

**The University of Texas at Dallas
Advisory Commission on Residential Housing
Final Report
Executive Summary**

Introduction

On April 28, 2005 self-described alternative news weekly the *Dallas Observer* published a story critical of residential housing at The University of Texas at Dallas (UTD). The story made numerous allegations about safety, security, maintenance, and business practices within Waterview Park Apartments, the 1,238 unit campus housing facility. Some claims, particularly with regard to business practices and maintenance issues, were also reflected in comments from student leaders, the campus newspaper, and university staff. In response, outgoing President Franklyn Jenifer, with the concurrence of incoming President David Daniel, appointed an independent advisory commission to review the charges and make whatever recommendations were deemed necessary to ensure that UTD provides safe, high-quality housing at a reasonable price to the growing number of students who live on campus.

Advisory Commission Charge and Membership

The Advisory Commission on Residential Housing was charged specifically with conducting a comprehensive evaluation of Waterview, including but not limited to the physical state of the apartments, security, maintenance, contractual/financial relationships and customer/management relations. This evaluation was to culminate in a set of concrete recommendations to the university as to how best ensure that the quality of life within residential housing reflects the same standards of excellence exemplified by other aspects of the academic institution.

Professor J. Michael Coleman, Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, agreed to chair the Commission. Commission members were selected from faculty, staff, and students at the university as well as members of the local community.

Commission Approach and Activities

In order to provide appropriate attention to the complex issues identified in the charge, the Commission membership divided into three subcommittees: 1) Subcommittee on Business Practices; 2) Subcommittee on Maintenance; and 3) Subcommittee on Safety and Security. Each subcommittee was chaired by a Commission member from the community and not the university.

The Commission met monthly between May and August to operationalize the charge, set specific goals, coordinate data collection, and present preliminary proposals. Each subcommittee met numerous times to collect and review data

relevant to its individual charges and to refine the recommendations it later made to the larger Commission. The Commission and the three subcommittees based their recommendations on multiple forms of research: collection of quantitative data (including surveys, interviews with students, university staff and personnel from the company that holds the property management contract for residential housing); consultation with external consultants (who reviewed legal contracts and provided benchmarking standards for residential housing); and analysis of UTD housing policies and procedures against those of a number of peer institutions.

Categories of Issues Identified by the Commission

The Commission's review and analysis yielded a number of issues facing residential housing at UTD. Where possible, the commission tried to detail best practices addressing these concerns. These issues and the corresponding recommendations are organized into four categories: 1) mission and operational philosophy; 2) business practices; 3) safety and security; and 4) maintenance. The specific recommendations and the rationales for them begin in Section II of the report.

1. *Mission and Operational Philosophy:* The university lacks a specific mission statement that specifies its goals for residential housing and drives its operational philosophy and business plan for the apartment units. Such a statement would provide the scaffolding necessary to organize the university's efforts towards excellence in residential housing and provide benchmarks by which to judge the effectiveness of policies and procedures used to manage and monitor student residences.
2. *Business Practices:* The primary objective of the university should be to ensure that residential housing is operated to provide optimal campus housing for students and not to maximize income to the university, the property management company, or the nonprofit Utey Foundation which owns housing Phases I-IV. To accomplish this objective, the university must adopt operating standards that include benchmarks for safety, security, customer service, maintenance, leasing, and other business operations that reflect the university's housing mission. The property management company must agree to provide timely reports detailing its performance in meeting these standards and the university must conduct periodic and regular inspections to confirm that the properties are being operated in compliance with applicable law and under the terms of the agreements among the parties.
3. *Safety and Security:* The Commission judged residential housing and the campus in general to be a safe environment in comparison to other major universities and far safer than the larger community. At the same time, several recommendations were advanced to ensure that the level of safety

and security on campus was maintained. One major theme was increasing safety through improving physical facilities by providing better lighting, changes in landscaping, improvements in emergency call stations for fire and personal safety, and limiting access to residential housing during certain hours. Safety issues were also seen as a result of the limited resources of the campus police department and the many ancillary activities they were assigned to perform that reduced the time they could devote to traditional crime prevention and detection activities. A third theme supported an increase in community policing activities including crime prevention programs, personal safety classes, establishment of police storefronts in residential housing, and the establishment of a mandatory sexual assault prevention and awareness training program for all incoming first-year students.

