

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 837

EF 002 746

By-Hewitt, Raymond G.

A Survey of Selected Student Union and Conference Facilities.

Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. Office of Institutional Studies.

Pub Date Jul 67

Note-27p.

Available from-Office of Institutional Studies, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.45

Descriptors-*Administrative Policy, *Building Design, *Campus Planning, Facility Requirements, Higher Education, Parking Areas, *Parking Facilities, Recreational Facilities, Social Organizations, *Student Unions

Results are summarized from data gathered from sample institutions of higher education, concerning the policies on alcoholic beverages served in student unions, as well as sleeping, dining and parking facilities. (FS)

**A SURVEY OF SELECTED STUDENT UNION
AND CONFERENCE FACILITIES**

**Conducted by
RAYMOND G. HEWITT
Research Assistant**

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES • UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS • JULY 1967

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES

The Office of Institutional Studies is a research service agency that conducts studies on the University and institutions of higher education in general. It also provides a library of published materials on higher education and serves as a clearinghouse of information on the University's growth and development.

Additional copies of this publication may be obtained by contacting the Office of Institutional Studies, 545-2141.

A SURVEY OF SELECTED STUDENT UNION
AND CONFERENCE FACILITIES

Conducted by
Raymond G. Hewitt
Research Assistant

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Office of Institutional Studies / University of Massachusetts / July 1967

PREFACE

This report summarizes the results obtained from two recent questionnaires distributed by the Office of Institutional Studies. Specifically, data were gathered concerning the policies presently governing the use of alcoholic beverages in student unions and conference centers at a sample of institutions of higher learning. General statistical data and information concerning the availability of parking at conference centers were also gathered.

While the few institutions considered here cannot be considered a statistically reliable sample of all the schools in the country, the trends that appear are noteworthy. It seems that these trends could be especially interesting to administrators considering possible policy changes in these areas. This data could also be of particular use to those presently planning the construction of some general purpose structure such as a student union or conference center.

Raymond G. Hewitt
Research Assistant

June 9, 1967
Amherst, Massachusetts

CONTENTS

PREFACE	i
PURPOSE	ii
METHODOLOGY	1
STUDENT UNION FACILITIES	2
Summary of Responses	3
Responses	3
CONFERENCE FACILITIES	7
Summary of Responses	8
Alcoholic Beverages	9
General Statistics	11
Parking	16
CONCLUSIONS	16
APPENDIX	
A. Student Union Facilities Questionnaire	
B. Conference Facilities Questionnaire	

Purpose

The University of Massachusetts will begin construction of its new Campus Center within the coming summer months. Designed as an addition to the Student Union, this twelve-story complex will maintain facilities for an Adult Continuing Education program and the University's conference program.

This survey was conducted in order to gather data which would be helpful in planning the facilities to be included in the building. Specifically, data were gathered concerning policies on alcoholic beverages, sleeping and dining facilities and parking facilities.

Methodology

Since this center will serve a variety of purposes and a diverse population, it was felt that one questionnaire would be inappropriate and inadequate for collecting data. Two questionnaires were, then, constructed, a Student Union Facilities Questionnaire (see Appendix A) and a Conference Facilities Questionnaire (see Appendix B). The former was sent to the Student Union Directors of 51 institutions of higher education, the latter to the Conference Coordinators at 26 conference centers, 5 privately owned and 21 affiliated with an institution of higher education.

The Student Union Facilities Questionnaire was designed primarily to assess current policies regarding alcoholic beverages. In particular, data were gathered concerning the basis of and the success of the various policies currently in effect in schools across the nation.

The Conference Facilities Questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section deals with the sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages in conference facilities. The second simply requested general statistical data on the facilities, e.g., the number of beds available for conferences. The third section is primarily concerned with parking facilities and their accessibility to the conference center.

Student Union Facilities

Before discussing the responses to this questionnaire, it should be pointed out that two of the questions used were not clearly stated.

Question #1: Does legislation exist (e.g., state, county, city, university, etc.) which limits or prohibits the sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages on your campus?

Question #3: Has the serving of alcoholic beverages resulted in any controversy on your campus?

In question #1, legislation regarding age and/or licensing restrictions¹ was not meant to be included in this question. The type of legislation of particular interest was that prohibiting alcoholic beverages on state property or state-supported educational facilities, etc. Thus, if the only legislation indicated in a response dealt with age or licensing restrictions the response was interpreted as a "no" since these are general restrictions in most states.

