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Abstract

This dissertation examines why universities are establishing affiliated retirement communities, and the connections that university administrators create between an academic institution and these linked neighborhoods. This is a qualitative study that looks at three public, research universities with affiliated retirement communities using the case study method. This study documents ways in which this new type of affiliation may lead to the advancement of a university's institutional mission, engage a valuable constituency, and ultimately encourage the flow of vital resources back to the university. This study indicates that universities may elect to create a linked retirement community for a number of reasons, including the desire to be responsive to alumni demand and the need to create a suitable source of revenue on university-owned land.

As the Baby Boomer generation ages and the pool of traditional-aged students declines, more academic institutions may find themselves considering the addition of an alumni-oriented residential community. The incorporation of a university-linked retirement community under a university's auspices holds implications for the institution's programming, and may expand traditional notions of the scope of the university community.

The research is framed by the resource dependence theory of organizational dynamics of Pfeffer & Salancik (1978), which is also used in developing a Model of Institutional Integration. Institutional Integration refers to the extent to which the goals and activities of the retirement community are congruent with the university's institutional mission. The model pictorially describes the potentially symbiotic relationship between a university and a linked retirement community, based on the themes uncovered in this research. The findings indicate that the universities with the greatest formal, organizational linkages with their respective university-linked retirement communities are positioned to achieve higher levels of institutional integration. This integration facilitates the advancement of institutional mission at the retirement community.
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Chapter One: Introduction

In recent decades, university towns have become increasingly desirable retirement destinations. Aging, educated Baby Boomers, seeking more from retirement than golf and sunshine, are now often choosing to retire near higher education institutions. University towns offer a stimulating, intellectual atmosphere with many cultural and sporting events. Private developers, seizing on this enduring appeal, have constructed retirement communities near colleges and universities and succeeded in attracting alumni and retired faculty and staff as residents. The Kendal Corporation operates several of these facilities. In other instances, groups of alumni and retired faculty and staff have joined together to create a retirement community near their institution of choice. This has happened with the Forest at Duke and Carol Woods in the Chapel Hill area.

Leon Pastalan, Director of the National Center on Housing and Living Arrangements for Older Americans at the University of Michigan estimates that between 75-100 retirement communities are already open in close proximity to American campuses, with many more in the planning stages (Personal Communication, March 22, 2001). Most of these communities were developed privately and opened within the last decade. Few of these independent retirement communities have cultivated formalized relationships with the nearby academic institution, however. The experiences of this retirement age couple exemplify their perceptions of the offerings at one of these retirement communities:

Greg and Nancy Forsythe, both in their late 50s, are beginning to look for a place to retire. A graduate of the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor and a one-time instructor at the school, Mr. Forsythe has long been smitten with his college
town. So last spring, when the couple came across a mention online of University Commons, a new community in Ann Arbor, their search for a home appeared to be over. Today, though, having visited University Commons, the Forsythes, who live in Asheville, N.C., are still looking for a retirement home. While both admired the development itself, "We were disappointed that there was no formal connection to university activities, beyond what anybody in Ann Arbor could get," says Mr. Forsythe (Manheimer, 2001b, R8).

University Commons was built by a private developer, and residents must be either alumni or retired faculty of the University of Michigan. Despite the makeup of its residents, this community is not officially linked to the university.

Recently, some major universities have joined forces with developers to participate in creating their own, officially affiliated retirement communities. These neighborhoods, referred to in this research as university-linked retirement communities (ULRCs), are fundamentally different from those created privately and independently from a higher education institution. These affiliated communities are purposefully created through the initiative and involvement of university administrators, and bear the university’s imprimatur.

This new type of retirement community offers the prospect for an unprecedented level of formalized interaction between the university and the residents of the community. Universities are typically not accustomed to dealing with senior citizens on campus (except perhaps behind the lectern). Negotiating the relationship between this new type of community and a university is uncharted territory for both the institution and the elder residents. Lessons from the experiences of the earliest schools attempting this new type of living/learning community may prove helpful in navigating this new terrain.

A university can not simply build a retirement community on or near campus and expect meaningful collaboration to occur spontaneously. An academic community
wishing to incorporate a ULRC must take deliberate, conscious steps to integrate the elder students with the university culture, and to develop a sustaining, connected environment that will enable residential senior citizens to create meaningful roles during their retirement.