4. *Maintenance*: Maintenance of individual apartments and common spaces is the most severe and chronic problem facing residential housing. At this point, the university has no accurate assessment of the state of maintenance, no historical record of the extent of effectiveness of previous maintenance efforts, and no systematic approach to preventive maintenance for its housing facilities. There is a compelling need for a complete maintenance audit of all residential facilities, an effective mechanism for monitoring maintenance activities, and a program to enhance customer service and satisfaction with regard to maintenance issues.

In the Wake of the Commission

UTD must create an Office of Residential Housing headed by a staff member given the responsibility and authority to coordinate the overall management of the university's obligations to student housing. This office would: manage the relationship with the Utey Foundation and the property management company; establish measurable performance standards for the operation of residential housing; review management, maintenance, and financial reports; provide procedures which allow for the identification and resolution of conflicts between students and the property management company; and advise the Office of the President on all matters related to student housing. Such an office would also require an advisory committee composed of the various stakeholders in campus housing as well as experts in commercial housing, property management, and real estate law whose function would be to assist the university in complying with its residential housing mission statement.

Section I – Commission Activities

A. Commission Structure

The Commission decided it could best fulfill its charge by dividing itself into three subcommittees:

The Subcommittee on Business Practices was chaired by Robert Shaw, President of Columbus Realty Partners, Ltd., an affiliate of The Staubach Company. Mr. Shaw's expertise in commercial real estate, including multifamily housing construction, development, and property management, was vital in organizing the activities of the group. The subcommittee gathered and reviewed an assortment of legal documents outlining the business relationships among the university, the property management company, and the nonprofit Utley Foundation which now owns Phases I-IV. The group conducted interviews with officials of the property management company and university officials, analyzed the financial history of residential housing, and ordered a legal review of all contracts to be completed by an outside attorney specializing in real estate law. This attorney also analyzed the sale of Phases I-IV to the Utley Foundation and the role of the university in the direction and operation of that organization. These reviews and interviews became the basis for the subcommittee recommendations.

The Subcommittee on Safety and Security was chaired by Bill Taylor, Chief of Campus Police and Director of Public Safety at Rice University. Chief Taylor's long history in higher education law enforcement was vital to this subcommittee's efforts. The group's focus was divided broadly into two areas. Through analysis of university crime statistics in Texas and across the nation, its members reviewed whether UTD is comparable to other colleges and universities in terms of criminal activity. A second, and larger, task was to review safety and security procedures on campus, comment on the adequacy of law enforcement personnel and their deployment, evaluate the use of security technology, and identify landscape, architectural, and infrastructure barriers that influence safety and security on campus. The subcommittee interviewed numerous students, staff, and faculty, analyzed results from the residential housing survey, reviewed various internal and external documents related to safety and security, and completed several walk-throughs of campus housing at different times of the day and night.

The Subcommittee on Maintenance was chaired by Sanjeeb Samanta, manager of World-Wide e-Learning Initiatives at Texas Instruments, an alumnus of UTD, past-president of The Student Government Association, and a former resident of campus housing. This subcommittee made extensive use of the data gathered through the residential housing survey, interviewed a large number of staff, faculty, and students, and met with officials from the property management company. The subcommittee also reviewed maintenance practices at other

universities that provide private on-campus housing, consulted with outside companies to determine industry standards for apartment maintenance, and reviewed the maintenance records of the property management company operating UTD residential housing.

B. Commission Research, Analysis, and Deliberation Process

The Commission based its review and recommendations on a wide range of activities.

Task Force Meetings and Deliberations: The Commission completed its work in three overlapping phases. The first phase, which began in June, focused on research and discovery of the pertinent information and relevant stakeholders that provided the foundation of the commission's task. A second phase, which followed in July, entailed the review and analysis of the information collected and a review of further information requirements. During August the Commission met to review and finalize the recommendations to be sent forward to President Daniel. While the full commission met only four times, the various subcommittees met many additional times as they undertook their investigative assignments and completed their reports and recommendations.

