</b>	
Dillingham	34%
Nome	33
Kotzebue	33



# KPC Student Survey Findings

---

A total of 203 KPC full- and part-time students responded to a web survey designed by McDowell Group. The purpose of the survey was to assess student opinions about the need for on-campus student housing at KPC, examine current housing status and housing availability, spending capability, desired student support services/amenities, and other related campus life issues.

Survey results provide information on:

- Enrollment status (full-time or part-time), current community of residence, home community, other college/universities attended;
- Factors involved in making the decision to attend KPC;
- Opinions regarding the need for on-campus student housing at KPC;
- Amount of monthly rent currently paid by respondents;
- Satisfaction level with current housing arrangement;
- The extent to which finding housing has been easy or difficult;
- Student interest in living in on-campus housing if it were provided;
- Price sensitivity of various on one- or two-bedroom dormitory rooms; and,
- The extent to which the availability of certain amenities would make respondents more likely to live on-campus.

## Enrollment Status

- Nearly one-half (49 percent) of student respondents attend KPC on a full-time basis and just over one-half (51 percent) attend KPC on a part-time basis.

### *Do you attend KPC full-time or part-time?*

	% of Total
Full-time	49%
Part-time	51

## KPC Campus

- The majority of respondents (74 percent) attend the Kenai River Campus. Approximately one out of six (17 percent) attend the Kachemak Bay Campus and 9 percent take online classes only.

### *Which Kenai Peninsula College campus do you attend?*

	% of Total
Kenai River Campus	74%
Kachemak Bay Campus	17
Take online classes only	9

## Current Residence

- The top three communities where KPC student respondents live include Soldotna (31 percent), Kenai (23 percent), and Homer (15 percent). Approximately one out of six student respondents (18 percent) live in other Kenai Peninsula communities, including Nikiski, Sterling, Kasilof, and Anchor Point, among others.
- Approximately one out of nine respondents (11 percent) lives in a community outside of the Kenai Peninsula, including Anchorage (8 percent), Palmer/Wasilla (2 percent), and other communities (1 percent).

### *What community do you currently live in?*

	% of Total
Soldotna	31%
Kenai	23
Homer	15
Anchorage	8
Nikiski	7
Sterling	6
Kasilof	3
Palmer/Wasilla	2
Anchor Point	1
Seward	1
Other non-KPB communities	1
Ninilchik	<1
Other KPB communities	<1

\*Due to rounding, column may not add to 100 percent.

## Home Community

- Most student respondents (75 percent) are originally from communities on the Kenai Peninsula. One-fourth (25 percent) report that their home community is Soldotna, another 17 percent are from Kenai, and 10 percent are from Homer. Just over one-fifth (22 percent) of respondents are from other Kenai Peninsula communities, including Nikiski, Sterling, Kasilof, Anchor Point, and others.
- Sixteen percent of respondents are from Alaska communities outside of the Kenai Peninsula, including Anchorage (9 percent), Mat-Su communities (3 percent), and other Alaska communities (4 percent).
- Approximately one out of eleven respondents (9 percent) report that they are from outside of Alaska.

### *Before enrolling at KPC, what was your home community?*

	% of Total
<b>Kenai Peninsula</b>	<b>75%</b>
Soldotna	25
Kenai	17
Homer	10
Nikiski	7
Sterling	7
Kasilof	3
Anchor Point	1
Seward	1
Fritz Creek	<1
Ninilchik	<1
Other Kenai Peninsula Community	2
<b>Other Alaska</b>	<b>16%</b>
Anchorage	9
Mat-Su	3
Other Alaska Community	4
<b>Outside Alaska</b>	<b>9%</b>

## Relocation to Attend KPC

- A third of KPC students (32 percent) relocated to the Kenai Peninsula to attend KPC. The remaining respondents did not need to relocate.
- Significantly more full-time student respondents relocated to attend KPC, compared to part-time student respondents (48 versus 19 percent).

*Did you relocate to the Kenai Peninsula to attend Kenai Peninsula College?*

	% of Total
Yes	32%
No	68

## Previous College Experience

- Just over one-half (51 percent) of respondents attended another college or university before enrolling at KPC.

*Before enrolling at KPC, did you attend any other college or university?*

	% of Total
Yes	51%
No	49

- Of those respondents who attended another college or university before enrolling at KPC, the majority (64 percent) attended a college or university out of state.
- Approximately two out of five (43 percent) attended an Alaska university or college.