Similarly, question #3 was meant to include any controversy as a result of either the presence or absence of alcoholic beverages. As a result of the badly chosen wording of this question, however, many respondents either left this question blank or indicated "not applicable" since alcoholic beverages were not served.

It should also be pointed out that although many indicated a university ruling to be a restriction to the use of alcoholic beverages, this may be in conjunction with a general state law, such as no alcoholic beverages allowed on state property. Hence, while many respondents mentioned only a university restriction, there may, in some cases, be an unstated state law that restricts alcoholic beverages as well. Keeping these facts in mind, then, an analysis of the responses is in order.

¹Age restrictions refer to a person having to be a certain age in order to purchase, possess or consume alcoholic beverages. Licensing restrictions refer to the need for a license in order to sell alcoholic beverages.

Summary of Responses

The responses clearly point out that many institutions of higher education cannot allow alcoholic beverages on campus for any purposes because of existing state laws. It is also clear that age restrictions, which exist in all states, present a serious deterrent to the general use of alcoholic beverages on a college campus where the majority of students are not of age.

There is some indication that allowing beer in student unions is not an unpopular idea, and where this is done, no serious problems have arisen. Few student union directors, however, feel that allowing liquor in general is practical or necessary. While there is some indication that schools are becoming more liberal regarding alcoholic beverages, it appears that this transition, if it comes, will come gradually over a several-year period.

Responses

Of the 51 questionnaires sent out, 39 responses (76.5%) were received. Of these 39 responses, 10 (25.6%) indicated no legislation existed² to prohibit the "sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages" on campus, 3 (7.7%) specifically indicated that both state and university legislation existed, 10 (25.6%) indicated that state legislation existed, 13 (33.3%) indicated university regulations existed and 3 (7.7%) simply indicated that legislation existed but did not describe it. Because some of the respondents desired their replies to be kept confidential, the specific names of institutions will occasionally not be mentioned in the following analysis.

Of the 10 institutions considered as possessing no "legislation" to prevent the sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages, 2 indicated that only a license was necessary for the sale of such beverages, 5 indicated that an age limitation was the only deterrent to the consumption of such beverages and 3 simply stated no such legislation existed.

² Included in this category are seven responses that indicated only age and/or licensing restrictions. As explained earlier, these are restrictions in most states and were not the types of legislation of particular interest.

Both Hamilton College and Georgetown University indicated that licensing was the only restriction regarding the sale of alcoholic beverages. Although such beverages are not presently sold at Hamilton because they do not possess a license, the respondent did indicate that alcoholic beverages "will be sold in the union in the future." Although there has been no controversy about the old policy, the respondent felt that a different policy will benefit the campus. The Georgetown union does not possess a license either so they do not sell alcoholic beverages. Students have, however, been permitted to have alcoholic beverages in their rooms³ since September 1966 and although this policy has been criticized, the respondent felt it will probably remain in effect. A separate lounge area is provided for faculty and conferences. The only controversy arose when "D.C. started to enforce their ruling on the need for a license." This has, however, been "circumvented ... by the use of an open bar at social events."

The University of Pennsylvania, Yale College, Columbia College, the University of Wisconsin and Stanford University all indicated that age restrictions were the only legislation limiting the use of alcoholic beverages. The respondent for the University of Pennsylvania felt that since the sale or consumption of alcoholic beverages is limited to those over 21 by Pennsylvania state law, it wouldn't be practical to have such beverages for sale. A separate faculty club is provided, but no mention was made of the policy in this area. At Yale College there is no university ruling to limit the use of alcoholic beverages, although a person must be 21 years old to purchase them. The respondent indicated that Yale has no real student union and felt the present policy to be adequate.

At Columbia College, the respondent indicated that the "state law limits the sale of alcoholic beverages to persons 18 years of age or over" and that some of their students, "usually freshmen", are not 18. "Beer is available (sold) in the dining area (cafeteria); wine and liquor are never sold, but may be served in conjunction with receptions, dinners and a few dances; beer is sometimes served at 'smokers' and dances, but not usually in lounge areas." Although this policy hasn't resulted in any real controversy, the respondent felt he would "like to see more controlled consumption of liquor, because too many students seem not to be able to handle it well." He did feel, though, that their "policies seem adequate and reasonable for the most part."