Solicited Information: The subcommittees collected information directly from various groups using several different mechanisms:

- Direct interviews with various stakeholders including students residing in campus housing, representatives of the Student Government Association, staff, faculty, and administration of the university, personnel from the property management organization, and university alumni.
- An email address that individuals used to register comments, compliments, or complaints about campus housing. The entire university community also redirected student and family comments about residential housing to the commission email address and the chairman's office.
- A residential survey that was distributed to more than 2,000 students living in campus housing during the spring 2005 semester. More than 500 students completed the survey which asked for demographic information about residents and their opinions on a range of issues related to safety, security, and maintenance in residential housing.
- Correspondence from families and students detailing specific issues related to living in campus housing.

Document Review: The Commission reviewed a wide range of documents related to campus housing that included:

- Student Government Association minutes.
- Maintenance records provided by the property management group.

- The management contract between UTD and FirstWorthing Corporation for the operation of Phases V-IX.
- The ground-lease contract between UTD and the Utley Foundation detailing the revenue to the university from apartment rentals in Phases I-IV.
- The management contract between FirstWorthing Corporation and the Utley Foundation for the operation of Phases I-IV.
- The prospectus for the Student Housing Revenue Bonds issued by the Anson Education Facilities Corporation.
- Revenue history of the ground-lease agreement between FirstWorthing Corporation and UTD.
- Revenue history of net income to UTD from leasing revenue in Phases V-IX.
- Reviewed housing documents from other U.S. campuses.
- Leasing contracts completed by students renting apartments at Waterview.
- Articles of incorporation for The Utley Foundation.
- Analysis of 2001-2003 crime rates for selected U.S. colleges and universities prepared by Dean Coleman.
- University of Texas System Police 2003 Annual Crime Report.
- Summary of the 'Jean Clery Act' prepared by Security on Campus, Inc.
- "Violent Crime on Campus" briefing paper prepared by The University of Arkansas System School Violence Resource Center.
- 2003 security audit report on Waterview Park Apartments prepared by ControlRisk, Inc., an independent security analysis company.
- Portfolio on campus police department prepared by UTD Police.

Consultation: A number of issues required external consultation with individuals or organizations that could provide specific expertise in a particular area.

- The Lincoln Property Group assisted the Commission in understanding a wide range of industry standards relating to maintenance and leasing issues in commercial multifamily housing.
- The law firm of Hughes & Luce reviewed the business contracts between the university and the property management group, and the property management group and the Utley Foundation, as well as the ground lease agreements by which the residential housing units were constructed originally.

Section II – Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Mission Statement for Residential Housing.

Rationale

The Commission proposes that the university is best served by a strong mission statement that clearly specifies the purpose of residential housing on campus and the role it plays in university life. The Commission members provide this first draft of such a statement:

“The University of Texas at Dallas offers residential facilities for students to provide a desirable, safe, secure, and economical living environment that attracts students to the campus and enhances their collegiate experience.”

All decisions and actions of the university regarding residential housing must support this primary mission. All recommendations advanced by this Commission are supportive of this mission and intended to guide the university in ensuring that our residential housing facilities will play a role in attracting the very best college students to campus.

Recommendation 2: Customer Satisfaction as Primary Goal

Rationale

Many of the problems with maintenance in residential housing seem a function of the university’s previous decision, conveyed to the property management company, that maximizing revenue was the primary goal of campus housing. This position has resulted in delayed maintenance, poor customer relations, and a sense of mistrust among students, the university and the property managers.

The primary objective for UTD should be to ensure that residential housing facilities are operated to provide optimal campus housing for its students, with maximizing income to either the Utey Foundation or the university as a secondary, not primary, objective. UTD can accomplish this objective in Phases I-IV by influencing operations and management through its capacity as landlord under the ground lease, as a party to the management agreements, and through its two members of the Utey Foundation Board of Directors. As the owner of Phases V-IX, UTD has direct control over these housing facilities.

Recommendation 3: Establish Operating Standards

Rationale

The university must set the standards for what constitutes adequate housing services to students. To this end, UTD must adopt operating standards for campus residential facilities in the areas of maintenance, safety, security, leasing, customer service, lease violations, damage deposits, and other business operations that reflect the university's housing mission. Moreover, the university must hold the property management company accountable for meeting or exceeding these standards.

Recommendation 4: Create a Performance Monitoring Program

Rationale

UTD should require the property manager to perform regular and timely inspections and deliver reports to the extent required or permitted under the agreements. The regular and timely delivery of such reports will allow UTD to monitor the operation and management of the property over time. Such reports will also provide a basis for comparison when apartment tenants raise particular issues from time to time.