*Was this college or university in-state or out of state?*

Base: Those who attended another college or university before enrolling at KPC (multiple responses accepted)

	% of Total
Out of state	64%
In-state	43

## PRIOR COLLEGE EXPERIENCE IN ALASKA

- Of those respondents who attended a university in Alaska, the majority (69 percent) attended the University of Alaska Anchorage. Approximately one out of five (19 percent) attended the University of Alaska Fairbanks and approximately one out of eight (12 percent) attended the University of Alaska Southeast.
- Approximately one out of five (19 percent) attended a non-University of Alaska school.

### *Which University of Alaska did you attend?*

Base: Those who attended an Alaska college or university before enrolling at KPC (multiple responses accepted)

	% of Total
<b>University of Alaska Anchorage</b>	<b>69%</b>
Anchorage Campus	55
Eagle River Campus	12
Mat-Su College	10
Prince William Sound Community College	5
Elmendorf Campus	2
Kodiak College	2
<b>University of Alaska Fairbanks</b>	<b>19%</b>
Fairbanks Campus	17
Northwest Campus	2
<b>University of Alaska Southeast</b>	<b>12%</b>
Sitka Campus	7
Juneau Campus	5
Ketchikan Campus	2

## Reasons to Attend KPC

- The top five reasons listed by respondents for choosing to attend KPC include convenient location (72 percent), low cost (44 percent), types of courses offered (36 percent), types of programs offered (33 percent), and small class size (31 percent).
- Significantly more respondents under the age of 22 report that cost was a factor in deciding to attend KPC, compared to students over 30 (62 versus 29 percent).
- More students over the age of 30 report that courses offered was a factor in deciding to attend KPC, compared to students under 22 (46 versus 26 percent).

### *Why did you choose to attend KPC?* (multiple responses accepted)

	% of Total
Convenient location	72%
Low cost	44
Courses offered	36
Programs offered	33
Small class size	31
Quality of education	25
Small student population	20
Distance courses	14
Course schedule	13
UA scholar/financial aid	12
Other	5

## Importance of Factors in Choosing KPC

This section provides greater detail on the importance of factors or reasons for why students choose Kenai Peninsula College.

- The top five major factors in deciding to attend KPC include campus location (67 percent), types of programs offered (63 percent), quality of education (59 percent), cost of tuition (52 percent), and availability of financial aid (36 percent).
- Availability of affordable housing was not a factor in the decision to attend KPC for 70 percent of respondents. However, cost of transportation to and from school was considered a minor factor by 28 percent of respondents and a major factor by 33 percent of respondents.
- A greater percentage of respondents who earn less than \$25,000 considered cost of tuition a major factor compared to those earning over \$50,000 (61 versus 40 percent).
- Significantly more respondents who relocated to attend KPC considered the availability of affordable housing to be a major factor in deciding to attend KPC compared to those who did not relocate (44 versus 3 percent).

*How much of a factor was each of the following when deciding to attend KPC.*

	Major Factor	Minor Factor	Not a Factor
Campus location	67%	17%	16%
Programs offered	63	26	11
Quality of education	59	27	14
Cost of tuition	52	23	25
Availability of financial aid	36	25	38
Cost of transportation to and from school	33	28	39
Availability of affordable housing	17	13	70

\*Due to rounding, rows may not add to 100 percent.

## Need for On-Campus Housing

- Approximately two out of five respondents (42 percent) believe that KPC needs on-campus housing on the Kenai River campus.
- Approximately one out of six (16 percent) respondents do not believe that KPC needs on-campus housing and approximately two out of five (42 percent) don't know.
- Full-time respondents are more likely to believe that KPC needs on-campus housing compared to part-time respondents (51 versus 33 percent).

### *Do you think that KPC needs on-campus housing at the Kenai River Campus?*

	% of Total
Yes	42%
No	16
Don't know	42

## Current Housing

- Nearly two out of five respondents (38 percent) rent the place where they live.
- One-third of respondents (32 percent) lives with family/friends and do not pay rent.
- Another third of respondents own their current residence (31 percent).
- Respondents over age 30 are significantly more likely to own their residence than those under age 22 (65 versus 4 percent).

### *While attending KPC, do you own or rent the place where you live?*

	% of Total
Rent	38%
Live with family/friends and do not pay rent	32
Own	31

\*Due to rounding, column may not add to 100 percent.