At the University of Wisconsin, the University Regents have limited "the sale on campus to 3.2 beer (by weight)." The only other limitation is that alcoholic beverages may not be

³Provided they are not minors, i.e., under 21 years of age.

"served to those under 18 anywhere in the state (state law)." The Regents have recently approved "the sale of liquor in special faculty quarters after 4:00 p.m. (but no open bar)." The facility has not, however, been built yet. They have had beer available for "3-4 years without much public reaction. Many consider it a good policy." The students, however, do not consider this policy adequate and are petitioning for "regular" beer. The respondent felt "the 3.2 beer policy is realistic in recognizing that students do drink and places the university on the side of moderation."

The policy at Stanford University is best described by the following excerpt from their Presidential Regulations.

"The University believes that the development of self-discipline, individual responsibility and respect for law will be enhanced by entrusting to the students a greater responsibility for compliance with state law and by the removal of complete prohibitions which are not enforceable in practice.

"Therefore, the University draws to the attention of all its members that it is unlawful for any person to sell, furnish, give or cause to be sold, furnished or given away any alcoholic beverages to any person under the age of 21 years. The University expects each individual student and each student living group to assume responsibility for his or its compliance with the provision of the California Alcoholic Beverage Control Act on the Stanford campus."

The Regulations go on to limit the use of such beverages to "the interior of campus residences and eating clubs" and to prohibit the sale of such beverages on campus. This policy has not caused any real controversy. The respondent did feel that "beer in the union would be helpful but (that), in a 21 year old state, this creates problems."

Cornell University was among the three institutions simply indicating that no such legislation existed. At Cornell, beer has been available in their student union since 1937 and complete bar service has been available at the faculty club since 1950. This practice has never resulted in any real controversy. The respondent commented that they would like to "be in a position to serve more than beer at the union." They would not like an open bar, "but would like to serve cocktails in the formal dining room."

Of the remaining two schools in this category, one simply stated that the sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages is not prohibited, this policy has resulted in no controversy and it is adequate. The other school did go into more detail, stating that a lounge area has been provided for faculty since 1962 and a Rathskeller (serving beer) has been open since 1966. This policy has met with no serious opposition. The respondent did feel, however, that if any changes were made, a more liberal policy would be most beneficial.

Purdue University, Boston University and the University of Colorado indicated specifically that both state and university rulings existed to prohibit use of alcoholic beverages. The state law referred to, however, was simply an age restriction in all these cases. None of these schools allow alcoholic beverages for sale or consumption and none of them indicated any controversy as a result of this policy. The University of Colorado has experienced "some pressure from students for 3.2 beer served in limited areas." All these respondents felt this policy to be adequate and the respondent for Purdue was of the opinion that "with the present state law /must be 21 to purchase or consume alcoholic beverages/ and undergraduate enrollment, no other policy would be feasible." The respondent for the University of Colorado did feel, however, that the "limited sale of 3.2 beer might prove advantageous."

Ten (state-supported) institutions indicated that state law prohibited alcoholic beverages either on state or university property. As a result, alcoholic beverages are strictly prohibited at all of these institutions. The University of Texas did indicate that alcoholic beverages are served in the Alumni Center "at special functions, but not on a daily basis." Three of the respondents indicated that there was some interest in beer (either 3.2 or regular) among the student body. This was the only "controversy" noted by any of the respondents.

The respondent for Montana State felt that their present policy was "all right" and that it would be a "long time before beer will be allowed to be served on campus." The respondents for the University of Maryland, Iowa State and the University of New Mexico were also satisfied with their present policy. The respondent from another university (which desired to be anonymous) felt that "the degree of social maturity ... on campus does not warrant or require a change of policy." The respondent for the University of Texas felt that a change in the present policy will come in five to ten years. The respondent for the University of Mississippi commented that their "situation would be improved if the serving of beer on the campus in specified facilities were permitted." Another respondent felt the present policy to be "inadequate and outdated. Observation of campuses where alcoholic beverages are permitted indicate a healthy,

mature attitude with no apparent complications." The remaining two respondents did not comment on their policies.

The respondents at thirteen institutions indicated that university regulations prohibit the use of alcoholic beverages. While state laws may exist in conjunction with university regulations at some of these institutions, they were not mentioned by any of these respondents. One respondent indicated that cocktail hours are allowed prior to dinner at the conference center, but this is the only exception at any of the thirteen. None of these schools indicated any serious controversy as a result of this policy.