The university should periodically and regularly perform inspections of the properties to confirm that the properties are being operated in compliance with applicable law and under the terms of the agreements. While the self-reporting by the property manager is helpful, on-site inspections by UTD will allow for firsthand analysis and review of issues raised by apartment tenants.

Recommendation 5: Alter Leasing Agreements with Students

- Create individual rather than group leases
- Allow short-term leases and structure leases to reflect the academic calendar
- Eliminate lease transfers between students

Rationale

Group leases place the responsibility for finding roommates on the remaining students when one or more person moves out of the unit and impose intolerable financial demands on students if they can't find new roommates quickly. Many other universities, including U.T. San Antonio, provide individual leases. The

property managing company also reports that all of its other campus properties offer individual leases. Individual leasing arrangements require that the university become more active in assisting the property management company in providing placement services for individual students.

Students should also be able to sign short-term leases so that they could live in residential housing for a single semester if they graduate midyear. Upper classmen and graduate students should be allowed to begin their leases in the middle of August, corresponding to the beginning of the academic year, instead of the beginning of August. Students who complete their academic year early in May should be able to terminate their leases at that time instead of having to pay until the end of May.

Individual and short-term leases should eliminate the need for lease transfers and the accompanying fees. The current lease transfer policy has led to substantial confusion in terms of responsibility for apartment damage and has often caused difficulties with scheduled maintenance.

Recommendation 6: Review Deposit and Standard Violation Fines

Rationale

Interviews and responses to the housing survey convey students' concerns that the property management company retains all or most damage deposits without reference to the actual condition of the unit. They complain that the level of deposit damages retained by the management company depends more on the defense prepared by the student than the actual level of damages that exist. They also argue that normal wear and tear or the expected duration of improvements like carpet and paint are not considered when damage charges are assessed. The university must work with the property managers to assure an accurate and objective method to gauge the condition of a unit at the onset and termination of a lease and an explicit set of standards for demanding the surrender of some or all of a student's damage deposit.

Students also report a substantial increase in fines for non-conformance to standards for what can be placed on an apartment balcony. UTD must take an active role in determining these standards while remaining sensitive to the fact that campus housing at a university might require different standards than non-campus housing. Students should be given a written warning prior to the imposition of a violation fine.

Recommendation 7: Improve Security Lighting

- Building mounted lighting
- Pole lighting
- Parking lot lighting
- Street lighting
- Secure control panels
- Photoelectric controls
- Lighting surveys

Rationale

The development of campus housing over a long period of time has resulted in unevenness in several security areas. This is most apparent with regard to security lighting. Newer construction incorporates many aspects of lighting security that is deficient in the older apartments.

The building mounted lighting fixtures in Phases I, II, and III should be replaced with new design fixtures similar to the ones used in Phases VIII, VIIIA, and IX. These fixtures would be more resistant to damage and would provide a better distribution of light. The fixtures in the stairwells, at the bottom of the stairs, should be placed a little higher on the wall or covered with a protective shield so they are less likely to sustain damage from persons using the stairs.

The pole lights in Phases I, II, and III courtyards and walkways should be replaced with box fixtures that distribute light more effectively over an area without causing a glare that limits visibility on the other side of the light. The current lighting fixtures are decorative in nature and not designed to enhance security.

Parking lot lights should be added throughout the parking lots for Phases I – VII of the same type and distribution as the parking lot lights in Phases VIII, VIIIA, and IX. These lights, placed at an effective interval in the parking lots, will greatly improve visibility at night making the area less attractive to car thieves and burglars and increasing the safety of those having to move through the parking lots after dark.

Overhead lights on Drives A & H, bordering the apartments, and parking lot H, near the apartments, should be repaired so that they work consistently. In some cases, these lights are not working. Some lights, while functional, appear to be using low luminescence bulbs as an energy saving measure.

Place and use locks on all control panels located in the campus housing complex. This will reduce the ability of individuals to disable lights and alarm systems, as is happening currently. It will provide consistency in the operation of

lights and alarm system and reduce the likelihood of someone being injured or killed because of a light or alarm system's failure to activate.

Install dusk-to-dawn photoelectric controls on all exterior light circuits. This will enable the lights to come on and turn off at the appropriate time of day to provide illumination without having to continuously reset time clocks. It also allows the lights to come on when there is a significant reduction of natural light during intense storms.