## Current Housing Costs

- On average, respondents pay \$696 monthly for rent. The majority (65 percent) pay \$750 or less.
- Approximately one out of eleven (9 percent) pay over \$1,000.

### *Can you estimate how much is your monthly rent?*

	% of Total
≤ \$500	27%
\$501 - \$750	38
\$751 - \$1,000	26
\$1,001 +	9
<b>Average rent</b>	<b>\$696</b>

- For most respondents (58 percent), the cost of rent does not include heat and electricity.

### *Does this amount include the cost of heat and electricity?*

	% of Total
Yes	42%
No	58

- On average, respondents pay \$145 monthly for heat and electricity. The majority (61 percent) pay \$149 or less.
- Approximately three out of ten (29 percent) pay over \$200 per month.

### *On average, how much is your monthly cost for heat and electricity?*

	% of Total
< \$100	32%
\$100 - \$149	29
\$150 – 199	11
\$200 +	29
<b>Average cost of utilities</b>	<b>\$145</b>

\*Due to rounding, column may not add to 100 percent.

## Satisfaction with Current Housing

- The majority of respondents (87 percent) report that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with their current housing arrangement, with 39 percent stating that they are very satisfied.
- Only 13 percent stated that they are not at all satisfied.
- Those respondents under the age of 22 are more likely to be very satisfied with their housing arrangement compared to respondents over the age of 30 (56 versus 17 percent).

### *How satisfied are you with your current housing arrangement?*

	% of Total
Very satisfied	39%
Satisfied	48
Not at all satisfied	13

## Housing Availability

- Nearly half of respondents (49 percent) still live in their home community and do not need to find new housing.
- A quarter of respondents (26 percent) report that it has been easy or very easy to find housing, with 6 percent stating it was very easy.
- A quarter of respondents reported that it has been difficult or very difficult to find housing, with 2 percent stating it was very difficult.

### *While attending KPC, how difficult or easy has it been for you to find housing?*

	% of Total
Very easy	6%
Easy	20
Difficult	23
Very difficult	2
I still live in my home community and didn't need to find new housing	49

## Interest in On-Campus Housing

Respondents were asked how interested they would be in living on-campus if student housing were provided.

- Nearly half of respondents report that they are interested (23 percent very interested and 24 percent somewhat interested).
- Just over one-half of respondents (53 percent) report that they are not at all interested in living in on-campus student housing.
- Focusing only on *full-time* students, 29 percent are “very interested” and 24 percent are “interested” in living on-campus.

*If on-campus housing were available at the Kenai River campus,  
how interested would be in living on-campus?*

	% of Total
Very interested	23%
Somewhat interested	24
Not at all interested	53

## PRICE SENSITIVITY FOR ON-CAMPUS HOUSING

- Student interest in on-campus housing appears significantly price sensitive.
  - Of all students (both full-time and part-time) who said that they are “very interested” or “somewhat interested” in on-campus housing, 41 percent report that they would be “very likely” to live in on-campus housing with one roommate, if housing were available for \$2,400 per person, per semester, including utilities.
  - At \$2,700 per person, per semester, including utilities, the percentage saying they are “very likely” drops to 27 percent.
  - At \$3,000 per person, per semester, including utilities, the percentage saying they are “very likely” drops even further to 16 percent.
- Of the *full time* students who were “very interested” or “somewhat interested” in on-campus housing, 30 percent said they would be “very likely” to rent at \$2,700 per semester (the medium pricing level). This indicates that 13 percent of all full-time students (including those not interested in on-campus housing) are “very likely” to rent at \$2,700 per semester. This percent is used in the demand estimate.

*How likely would you be to live in on-campus student housing, with one roommate, if housing were available for \$...per person, per semester, including utilities?*

(Base: Respondents who are “very interested” or “somewhat interested” in on-campus housing)

	\$3,000		\$2,700		\$2,400	
	All Students	Full-time Student	All Students	Full-time Student	All Students	Full-time Student
<b>Very likely</b>	<b>16%</b>	14%	<b>27%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>41%</b>	48%
Likely	43	52	37	43	26	30
Unlikely	24	20	24	16	23	11
Very unlikely	17	14	11	11	10	11