Five respondents simply stated their present policy was adequate and gave no further comment. The respondent for Ohio State University, although feeling that a different policy might benefit them financially, was of the opinion that the present policy should be maintained. Another respondent also felt their present policy was a good one since "it is much easier to have one policy for all the University community." The respondent for the University of Vermont, on the other hand, felt that "if students accept freedom and responsibility for administering, they could (hopefully) enjoy a change of policy." Howard University and the University of Arizona both felt some "change is desirable." The respondent for Michigan State University felt "there are times when a different policy would give us flexibility in our operations." The respondents for the remaining two institutions in this category both felt that the present policy was "inadequate for conferences and faculty members."

The remaining three respondents simply indicated that legislation existed that prohibited the sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages. There were no exceptions to this prohibition at any of these institutions and no controversy was mentioned. One respondent did feel that they should have "a beer cellar and faculty club bar." The remaining two respondents gave no opinions on their policy.

Conference Facilities

Here again, question #1 is badly stated but fortunately none of the respondents took it to include age or licensing restrictions. Question #11, it should be pointed out, was not intended to be included under the section regarding parking. It had been intended to determine if the conference center relied heavily on off-campus sleeping and dining facilities, etc. Hence, this question seemed rather repetitious in light of question 12. Fortunately, some respondents answered question 11 as

had been originally intended.

Of the 26 questionnaires sent out, 18 (70%) responses were received. The Asilomar Conference Grounds, Pacific Grove, California, was the only private conference center that responded. Asilomar does not serve or sell alcoholic beverages since they are located in a "dry" town, but they have found this to be advantageous since it "has excluded conferences whose sole purpose is fun-making." While groups have occasionally criticized this arrangement, the respondent saw no advantage in a different policy since "conferences have (their) own "hospitality" catered by an adjacent source." Asilomar services approximately 500 conferences a year ranging in size from 15 to 750. Their facility is available to "any type" of conference and they maintain beds for 690 and can feed 850 conferees per sitting. Parking facilities are adequate and easily accessible.

The remaining 17 responses are from conference centers affiliated with colleges and universities around the nation. The responses to each group of questions, i.e., alcoholic beverages, general statistics, and parking, are treated separately in what follows. Note that one institution wished to remain anonymous and hence will be referred to hereafter as Institution X.

Summary of Responses

Few conference directors considered serving alcoholic beverages essential for their operations. The general feeling seems to be that while they might be of some benefit, they have coped with this problem successfully in the past and could continue to do so. When alcoholic beverages are permitted, however, the opinion is that their use must be controlled.

The statistics show that most conference centers primarily service university-sponsored educational programs or conferences that are educational in content. Most centers provide sleeping facilities for 200 to 300 conferees and often rely on dormitories for additional space. Dining facilities are generally available for several hundred conferees at a sitting. Even with these facilities, however, several centers indicated that some conferences must be housed off-campus.

Parking does not appear to be a problem at centers that have facilities specifically for conference parking, e.g., conference-only parking lot or university-owned parking garage. Schools that rely on the normal university parking frequently

experience parking problems, however.

Alcoholic Beverages

Of the 17 responses, 3 (18%) respondents indicated no legislation existed to limit the sale and/or consumption, 5 (29%) indicated state legislation, 6 (35%) university regulations, 2 (12%) town legislation and 1 (6%) simply stated legislation existed to prohibit the general use of such beverages.

There is no legislation existing to prohibit the use of alcoholic beverages in conference facilities at the University of Minnesota, University of Connecticut, or Teacher's College, Columbia University. The Nolte Center for Continuing Education (Minnesota) does not, however, allow the sale or consumption of such beverages in conference facilities. They have not experienced any serious opposition to the policy and the respondent did not feel any change would be beneficial. He points out that he is "acquainted with universities that have available alcoholic beverages, and in checking with them finds that they don't feel that this enhances conference activities."

At University of Connecticut alcoholic beverages have been allowed in the conference center since 1966 with no serious problems or opposition. The respondent felt that this policy has made the center more attractive to conferences although the use of such beverages "must be controlled".