The Police Department should conduct weekly lighting surveys of the entire campus to include the Waterview Park Apartments. Patrol officers and security guards could provide the information that could then be compiled into a single report for distribution by the crime prevention officer. The distribution of this report should include the management of the Waterview Park Apartments, the Physical Plant Administration, the Vice President for Business Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the President of the University, and the Chief of Police. This should increase awareness of lighting deficiencies, encourage timely repairs and provide data for strategic infrastructure maintenance and planning.

Recommendation 8: Improve Emergency Notification Technology

- Emergency telephones
- Fire alarms

Rationale

Install blue light emergency telephones throughout the Waterview Park Apartment complex. The distribution recommended by the Security Audit Report conducted by ControlRisk for the property management company in June of 2003 would be a very effective installation of emergency telephones. Such emergency phones will increase student confidence in security and serve as a deterrent to potential intruders.

The fire alarms should be updated so they all report to one central monitoring station. The University Police Department should be notified immediately when a fire alarm is activated, and police officers should be dispatched to the location of the alarm. Strong consideration should be given to having in-apartment smoke detectors connected to the building alarm systems so that if they are set off, the entire building is alerted to a possible fire.

Recommendation 9: Remove Vegetation Detrimental to Security

Rationale

The landscaping in Phases I – IV has grown to the point where it provides potential hiding places for intruders and blocks the effect of security lighting. The Commission suggests that all bushes over eighteen inches high be removed from around pools, parking lots and near walkways throughout campus housing and be replaced with low-growing ornamental vegetation which is kept trimmed between twelve and eighteen inches high. Trees should be trimmed of lower branches to approximately six feet from the ground. Plants trimmed and maintained in this manner will allow clear lines of sight for persons walking through the Apartment complex and will eliminate potential hiding places. It will also allow better distribution of illumination from lights in the complex.

Recommendation 10: Limit Access to Campus Housing

Rationale

Closing the access from Waterview Parkway into the Phase II parking lots will reduce the ability of car thieves, burglars and others intent on committing a crime from easily getting into and out of the parking lot by vehicle. Many thieves like to be close to their vehicle and near a main thoroughfare for easy escape if detected. This may require the construction of a second driveway between the Phase I and Phase II parking lots. If this cannot be done on a permanent basis, strong consideration should be given to closing this driveway during nighttime hours. A gate with card-controlled access might also provide increased security with relative convenience for the driveway into Phase II from Waterview Parkway.

Recommendation 11: Increase the number of Campus Police Officers

Rationale

While the overall campus population, resident student population, and campus building square footage has increased between 32% and 41% since 1999, the university has increased the number of officers in the same time span by a single officer, or 5%. Six additional police officers would only increase staffing by 32%, but would allow minimum staffing levels to be set at three police officers per shift and provide the staffing needed to implement high-visibility presence in the housing facilities. With the increased staffing, at least one officer could be assigned specifically to the Waterview Park Apartments each evening and night shift.

Recommendation 12: Reduce Ancillary Responsibilities of Police Officers

- Building Security
- Student Escort Program

Rationale

Until the university acquires automated locking systems for the 200 doors that the police must lock and unlock each night, additional security guards should be added to the Police Department to accomplish this task. This will allow the current staff of police officers to spend more time involved in crime prevention and detection activities.

The escort services of the University Police are underutilized for a campus the size of the University of Texas at Dallas. The walking-only escorts may have some detrimental impact, both on usage and the time it ties up Police Department personnel. Conducting walking escorts in this manner ensures safety door-to-door. An alternative that would provide escorts in a more timely and efficient manner and would free up police officers for other tasks much of the time, would be the use of a student patrol supported by work study or other grant funds. The student patrol members would receive several weeks of training from the police department and carry radios and flashlights with them on patrol. They could be deployed in the evenings as two-person teams and wear a vest, shirt, or jacket identifying them as student patrol members. Consideration might be given to providing the student patrol with a gas or electric cart set up for transporting persons. This would allow more efficient escort services and still provide door-to-door safety. The radio would allow the student patrol members to report any safety hazard or suspicious activity they might observe and let them communicate with the dispatchers to coordinate escorts. The student patrol would operate out of the police department and would create increased officer/student interaction as a team. Police officers and security guards would continue to provide escorts at times when the student patrol was not available. If implemented, this program would likely generate increased usage of escorts on campus as they would be more convenient and consistently available.

