

Student Life-Off Campus Student Services Property Manager Survey Fall 2023

Purpose of Assessment

Off Campus Student Services (OCSS) supports students living off-campus in the Bryan/College Station area, including helping students understand leases and find housing. OCSS surveyed property managers in the Bryan/College Station area to learn more about their leases, their marketing timeline, and the type of housing they oversee. OCSS will use this information to inform future programs and student support.

Key Findings with Recommendations

Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research identified several key findings and developed actionable recommendations the department may take based on the results. However, OCSS staff may identify other findings using their knowledge and understanding of the community. Staff members are strongly encouraged to read all the results and qualitative comments to gain a fuller understanding of students' experiences.

- Approximately half of respondents manage apartments and a little over one-third responded that they manage houses and/or townhomes/duplexes/fourplexes. Of those who manage houses, around 40% shared that they have been impacted by the No More Than 4 ordinance.
- The majority (76%) of respondents shared that they primarily house Texas A&M University students in their properties.
- When asked what main issue they experienced while leasing to students, many responded that they have had no issues with students. However, those who have had issues shared that they have experienced unauthorized animals on the property and students not knowing their rights and responsibilities according to their leases.
 - SAPAR recommends continuing to create educational resources for students to understand their leases and the consequences if they violate their leases.
- The number one service that respondents requested from OSCC was to bring the Housing Fair back or have other creative ways for property managers to interact with students.
 - SAPAR recommends exploring bringing the Housing Fair back and/or continuing to market AggieSearch to current and prospective students so they know that it is available and how to use it.

Method and Sample

The electronic survey was created using Qualtrics®, a software program that creates web-based surveys and databases. The survey was emailed to property managers who OCSS had contact information for and through a QR code that OCSS advertised. The survey included 23 questions, of which eight were quantitative, 11 were qualitative, and four were asking for contact information.

The survey link was sent to 180 emails on November 20, 2023; however, 13 were undeliverable and one was a duplicate. Nonrespondents received up to two reminders before the survey was closed on December 14, 2023. There were 44 responses: 24 from the emails and 20 from the QR code. An accurate overall response rate cannot be determined due to using an open-access QR code.

Results

Results are reported as means, standard deviation (sd), and frequency percentages for the number of people (n) who responded to the question. For ease of reading, frequency percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent, so totals may not add up to exactly 100%. Tables are in descending mean or frequency order unless otherwise specified. Summary themes are contained in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document.

The first question asked respondents what type(s) of properties that they manage in a select-all-that-apply format. As seen in Table 1, the most common type of property managed was apartments. Respondents also had the option to write a response if they selected “other.” There were eight written responses, the most common being condos. Self-storage and commercial were also mentioned.

Property Type	Percent of Cases (n=43)
Apartments	49%
House(s)	37%
Townhomes/duplexes/fourplexes	35%
Other	19%

Table 1: Property Types

The next question asked respondents to write in how many units they managed and, if they leased by the bedroom, how many bedrooms. Of the 42 responses, there were a wide range of answers, some managing as few as one unit up to over 3,000 units. Respondents were also asked which property(ies) they managed. The 30 responses can be found in an attached document.

Next, respondents who indicated that they manage houses were asked if any of the properties that they manage were impacted by the No More Than 4 city ordinance. 16 respondents indicated that they manage houses and all 16 responded to this question. Of these responses, 56% (9 respondents) indicated no, 38% (6) indicated yes, and 6% (1) indicated unsure. If respondents indicated yes or unsure, they were asked to share how the ordinance impacted their properties. There were six respondents who shared that they could only lease properties with more than four bedrooms to four tenants, meaning that rent would have to be raised based on the property value. Another shared they had to work on new zoning, and another noted that they only leased to four students in their properties, but that their students were being ‘harassed’ by zoning officers due to number of cars in the driveway. This respondent shared that it would be helpful for OCSS to help educate students on their tenant rights as well as about the No More Than 4 ordinance.

Next, all respondents were asked which lease they used. As shown in Table 2, on the next page, the TAA lease was most frequently used. Those who selected “other” also had the option to write a response. The five written responses included attorney-prepped leases, Beal Prop Management company, corporate leases, Texas Residential Lease, and Texas self-storage associate lease.

Lease Type	Percent of Cases (n=38)
TAA Lease	45%
Texas Realtors Lease	32%
Other	21%
Corporate Lease	3%

Table 2: Lease Types

Respondents were also asked which lease addenda they use. There were 23 responses that included mold, bed bugs, pet agreement, parking, utilities, community policies, etc.