Leon Pastalan argues that the motivations of seniors returning to campus is qualitatively different from those who choose traditional retirement communities. These seniors exhibit a “hunger” that is manifested in a quest for meaning, learning, service, and value in retirement (“The importance of senior residential/retirement communities on or near a college/university campus.” Unpublished position paper available from the National Center on Housing and Living Arrangements for Older Americans, University of Michigan).

This research explores the nature of the inchoate relationships between three universities and their allied retirement communities. The quality and types of institutional connections (referred to as “institutional integration”) between the two entities are explained so college administrators may better understand the dynamics and implications of this emerging trend. In particular, this study investigates the ways in which a university's relationship with an affiliated retirement community may be structured symbiotically to advance a university's institutional mission and enlarge its resource base while serving the needs of the residents.

Significance

As a relatively new phenomenon developing among scattered higher education institutions across the country, university-linked retirement communities (ULRCs)
remain largely unstudied. Their potential impact on university administration and society, however, is considerable. These communities may affect the way in which the academy views itself, its clientele, its relationship to its alumni, and its relationship to society.

ULRCs have the capacity to improve the lives of senior citizens, promote intergenerational interaction, expand the scope of the university community, redefine the relationship between a university and its alumni, and enlarge the resource base for academic institutions. Public research institutions charged with serving the wider community may also find that ULRCs provide potential new avenues to advance their institutional missions.

**Improve lives of seniors.** Senior citizens are the fastest-growing age group of the American population. The current population aged 65+ is about 34.7 million (13 percent of the population). This number is projected to double over the next three decades to nearly 70 million (20 percent of the population). The Census Bureau projects the 65+ population to be 39.4 million in 2010, 53.2 million in 2020, and 69.4 million in 2030. (National Council on the Aging. Available:www.ncoa.org/news/mra2000/factsheet.html).

As American life expectancy has grown, so have our expectations for aging. Today’s seniors have higher levels of educational achievement than previous generations, and they are likely to want to remain intellectually active when they retire. Pastalan points out that “There’s a searching, a real need, to provide more value and meaning to retirement” (Boss, 1999, p. 19). University-linked retirement communities constitute one proactive solution to the challenge of enabling senior citizens to remain engaged and involved during their later years. By living in a community that is meaningfully linked to a university (possibly their own alma mater), senior citizens can be challenged to pursue
new, or renew old, interests and to remain connected to the life of the mind. Such engagement is associated with numerous benefits for seniors (Fischer, Blazey, & Lipman, 1992; Leptak, 1989).

**Expand university community.** Existing retirement communities in college towns have already challenged some universities to reconsider where their boundaries lie. Many residents from these communities are alumni or retired faculty and staff who continue to be actively involved in university life. Others, by virtue of their choice to retire near the institution, can be considered potential “friends” of the university. These residents may attend university cultural or sporting functions, volunteer in museums and libraries, or follow university news. They also comprise a vital additional constituency for university administrators to consider in their programming and planning.

**Intergenerational involvement.** Universities may benefit from diversifying the age range on campus. Retirees can bring “new” and different perspectives to the campus community. Having senior citizens on campus can foster increased understanding and interactions between generations. Residents of a ULRC may value the opportunity to volunteer as mentors or informal advisors for students (Brabazon & Disch, 1997).

Likewise, traditional-age students may appreciate the opportunity to pursue volunteerism within the senior community, and can benefit from exposure to a more widely diverse population than is normally available within a university setting. University administrators rightly concerned with increasing diversity on their campuses ought to examine whether older adults are currently included under blanket policies aimed at increasing campus access by underrepresented groups.
On the other hand, not all traditional students may welcome these new “seniors” on campus, or in class. At Lasell, a small college in Massachusetts with an on-campus retirement community, the dean for senior residents of the on-campus retirement community acknowledges some problems. “At first, polite young college students didn’t want to contradict those they referred to as nice old people,” she says. But there have also been issues involving “vintage seniors who got carried away and dominated discussions” (Manheimer, 2001c, p. 4). Manheimer also describes the experiences of a resident of The Pines at Davidson—a retirement community near Davidson College in North Carolina—who says that “some of his professors have made it clear that he’s a guest and should act accordingly—speak when called on. And when he actually was called on—invited to relive fighting under Gen. George Patton as a machine gunner on a tank during World War II—his young classmates failed to respond” (Manheimer, 2001b, p. R8). There is apparently some ambivalence concerning the retirement community at Lasell College in Newton, MA. “The old folks’ invasion has delighted Lasell professors, and undergraduates say they like them, too—up to a point. The students admit they learn a lot from the seniors in class discussions but draw the line at the prospect of intergenerational keg parties. . .Others fret that the retirement program outshines the college” (Tyre, 2002, p. 48).