Recommendation 13: Create a Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Team

Rationale

It is strongly recommended that a Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program be established in an effort to create a climate that minimizes sexual assault incidents and encourages victims to report incidents of sexual assault without fear. The implementation of a Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) would ensure that victims and individuals accused of perpetrating a sexual assault are treated consistently and in accordance with UTD policy, that victims receive sensitive and comprehensive treatment to restore health and well-being,

that members of the university administration have clearly defined roles and understand their responsibilities when responding to victims of sexual assault, and that allegations of sexual assault be thoroughly investigated and appropriate disciplinary actions administered by the university. This should include sensitivity training for members of the Sexual Assault Response Team so that re-victimization is minimized and advocates who are prepared to assist victims/survivors with crisis intervention help reduce the victims stress resulting from a sexual assault. Another function of the SART would be to conduct a mandatory sexual assault prevention and awareness training program that is presented to all incoming first- year students during the first six weeks of their first semester.

Recommendation 14: Conduct an Audit of Current Maintenance Requirements

Rationale

Improvements in residential housing maintenance must begin with an understanding of current maintenance needs. UTD should contract with an independent agency to thoroughly review every apartment in residential housing. Among other things, this baseline audit should cover carpet conditions, water leaks, walls/paint, blinds, flooring, appliances, pests (particularly roaches), mold/mildew, plumbing, climate control, security, and tenant quality of living. The results of this audit should become the basis for a thorough and systematic plan for intervention and, ultimately, a preventive maintenance program.

Recommendation 15: Reorganize Housing Maintenance Program

- Set maintenance standards
- Create cyclical maintenance schedule
- Develop maintenance evaluation system

Rationale

Interviews with students and property management personnel reveal that there is little documentation of previous maintenance activities and reports that students have been offered a choice of which maintenance needs would be addressed when multiple problems occurred. The survey of students living in campus housing demonstrates that over half the respondents are dissatisfied with how maintenance requests are submitted, how fast they are processed, the quality of maintenance services, the durability of repairs, and their ability to have personnel return when repairs are unsatisfactory.

The university must demand that the property managers establish and maintain a set of standards for maintenance of both the apartment units and common areas such as hallways, stairways, pools, laundry facilities, trash receptacles, parking

lots, and grounds. Such standards are commonplace in this industry and readily available. This includes the minimum staffing requirements for maintenance services. The industry standard of one maintenance staff member per 100 units is double the current maintenance staff at our own facility.

All UTD residential housing must be placed on a cyclic maintenance schedule. The property management company must maintain and distribute a schedule of planned and completed routine and emergency maintenance activities that meet industry standards. A uniform, objective, electronic process for the submission, fulfillment, monitoring, and management of maintenance requests should be implemented. Such a system would include an effective evaluation component based on customer satisfaction of the services provided.

The property management company must evaluate the effectiveness of all maintenance efforts and provide this information to the university on a periodic basis to serve as evidence of the quality, efficiency, and timeliness of its maintenance efforts. A complete audit trail of all maintenance requests and responses should be available to the university upon request.

Recommendation 16: Establish and Maintain an Effective Pest Control Program

Rationale

The most frequent maintenance complaint by students is that apartments are infested with insects, particularly roaches. Some students have given up on the property management company efforts and have purchased products and services themselves to control the problem. Numerous reports suggest that efforts at spot treatment do more to move the problem around than to eliminate the infestations.

The property management company must initiate programs to ensure the elimination of insect infestations within apartments. Such a program must be sufficiently comprehensive in nature and occur with adequate frequency to ensure that pest control throughout university residential housing is no longer a problem.

Recommendation 17: Create a Student Housekeeping Orientation

Rationale

The student survey indicated that well over half of the incoming residential students are living in apartments for the first time. Many have had no previous housekeeping responsibilities and require assistance in understanding the operation of household appliances and minimum standards of cleanliness required in multifamily residences.

The university should offer a basic housekeeping orientation for all students living in apartments or away from home for the first time. Information should include the operation of appliances, the use of cleaning products, minimal levels of sanitation and orderliness, and standards of conduct within an apartment community.

The university, along with the property management company, should establish and publish minimum standards for apartment cleanliness and sanitation required to maintain an apartment lease. Such requirements would be essential elements of the housekeeping orientation.