Next, respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of their residents who were students. The 38 responses ranged from 10% to 100%, but the majority shared that at least 75% of their residents were students.

Respondents were then asked which institution they believed most of their students were affiliated with. Table 3 shows that the majority of property managers believe their students are affiliated with Texas A&M University.

Institution	Percent of Cases (n=38)
Texas A&M University	71%
Both Texas A&M University and Blinn	26%
Unsure	3%
Blinn	--

Table 3: Institution Affiliation

Next, respondents were asked about their current vacancies in the properties that they manage. Of the 35 responses, 50% had minimal vacancies, 39% had no vacancies, and 11% were actively seeking residents. The respondents who responded they had minimal or no vacancies were asked what month they leased to capacity. The 31 responses varied; however, many shared that they lease to capacity in August, from May to June, and in September-October.

All respondents were asked to share what they believed the top selling points of their properties to be. The 32 responses varied, but many shared that they were close to Texas A&M's campus, had a convenient location, good customer service, and competitive amenities.

Respondents were asked when the majority of their leases started and ended. As Table 4 shows on the next page, the majority of leases run from mid-August through July. Respondents who selected "other" had the option to write responses and 10 shared that they ran as needed, starting in August through July, starting in August- September, June 1 to late May, and as needed.

Lease Timeline	Percent of Cases (n=36)
Mid-August through July	61%
Other	28%
On a rolling basis throughout the year	11%

Table 4: Leasing Timeline

Respondents were then asked when they typically began marketing to current residents and prospective residents. Table 5 shows that the most selected option to market to current residents was during September-October; however, November-December and year-round closely followed. Table 6 shows that the marketing timeline for prospective residents is very similar, however they most focus on November-December.

Marketing Timeline	Current Resident Percent of Cases (n=33)
September-October	27%
November-December	21%
Year-round	21%
January-February	18%
March or later	12%

Table 5: Current Resident Marketing

Marketing Timeline	Prospective Resident Percent of Cases (n=33)
November-December	27%
Year-round	24%
September-October	18%
January-February	18%
March or later	12%

Table 6: Prospective Resident Marketing

Respondents were asked what the primary force was behind their peak marketing timeline. The most common of the 29 responses was that they followed Texas A&M's academic calendar. Other responses included marketing as they have vacancies, competing with other properties, and word-of-mouth marketing.

Respondents were also asked to share what their average annual marketing budget was. The 21 responses varied greatly, some as little as \$0, a few in the couple of thousand-dollar range, with the highest reaching \$75,000-\$100,000.

Next, respondents were asked to share what the main issue that they have experienced with students renting their units. A couple of the 27 responses shared that they have had no issues with students, but

others shared that they have cleanliness and maintenance issues, unauthorized animals, and students not understanding their responsibilities according to their leases.

Respondents were also asked if they could have one wish-list program or service from OCSS, what they would choose. Of the 24 responses, the most common request was for a Housing Fair or some other way to market their properties directly to students. Other answers included helping students understand their rights as tenants, and helping students find gap housing during the summer between leases.

Lastly, respondents were asked if they were interested in being on an email list that OCSS staff would utilize to determine which properties have vacancies in supporting students looking for housing. Respondents who selected yes or unsure were asked to provide their contact information, which has been provided in a separate document.

Department Background

Off Campus Student Services is a branch of Student Life at Texas A&M University. According to its website, <https://studentlife.tamu.edu/ocss/>, "supports off-campus living through educational materials and AggieSearch, an online housing search tool." Their educational resources are for students and families to use to find housing, learn about community standards, and learn about leasing in Aggieland.

Project Details

Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research provides quality assessment services, resources, and assessment training for departments in the Texas A&M University Division of Student Affairs and student organizations. Services by Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research are funded, in part, by the Texas A&M University Advancement Fee. Results of this project and other assessment projects done through Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research (SAPAR) can be found at <https://sapar.tamu.edu/results/>. Additionally, anyone can follow Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research on Facebook.

To work with Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research Planning for future assessment projects, please fill out the Assessment Questionnaire at <https://sapar.tamu.edu/aqform/>.

Report Prepared for: Jaclyn Upshaw-Brown, Off Campus Student Services, Student Life
Report Prepared by: Gabrielle Tharp, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research
Report Prepared on: January 18, 2024
Survey Designed by: Gabrielle Tharp, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research
Analysis by: Dennis Trukawka, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research