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

- Price sensitivity is also apparent in demand for on-campus housing with no roommate.
  - Of all students (both full-time and part-time) who said that they are “very interested” or “somewhat interested” in on-campus housing, 41 percent report that they would be “very likely” to live in on-campus housing with no roommate, if housing were available for \$2,600 per person, per semester, including utilities.
  - At \$2,900 per person, per semester, including utilities, the percentage saying they are “very likely” drops to 26 percent.
  - At \$3,200 per person, per semester, including utilities, the percentage saying they are “very likely” drops even further to 17 percent.
- Of the *full time* students who were “very interested” or “somewhat interested” in on-campus housing, 34 percent said they would be “very likely” to rent at \$2,900 per semester (the medium pricing level). This indicates that 15 percent of all full-time students (including those not interested in on-campus housing) are “very likely” to rent at \$2,900 per semester.

*How likely would you be to live in on-campus student housing, with no roommate, if housing were available for \$...per person, per semester, including utilities?*

(Base: Respondents who are “very interested” or “somewhat interested” in on-campus housing)

	\$3,200		\$2,900		\$2,600	
	All Students	Full-time Student	All Students	Full-time Student	All Students	Full-time Student
<b>Very likely</b>	<b>17%</b>	23%	<b>26%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>41%</b>	50%
Likely	23	27	31	30	26	20
Unlikely	36	25	23	16	19	14
Very unlikely	24	25	20	20	14	16

## On-Campus Housing Amenities

Respondents were asked if the availability of certain amenities would make them more likely to live in on-campus housing at the Kenai River Campus.

- The top three amenities that make respondents *much more likely* to live in on-campus housing include laundry facilities (54 percent), a fitness room (51 percent), and a computer/study lounge (42 percent).

*Would the availability of any of the following make you more likely to live in on-campus housing at the Kenai River campus?*

	Much More Likely	Somewhat More Likely	Not Likely
Laundry facilities	54%	13%	33%
Fitness room	51	18	31
Computer/study lounge	42	23	35
Recreational room (including TV pool table, ping pong, etc.)	40	24	36
Social lounge (including couches, chairs and tables for social gathering)	30	33	37
More on-campus student activities	27	32	41
A program to provide support for students from rural areas while they adjust to campus life	17	23	59

## Demographics

Demographic characteristics of the student respondents are found in the tables below.

### Respondent Ethnicity, Gender, Age, and Household Income

	% of Total
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
White/Caucasian	76%
Alaska Native/American Indian	8
Asian	2
Hispanic	2
Other	8
<b>Gender</b>	
Female	68%
Male	32
<b>Age</b>	
<19 years	6%
19-21 years	24
22-24 years	15
25-29 years	16
30+ years	39
Average age	30 years
<b>Household Income (2007)</b>	
Less than \$15,000	30%
\$15,001-\$25,000	14
\$25,001-\$50,000	21
\$50,001-\$75,000	11
\$75,001-\$100,000	9
\$100,001-\$125,000	7
\$125,000+	7
Average household income	\$47,900

\*Due to rounding, columns may not add to 100 percent.

**Respondent Educational Attainment, Marital Status and  
Children in the Household**

	<b>% of Total</b>
<b>Highest Level of Educational Achievement</b>	
Some College	65%
Associates Degree	18
Bachelor's Degree	12
Master's/PHD	5
<b>Marital Status</b>	
Single/Divorced/Separated/Widowed	69%
Married	31
<b>Children Under 18 years in the Household</b>	
Yes	36%
No	64

# Potential On-Campus Housing Demand Estimate

---

During the process of estimating potential demand, the study team used a relatively conservative approach in order to ensure that demand estimates were realistic and supported by research results. For example, high school students per household were adjusted to 1.00 while survey data from the relatively small samples suggested 1.25 high school students per household. In addition, only those households that said they were “very interested” were used in the estimates. While those that stated “somewhat likely” and “somewhat interested” were not used in the estimates, there is the possibility that some additional demand may come from these households.

## Estimated Demand from Household Survey Communities

In order to estimate the potential demand from the sample areas (Nome, Kotzebue and Dillingham and selected KPB communities), the study team first determined the number of current high school students enrolled in these areas. There are approximately 715 high school students in the Nome, Dillingham and Kotzebue school districts for the 2007/2008 school year. There are 1,560 enrolled for the selected KPB communities of Kenai, North Kenai, Nikiski, Soldotna, Sterling, Anchor Point, Ninilchik, and Homer.