There is certainly the potential for classroom discord when some students are taking a class for a grade and a job and others see it as a leisure activity. Faculty members may encounter new classroom management problems in these situations. Smaller institutions are likely to find this to be a thornier issue than larger ones, where the number
of senior learners will be relatively small when compared to the undergraduate population.

**Redefine relationship with alumni.** Since many of the residents of a ULRC are likely to be alumni, university administrators face the challenge of redefining a relationship that had previously been based upon occasional reunions and sporting events. The addition of a ULRC will increase the intensity of the university/alumni relationship due to proximity and duration. This relationship may also change in quality to incorporate a lifelong learning component. Serving the lifelong learning needs of alumni can strengthen ties between higher education institutions and their alumni and thus bring enhanced benefits both to the alma mater and to its clientele. Calvert (1987) suggests that if higher education institutions fail to address the continuing educational needs of alumni, other institutions will fill the void, and alumni allegiances may be transferred to those agencies.

**Improve resource base for university.** Alumni and other residents of a linked retirement community have the potential to become significant human resources for the university community. Retirees bring a lifetime of experience and knowledge that can be shared with younger generations. They may have considerable time to devote to their favorite causes. Research has shown that older adults are far more likely to engage in volunteerism when these opportunities are structured and presented under the auspices of a university program (e.g., Manheimer, R. & Snodgrass, D, 1993). ULRC administrators may find considerable untapped volunteer potential among this population that can be mobilized both within the university and among the surrounding community.
Because ULRCs come with a high price tag, residents are also likely to have substantial financial assets that they may choose to contribute to university causes. With proper cultivation, many of these “friends” of the university may eventually become donors to fundraising campaigns and other initiatives. Whether or not these prospective resources are mobilized in support of the university will likely depend in large part on the initiative shown by the university in reaching out and involving these affiliated seniors in the daily life of the campus community.

University-linked retirement communities can also help universities to expand and diversify their financial resources, by enabling them to create revenue-generating projects on hitherto unused university land. This revenue can then be applied to support various institutional aims and initiatives. In recent years, universities have had to become increasingly self-reliant for funding as dwindling state support forced them to look elsewhere for sources of revenue. Land-rich, cash-strapped universities need to examine the possible ways in which they can maximize their use of their resources, and ULRCs offer an opportunity for universities to accomplish this aim.

**Advance Institutional Mission.** From their inception, the state and land-grant universities assumed a public service obligation “to disseminate knowledge widely and to apply the results of campus research for the benefit of the people” (Calvert, 1987, p. 12). This commitment led to the development of university extension services whose mandate was to reach out into the community in an effort to improve the lives of citizens of all ages through learning. University-linked retirement communities present another potential avenue for universities to utilize in extending their institutional missions to wider segments of the surrounding communities.
Opportunities for the advancement of institutional mission through a ULRC are multiple. The teaching mission may be advanced by extending educational services to residents or by utilizing the retirement community as a practicum site for undergraduate or graduate students in fields such as nursing, physical therapy, gerontology, kinetics, recreation, or the arts. The research mission may be advanced when residents are encouraged to participate in university-based research studies or trials for which they qualify, or when researchers select the community as a potential site for the study of aging-related issues. The service mission may be advanced through the delivery of health-related services to residents by university hospital practitioners, or by mobilizing the senior residents of the ULRC in volunteer activities among the university or wider community.

Overall, universities are impacted by the creation of a university-linked retirement community. Universities may choose to become involved in these projects for a variety of reasons. Universities that decide to connect to a retirement community need to consider the ways in which they can structure their relationship to such a project in order to maximize the positive benefits for the academic institution.