The Greystone Conference Center (Teacher's College) does not sell alcoholic beverages but does allow the consumption of such beverages ("set-ups are provided at cost"). This policy has been in effect since 1961 and has not resulted in any serious problems. While they do not publicize their policy regarding alcoholic beverages (it must be requested) the respondent felt this was helpful in attracting conferences.

State law prohibited the use of alcoholic beverages at 5 of the responding centers. Specifically, 3 respondents indicated such beverages were prohibited on all state property while the remaining 2 indicated they were forbidden on all campuses in the state. None of these respondents indicated any opposition to this policy and four of them felt this policy was adequate as it stood. The respondent for Purdue commented that "we are a part of the University and expect to operate within its policy." The respondent for the Michigan State Kellogg Center felt it was a "very good policy" and went on to add that "most groups ... come here to learn and recreate elsewhere." The

opinion at the University of Nebraska was that "there are more advantages to keeping alcoholic beverages away from facilities" and at Northern Michigan University that although "it is considered by some groups ... we have not suffered because of it." The respondent for the University of Maryland, on the other hand, felt that

"we are a Center of Adult Education in every respect except one. While alcoholic beverages are not sold in the center, nor allowed in 'public spaces', guests are not policed in their private rooms. Present practice probably leads to more unwise consumption (i.e., thru possession of bottles) than if single drinks were available in a cocktail lounge."

Of the 6 responses indicating that university regulations prohibited the use of alcoholic beverages, only 2 had experienced any opposition to this policy. The respondent for Oklahoma State University felt the best answer to the question "Why can't adults drink?" was that it sets a "poor example to students and hinders conference effectiveness."

Three of the respondents in this group did feel, however, that having alcoholic beverages available would be advantageous. The respondent for the University of Georgia explained quite clearly why he felt this way.

"In my opinion, adults should have the opportunity to decide for themselves whether or not to have alcoholic beverages served--for example, many adults enjoy a drink at the conclusion of a working day. A social hour, with alcoholic beverages, at a proper time and in a proper manner might very possibly make a positive contribution to a conference program. In addition, leisure hours are an important part of a total conference program, especially in a residential conference setting."

On the other hand, the respondent for Oklahoma State felt that they "have many educational conferences because there is a lack of 'party' facilities. Serious adult students prefer the academic atmosphere for their conferences." This point of view was shared by the respondent for the University of Michigan.

At the remaining institution in this group, a "great deal of leniency is shown in the guest room area" since "the unwritten policy is that activity in a guest room is the affair of the guest unless it disturbs other guests." The respondent

felt that the policy was a satisfactory one and points out that "conferees who feel the need to be near a bar are easily accommodated" in local hotels or motels.

Michigan State University and Pennsylvania State University are both prohibited by town legislation, although "controlled" consumption is allowed in the Nittany Lion Inn at Penn. State. Neither has experienced any serious opposition to the policy, although both respondents felt a change in policy might make their facilities slightly more attractive. The respondent for Penn. State did not, however, feel there was a "basic need" for change since although it "would help in regard to cocktail parties held in conjunction with programs" they "have coped with the situation for 15 years."

Louisiana State University simply indicated that legislation existed to "limit or prohibit the sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages", but did not describe this legislation. Such beverages are not permitted in conference facilities, a policy that has not resulted in any serious opposition. The respondent felt that the existing policy is "acceptable" and commented that they "work out the problems satisfactorily."

General Statistics

The data obtained from this section of the questionnaire is presented in tabular form since this seemed the most meaningful way to view it. The conference centers that responded service from 70 (Gull Lake Center for Continuing Education, Michigan State University) to 375 (Division of Continuing Education, Oklahoma State University) conferences per year ranging in size from 5 to 600 conferees (University of Nebraska, Center for Continuing Education). All but two (Gull Lake Center for Continuing Education, Michigan State University; Greystone Conference Center, Teacher's College, Columbia University) of these facilities are located on-campus.

The following table, then, presents the answers given to questions 5 thru 10 (see Appendix B) by the 17 responding institutions. The centers are listed in ascending order by the average number of conferences serviced per year. Only the numbers of the question will appear in the heading unless further clarification is necessary, e.g., #5 refers to question 5 on the questionnaire and "number" and "size" refer to the average number and size of the conferences serviced as requested in question 5.