Based on the statewide 2007/2008 high school graduation rate of 60 percent<sup>2</sup>, 429 of the rural students and 936 KPB students currently enrolled in high school are expected to graduate. Based on a University of Alaska study<sup>3</sup>, the college attendance rate for Alaska high school graduates is 48 percent.

Multiplying these ratios times the number of current students in the school districts results in an estimate of the total number of likely college-bound students. About 205 current high school students can be expected to eventually graduate from the rural communities and 450 from the selected KPB communities.

Sixteen percent of households in Nome, Kotzebue and Dillingham said they would be “very interested” in having their students attend the Kenai River campus (in the future) if on-campus housing were available. Multiplying the expected number of college bound students (205) from the rural schools by 16 percent equates to about 33 students who may be interested in attending KPC if on-campus housing were available. (This methodology assumes one high school student per household).

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/stats/>. Department of Education and Early Development.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.alaska.edu/swoir/students/enrollmgmt/studentmigration/HighSchoolGradsGoingToUA.pdf>



Twenty-one percent of households in selected KPB communities said they would be “very interested” in having their students attend the Kenai River campus (in the future) if on-campus housing were available. Using the method above, this demand equates to about 94 students from the selected KPB communities, who may be interested in attending KPC if on-campus housing were available. When combined, the total estimated potential demand from the rural areas and the selected KPB communities is approximately 127 students.

## Conversion Adjustments for Household Survey Results

Previous McDowell Group research has shown that when people are asked about their likely future actions there is often a disparity between their intentions (what they tell the surveyor) and what they may actually do in the future. In all likelihood, the number who would actually attend KPC would be significantly less than stated. In order to err on the conservative side, the study team reduced the estimated number of students from the rural communities who may attend KPC by about 50 percent (33 to 17 and from 94 to 47) for the selected KPB communities for a total estimated demand of about 64 students.

The estimated demand of 64 students is based on households with students enrolled in the hour years of high school in the surveyed communities. The survey did not attempt to determine what year each student was currently attending.

## Estimated Demand from KPC Student Survey Results

As part of the KPC student survey, students were asked how likely they would be to live in on-campus housing at difference price levels and with one or no roommate. They were told that on-campus housing would include kitchenettes and paid utilities. The first table below displays the percent of all full-time students that said they were “very likely” to live in on-campus housing at various price levels, with or without a roommate. The second table below shows an estimate of the number of potential full-time students.

**Percent of Current *Full-Time* KPC Students “Very Likely” to Live in On-Campus Housing**

	High Price	Medium Price	Low Price
<b>With a roommate</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>	<b>\$2,700</b>	<b>\$2,400</b>
Very likely	6%	13%	21%
<b>Without a roommate</b>	<b>\$3,200</b>	<b>\$2,900</b>	<b>\$2,600</b>
Very likely	10%	15%	22%

#### Number of Current *Full-Time* KPC Students “Very Likely” to Live in On-Campus Housing

	High Price	Medium Price	Low Price
<b>With a roommate</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>	<b>\$2,700</b>	<b>\$2,400</b>
	25 students	54 students	87 students
<b>Without a roommate</b>	<b>\$3,200</b>	<b>\$2,900</b>	<b>\$2,600</b>
	42 students	62 students	92 students

### Estimated Demand Adjustments for KPC Student Survey Results

To determine the number of students, the study team selected a mid-point estimate (medium price and average of “with and without a roommate”) of 58 current full-time students that would be likely to live in on-campus housing.

The study team has a higher level of confidence that current KPC full-time students and their future actions are more closely correlated with their survey responses. Therefore, a more modest conversion adjustment of -20 percent was made to the estimated demand for KPC students.

### Summary Estimate of Demand

This estimate is limited to demand supported by the research results of the three populations surveyed for this study:

1. Current full-time students
2. Households with high school students in KPB selected communities
3. Rural households with high school students in three remote communities

Readers should understand this estimate is meant only as a preliminary indication of potential demand from these specific populations, which by no means constitute the entire market for KPC student housing. The table below details study team estimates by group surveyed.