Problem Statement

Because ULRCs are such a new concept, many universities are grappling with the question of whether their campus is suited to such an arrangement. If the decision to proceed with a ULRC is made, administrators need to consider how to organize the retirement community's relationship to the university in a way that advances and supports the institution's overall mission. Without a vital connection to the university, these
retirement communities are merely “themed” senior housing developments with an ivy backdrop. Clear guidance on how to integrate the senior residents of a ULRC into the university community is currently in short supply. The schools engaged in these projects are pioneers. This study begins to build the knowledge base on connecting universities with retirement communities by looking at the models used by three public universities, and identifying the linkages between the two organizations.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to begin to build the knowledge base on how a ULRC can be meaningfully connected to a university. This study examines the reasons behind the creation of retirement communities at three universities. This research will identify the different linkages that are being forged between three universities and their affiliated retirement communities, and discuss the ways in which these connections encourage interaction and advance institutional mission. This paper will also make recommendations, based on the research data, to college administrators considering the incorporation of a ULRC at their institution. This research develops and advances a model to depict the symbiotic relationship that can ideally be forged between a university with a ULRC. This research also introduces the concept of “institutional integration” which is defined as the congruence of the retirement community with the university's institutional mission. The level of institutional integration will be said to be high or low depending upon the extent to which the goals and structure of the ULRC match the overall goals of the academic institution.
Research Questions

This research seeks to answer the following questions: Why are universities becoming involved in developing university-linked retirement communities? What are the links between the university and the retirement community? How may these links be structured so as to encourage meaningful interaction between the university and the ULRC?

Assumptions and Limitations

Because ULRCs are a relatively new phenomenon, they exist in different stages of development. In this study, one of the ULRCs has been in existence for over ten years, and the other two have just begun construction of their facilities. The two, newer facilities have sold a considerable number of their units, however, and are familiar with the backgrounds of many of their future residents. They have also made many organizational and structural decisions that have already been implemented. Nevertheless, the relationship of these unfinished ULRCs with the sponsoring universities must be considered provisional until the facilities are open and operating.

Scope and Delimitations

I am primarily interested in the impact of the ULRC on university organization and administration. Therefore, this research is limited to individuals who are involved with university administration and does not include interviews with the senior residents of ULRCs. This research is primarily focused on the central university organization—not on the organization of allied medical schools and other ancillary departments. Therefore,
I focused on those areas of the university only as they are directly linked to the university's role in the ULRC.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

The literature base dealing specifically with ULRCs is currently sparse. University-linked retirement communities are a new endeavor, and hence research in this area constitutes an emerging field. A significant portion of the work addressing this topic consists of practical essays, position papers, or journalistic accounts in the popular press.

There is, however, useful research on adjacent topics which helps to provide a basis for approaching the subject of ULRCs. There is a considerable research base on retirement communities; this research has generally been conducted by sociologists. A ULRC project is typically approached by a university as a joint real estate venture with a private development firm. There is a small literature base on this subject. Research on senior learning appears in the fields of continuing education, alumni continuing education and adult education. This research pre-dates the creation of ULRCs, however. The senior learning literature addresses the growth of senior citizen involvement in university life and the implications of this trend for university administrators. The literature on institutional mission and outreach is relevant for administrators considering the appropriateness of adding new “services”—such as a ULRC—to their institution. All of this prior research helps to inform the study of ULRCs, but none of it specifically addresses the topic.

Empirical research dealing with ULRCs is virtually nonexistent at this point. Current, ongoing research projects pertaining to ULRCs are discussed at the conclusion of the Literature Review Section.
Research on Retirement Communities

The research on retirement communities encompasses a broad range of topics in the field of aging. This research addresses the social, economic, psychological, and ecological aspects of the topic. Most of the work consists of essays by sociologists. There is little empirical work on this topic. This research describes unmistakable demographic trends pointing to an increased need for housing for the elderly, and the different ways in which retirement communities have traditionally been organized and operated. The changes that occur in retirement communities as residents shift from young-active, to old-infirm are another important consideration for the researchers.

The 1994 book edited by Folts & Yeatts offers a comprehensive treatment of the subject of housing for senior citizens. Pointing out that we, the readers, are the future aged in America, and that the housing options we create now will someday be our own living options, the authors include chapters on virtually every conceivable subject relating to housing and the elderly. Particularly pertinent to this dissertation are the chapters on leisure-oriented retirement communities and continuing care retirement communities.

The chapter on leisure-oriented retirement communities (LORCs) by Folts & Streib (1994) points out the rise of the “young old”—retirees who actively participate in social and recreational activities after they conclude their careers. The authors describe the rise of retirement communities centered on leisure activities, and discuss the greater acceptance of leisure in America (along with a perceived decline in the importance of the work ethic). The authors assert that while American middle age may be characterized by competition, individualism, and anomie, many people seek a more community-oriented
lifestyle for the later period of life. Mutual support and interdependence are important parts of this community spirit.