TABULAR SUMMARY OF

<u>Name of Center and/or Institution</u>	<u>#5</u>		<u>#6¹</u>	<u>Univ. Educ. Prog.</u>	<u>#7²</u>	
	<u>Size</u>	<u>Number</u>			<u>In-State</u>	<u>National</u>
Gull Lake Center for Cont. Educ. Michigan State University	70	55	Off	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Michigan	135	150- 200	On	Yes	Yes ⁴	Yes ⁴
Nolte Center for Cont. Educ. University of Minnesota	170	65	On	Yes	---	---
University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee	200	30- 40	On	Yes	Yes	Yes
Conference Center Pennsylvania State Univ.	200	120	On	Yes	---	---
Northern Michigan Univ.	212	40- 50	On	Yes	Yes	Yes
Univ. College Center of Adult Educ. University of Maryland	225	75	On	Yes	---	---
Georgia Center for Cont. Educ. University of Georgia	225- 250	100	On	Yes	---	---
Continuing Education Center University of Connecticut	250	50- 300	On	Yes	Yes	Yes
Short Courses & Conferences General Extension Division Louisiana State University	300	25	On	Yes	---	---
Institution X	300	200	On	Yes	---	---

NOTE: The numbers in the headings refer to the corresponding question number in the Conference Facilities Questionnaire (see Appendix B).

GENERAL STATISTICS

<u>#8</u>	<u>#9³</u>	<u>#10</u>	<u>Comments</u>
100	No	100	
275	Yes (4000)	1300	Conference Dept. handles 135 conf./year--total University handles 450.
24	No	125	Additional Facilities are available to feed up to 700 at a sitting.
25 ⁵	Yes	125	Student and community groups may also use facilities.
250	Yes ⁶ (3000)	160	Any educational program co-sponsored by the University may use facilities.
---	Yes ⁶	---	Facilities available to any group that they feel "would benefit from an on-campus atmosphere."
232	Yes	600	Any program educational in nature may be conducted in the facilities.
276	Yes	600	Organization wishing to use facilities must have some educational objective.
300	Yes ⁶	350	
350	No	---	Meals handled by Union, not General Extension Division.
---	Yes	1200	Presently planning a new "center" which will have beds for 200. Now conducts programs in the Student Union.

<u>Name of Center and/or Institution</u>	<u>#5</u>		<u>#6¹</u>	<u>#7²</u>		
	<u>Size</u>	<u>Number</u>		<u>Univ. Educ. Prog.</u>	<u>In-State</u>	<u>National</u>
Univ. of Nebraska Center for Continuing Education	300	5 to 600	On	Yes	---	---
Kellogg Center Michigan State Univ.	325	180	On	Yes	---	---
Biddle Continuation Center Indiana University	348	130	On	Yes	Yes	Yes
Division of Conferences and Continuation Services Purdue University	350	30-60	On	Yes	---	---
Division of Cont. Education Oklahoma State University	375	50-200	On	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greystone Conference Center Teacher's College Columbia University	---	---	Off	Yes	Yes	Yes

¹Off refers to off-campus facilities; on refers to on-campus. Occasionally some of these centers may rely on off-campus facilities, but this refers to the location of permanent facilities used by the majority of conferences.

²University-sponsored educational programs is abbreviated to Univ. Educ. Prog.; any in-state conferences to In-State; and any national conferences to National.

³If a respondent indicated yes, the maximum number of beds available in dorms is included in parenthesis.

<u>#8</u>	<u>#9³</u>	<u>#10</u>	<u>Comments</u>
196	Yes (400)	675	Facilities available to "National and international conferences with sponsorship by some college or department within the University."
400	Yes	1200	
300	Yes ⁶ (300)	1000	Will "provide facilities for most groups unless they are ... conventions without any educational program."
500+	Yes ⁶ (5000)	1000	"Other <u>large</u> groups accepted from time to time because of unique ability to handle large groups."
162 ⁷	Yes ⁶ (2000)	2000	
27	Yes	50	Available to most groups for educational purposes only.

⁴If it concerns an academic area of the University or is University hosted.

⁵Present number inadequate.

⁶During summer months only.

⁷Respondent indicated 81 hotel type rooms, assuming these are doubles, 162 beds are available.