#### Summary Estimate of Potential Kenai Peninsula College Student Housing Demand

Survey Population	Percent	Number	Conversion Adjustment (-%)
Current Full-time Students (“Very likely” at medium price)	13%	58	(-20%) = 46
Selected KPB Households w/ HS Students (“Very interested” in on-campus housing)	21%	94	(-50%) = 47
Selected Rural Households w/ HS Students (“Very interested” in on-campus housing)	16%	33	(-50%) = 17
<b>Total Potential Demand</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>110</b>

Factors that will likely increase KPC student housing demand beyond the above estimates include:

- The longer-term impact of a successful KPC marketing program.
- Demand from populations not included in this analysis, including:
  - Rural Alaska students from the many remote communities not surveyed.
  - Students from un-surveyed communities in the Kenai Peninsula Borough.
  - Urban Alaska students desiring a smaller, more intimate Alaska campus experience.
  - Part-time KPC students converting to full-time students due to new housing availability.
  - Other students from Alaska and beyond attracted by KPC's academic and training specialties, such as process technology and digital arts.
- Additional demand if KPC chooses a lower price level for its on-campus housing. Student survey results show significant price elasticity.

## Appendix A: Bibliography

---

- Barthelemy, K. J. & Fine (1995). The relationship between residence hall climate and adjustment in college students. *College Student Journal*, 29, 465-475.
- Blimling, G.S. (1993). The influence of college residence halls on students. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 9, 248-307. New York: Agathon.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2005). "Basic classification technical details." Retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=798>
- Catt, S.R. (1998). Adjustment problems of freshmen attending a distant, non-residential community college (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(06), 1881A. (UMI No. AAT 9837568)
- Enochs, W. (2006). Social adjustment of college freshmen: The importance of gender and living environment. *College Student Journal*.
- Hardy, D. (2005). A two-year college typology for the 21st century: An update of the Katsinas-Lacey classification system. Dissertation, University of North Texas.
- Katsinas, S. Lacey, V. and Hardy, D. (2005). *A classification of two-year colleges in the United States*. In press.
- Katsinas, S.G., Opp & Alexander, K.F. (2003). Preserving access with excellence: Financing for rural community colleges (Rural Community College Initiative Policy Paper). Chapel Hill, NC: MDC inc. (ERIC Document No. ED478631)
- Light, R.J. (2001). Making the most of college: Students speak their minds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lowther, S. & Langley, J. (2005). First year retention: Is it housing or affiliation that matters? Presented to ALAIR Annual Conference, April 2005.
- Moeck, P.G. (2005). An analysis of on-campus housing at public rural community colleges in the United States (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(06), 2079A. (UMI No. AAT 3181058)
- Moeck, P.G., Hardy, D.E., Katsinas, S.G., Leech, J.M. (2007). On-campus housing at rural community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 31: 327-337.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2005). How college affects students: A third decade of research (vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shapiro, N.S. and Levine, J.H. (1999). Creating learning communities: A practical guide to winning support, organizing for change, and implementing programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thompson, Jane, et al. (1993) The effects of on-campus residence on first-time college students. *NASPA Journal*, 31 (1), 41-47.

## Appendix B: List of Interviewees

---

- **Amy Anderson:** Sales Associate, Choice Realty (Kenai)
- **Susan Anderson:** President/CEO, CIRI Foundation
- **Loy Bigelow:** Education Specialist, Native Student Services, University of Alaska Anchorage
- **Clay Brockel:** Founding Director of Kenai Peninsula College
- **Karen Carlson:** Associate Broker, Beluga Property Management
- **Norman Eck:** Superintendent, Northwest Arctic Borough School District
- **Laurie Evans-Dinneen:** Director, Rose Urban Rural Exchange
- **Anna-Mariah Kelly:** Administrative Specialist, Student Housing, University of Alaska Southeast
- **Kolene James:** Advisor, Native and Rural Student Center, University of Alaska Southeast
- **Eli Kramer:** Assignment Coordinator, Residence Life, University of Alaska Fairbanks
- **Norma Holmgaard:** Director of Federal Programs and K-12 Schools, Kenai Peninsula Borough School District
- **Carol Maillelle:** Assistant to the Executive Director, Bristol Bay Native Corporation Education Foundation
- **Pete Sprague:** Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly and college council member
- **Chris Washko:** Residence Life Manager, University of Alaska Southeast
- **Bill Popp:** CEO, Anchorage Economic Development Corporation
- **Deborah Mekiana Toopetlook:** Director, Rural Student Services, University of Alaska Fairbanks
- **Steve Pautz:** Principal, Seward High School