According to Folts & Streib, residents of LORCs typically find that their social position is determined not by their former career roles, but rather by the activities they choose to join, and the skill and assiduousness with which they pursue them. Typical activities in LORCs range from sports and crafts to religion, philanthropy, or self-governance for the community. The authors include mention of educational pursuits such as lectures, foreign language classes, study clubs, investment groups, and book clubs, that are typically held on site.

Many LORCs traditionally have not included assisted-living type services. Folts & Streib indicate that this may be changing, however, as the proportion of “old old” citizens (defined as over age 85) increases, and as the younger residents of LORCs “age-in-place.” For example, the authors found, in revisiting one LORC in Florida, that ten years after the initial visit the activities program had been modified to include an Alzheimer’s support group, Meals-on-Wheels, and Home Health Services. Hence, Folts & Streib show the adaptability of one LORC in accommodating the changing needs of its residents.

Susan Brecht (1994), writing on continuing care retirement communities (CCRCs), describes their origin as stemming from homes run by religious denominations for elderly clergy and parishioners. These homes were typically created before Social Security, when there were few private pension programs. Other early facilities were called “Lifecare” communities; these typically guaranteed a lifetime of care in return for transfer of personal assets. Inherent in this concept is substantial economic risk, since
there is no way to accurately predict how many years of care a resident will eventually need. Some of these communities failed for this reason during the 1960s, which led to closer regulation of the communities by legal authorities. Continuing care retirement communities today have to meet stringent regulatory requirements, which typically include maintaining significant cash reserves.

Brecht explains that most CCRCs [including ULRCs] now operate financially using a combination of endowment fees and monthly fees. The endowment or “upfront” fee is designed to cover the development costs associated with each unit and to provide a reserve for future health-care costs. The monthly fee is tied to the cost of operating the community and assures that the facility will survive in perpetuity. The entrance fee was typically considered to be nonrefundable, although this issue is now dealt with in different ways by different facilities. In many cases, prorated refunds may be received if residents choose to relocate or pass away soon after moving in.

Sociologist Gordon Streib has been one of the most prolific writers in the field of retirement communities. In his essays, Streib attempts to consolidate what is known about these living environments. Streib (2002) points out that only about 5 percent of older Americans live in retirement communities (p. 3). He notes that retirement communities have been the targets of skepticism and criticism among both professionals and lay persons, due to the perceived value of living in an age-integrated community. Streib indicates that critics may not recognize many of the ways in which retirement housing may solve typical problems encountered by the elderly. According to Streib, retirement communities may become havens for the elderly because of the programs, transportation,
security, activities, sociability, and so on. Housing environments that include all ages may not provide the services and benefits that the elderly want and need.

Streib (1990) examines the linkages which retirement communities develop to their surrounding environments. He describes a network of “exchanges” between a retirement community and local business firms, churches, labor unions, government regulatory bodies, and voluntary associations. (Streib does not account for exchanges with institutions of higher learning.) Streib believes that in order for a retirement community to remain viable, the operators require knowledge of the linkages, an ability to understand how they operate, and the skill to steer the community through an often-complicated political economy.

Streib then identifies three principal kinds of retirement communities: Planned, CCRCs, and Naturally-Occurring. Planned retirement communities are created by private developers and are marketed initially for younger, active retirees. The larger projects typically include an extensive network of recreational facilities, clubs, and leisure programs. There may be hospitals, nursing homes, churches, and commercial and professional services. Smaller planned communities usually require that the residents go outside the community for these services.

Streib describes CCRCs as a special type of housing that includes lifetime arrangements for different levels of health care. Continuing care retirement communities constitute a growing segment of the retirement community industry due to the rapid increase in the size and affluence of the elderly population, and particularly to the increase in the extremely aged population in America (those over age 85).
Naturally occurring retirement communities (NORCs) were not designed as retirement communities. These are areas that attract a large proportion of older persons because of various reasons such as climate, natural recreation assets, costs, or rural nature. Streib mentions some cities in Florida, and also three communities in Madison, Wisconsin as being NORCs. (Since this article was written, other university towns have become attractive areas for educated, baby boomer retirees.) Organizations and services then develop to meet the needs and interests of older residents, and offer stability and security for the residents.

Streib (1990) also points out the limited amount of empirical research in this field, and recommends future empirical studies that give primacy to data collection from those who develop and manage retirement communities.