Parking

As pointed out earlier, question #11 was not intended to refer specifically to parking. Several institutions did, fortunately, respond to the question in a general manner. Twelve respondents simply answered no to this question while five indicated that some off-campus facilities are used. The University of Michigan frequently uses motels for housing although they do have 275 beds available in their union. They also find it necessary to rely heavily on off-campus parking facilities. A university parking structure is presently being built to alleviate parking problems. The University of Maryland relies "on local motels to accommodate overflow housing requirements" and "local restaurants for cocktail/dinner arrangements." Oklahoma State University also uses local hotels for sleeping accommodations for some conferences. The University of Minnesota finds it necessary to conduct approximately 30 conferences a year off-campus. Northern Michigan University makes considerable use of adjacent streets for parking.

Four of the responding institutions rely solely on the university's normal parking facilities for conference parking. Of these, the respondents for the University of Connecticut and Indiana University both felt these facilities were inadequate most of the time. Six institutions rely solely on conference-only parking facilities and none of these respondents indicated any parking problems. Four institutions rely on university and conference-only parking facilities. None of these has experienced any parking problems either. Purdue has a separate parking garage (capacity 627 cars) adjacent to the campus. As pointed out earlier both the University of Michigan and Northern Michigan University have to rely heavily on off-campus parking facilities (Michigan is presently constructing a university parking structure).

Nine of the respondents indicated their parking facilities are adjacent to the conference center and five indicated adjacent and within easy walking distance. Both the University of Connecticut and the University of Michigan must rely heavily on parking facilities that are a "long walk" from the center.

Conclusions

While these few institutions cannot be considered a statistically reliable sample of all the schools in the country, there are some noteworthy trends in this data that should be noted.

The responses to both questionnaires clearly point out that a great many institutions of higher education cannot allow alcoholic beverages on campus for any purpose because of existing state laws. It is also clear that age restrictions, which exist in all states, present a serious deterrent to the general use of alcoholic beverages on a college campus where the majority of students are not of age.

There is some indication that allowing beer is not an unpopular idea and where this is done, no serious problems have existed. Few respondents, however, feel that allowing liquor in general is practical or necessary. While there is some indication that schools are becoming liberal regarding alcoholic beverages, it appears that this transition, if it comes, will come gradually over a several-year period.

The consensus seems to be that alcoholic beverages are not a necessity for the general university community or for conferences. It also appears that conference centers affiliated with universities are essentially educationally-orientated and provide sleeping and dining facilities for several hundred conferees. A structure designed for conference parking also seems essential.

APPENDIX

Appendix B

CONFERENCE FACILITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. Any information provided will be kept strictly confidential if so desired. Please return to the Office of Institutional Studies, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, 01002 before February 1.

Alcoholic Beverages

1. Does legislation exist (e.g. state, county, city, university, etc.) which limits or prohibits the sale and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages on your campus? If yes, please describe or send copies of such legislation.
2. Are alcoholic beverages permitted within on-campus conference facilities for sale and/or consumption?

Yes

No

If yes, how long has this policy been in practice? Has it resulted in any problems? Please explain.

3. Has there been any serious opposition to this policy either in the past or at present?

Yes

No

If yes, what is the nature of the opposition?

4. As a director of conferences, what is your opinion of the present policy? For example, do you think the availability of alcoholic beverages would make (or has made) your institution more attractive to conferences?

General Statistics

5. What is the average size _____ and number _____ of conferences you serve per year?

6. Where are your facilities located?

- On-campus Off-campus

7. To whom are your facilities available?

- University-sponsored educational programs
 Any in-state conferences
 Any national conference
 Other, please explain:

8. How many beds does the college provide for conferences? _____

9. Are some of your conferences housed in student dormitories?

- Yes No

If so, approximately how many? _____

10. About how many conferees can you feed per sitting? _____

Parking

11. Do you rely heavily on off-campus (non-university) facilities to serve conferences? Please explain.

12. What parking facilities is your conference center able to make available for conferences?

- University's normal parking structure
- Conference only parking lot
- Relies on public (non-university) facilities
- Other, please explain

13. Generally, how far from your meeting facilities is your parking area?

- Adjacent
- Easy walking distance
- Long walk
- Intermediate transportation necessary

14. May any or all of this information be used in our summary report (1) that is to be circulated nationally? _____ (2) that is to be used on the University of Massachusetts campus only? _____

Thank you for your attention. If our office may be of any assistance to your institution or if you have further questions regarding this study feel free to contact us at any time. (413-545-2141)

Signature

Title

Office of Institutional Studies

University of Massachusetts

January 1967