Streib (1993) describes how retirement communities proceed through various stages in their development. He pinpoints three stages—establishment, transition, and maturation—and describes salient activities associated with each stage. He also describes the different stages which aging seniors experience, as they move from young, active retirement to old age and infirmity, and relates these life stages to the functioning of the overall community.

The establishment phase of a retirement community includes the initial marketing and sales of the community. The first residents move in during this phase. Activities associated with the establishment phase may include the erection of a clubhouse or other facilities, and provision for social programs.

During the transitions phase, the ownership of the facility may move from the developer to resident ownership or self-government. Activities associated with this phase
include adding or dropping activities according to residents’ wishes, and maintaining and preserving facilities for marketing to new residents.

The maturation phase requires maintaining physical facilities, and retaining community leaders to solve new issues and problems as they emerge. Old timers who fade away need to be replaced by newcomers for the community to thrive. Activities associated with this stage include the aging in place of first residents and efforts to secure new leadership.

Streib (1993) postulates the following table to illustrate the retirement stages of community residents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Work Status</th>
<th>Physical Condition</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Working or early</td>
<td>High Function</td>
<td>Participation in many activities. Leadership roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>Normal retirement</td>
<td>Medical problems</td>
<td>Continue activities of choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“young old”</td>
<td>may start to limit some activities</td>
<td>May shift to sedentary or spectator activities. Phase out leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-governance roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>Late retirement</td>
<td>More physical decline</td>
<td>Lower energy. More sedentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue social activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>The “old old”</td>
<td>Often considerable reduction in physical</td>
<td>Reduction in most activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>activities.</td>
<td>Continue some social activities in and outside of home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(p. 249).
Streib asserts in this essay that once a retirement community reaches its mature stage of development, balance may be attained. This equilibrium may last for a long period of time, but as residents age and their functional abilities and interests change, the retirement community must necessarily change with them.

Streib (2002) reconfirmed an earlier finding by Streib, Folts, and La Greca (1985). In studying decision-making in 36 retirement communities, they reported that most residents appear content to allow other residents—or in the case of the larger communities, management—to make most of the decisions regarding the day-to-day operation of the community. Streib (2002) applied an analytical framework for studying conflict to case studies, and found that most of the residents of a retirement community tend to stay out of community conflicts, unless their economic interests or style of life are severely threatened or a major change is involved. When a crisis does develop, however, a substantial number of the residents can be mobilized, and they can act more quickly than the residents of nonretirement communities. While residents typically express a desire not to be constantly involved in self-government, they do want to be involved in decision making. As a community matures and its residents age in place, a shortage of persons able and willing to fill leadership positions emerges.

Hunt, Feldt, Marans, Pastalan, & Vakalo (1984) describe retirement communities as “American Originals”—a uniquely American type of residential environment. According to the authors, the origins of American retirement communities can be traced to a desire of some older people to live in a warmer climate with other people of similar age. Other industrialized countries, for various reasons, do not have a retirement community industry. The availability of fairly large tracts of land in Sunbelt states made
it possible to create new communities that were attractive to retirees. In recent decades, many retirement communities have also been established in northern states, such as New Jersey and Pennsylvania, because some older adults preferred to remain in familiar surroundings.

Heintz (1976) was among the first to analyze the linkages of retirement communities to their surrounding communities. In a study of five planned communities in New Jersey, Heintz conducted an impact analysis and demonstrated that planned retirement communities have a fiscal impact (municipal revenues and services), a political impact, and an impact on the local health care system. Heintz concluded that the impact of a retirement community upon the health care system is offset by the economic and social benefits resulting from the residents’ relative underuse of other municipal services. Heintz also indicates that the fact that retirement community residents express a high degree of satisfaction with their housing accommodations and the social network of the retirement community brings indirect benefits to the larger community. As a result of their high morale, the retirement community residents continue to participate in the social and political activities of the community at large, working as volunteers for various organizations or social service groups, for example, to the benefit of the surrounding area.


Regulatory agencies exist at all three levels of government—local, state, and federal. Federal regulators include the Department of Housing and Urban Development
(HUD), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Department of the Treasury (IRS). State regulatory agencies are more directly involved in retirement communities, particularly CCRCs. Constituencies include the residents themselves, as well as potential residents. Suppliers are those providing vital services within the community, such as healthcare or personal services. Competitors are other facilities in rivalry for the patronage of residents. Folts describes Residuals as a final important linkage—the voluntary sector—that connects retirement communities and their environments. Residuals can work in two directions, as citizens volunteer at the retirement community, or retirees devote themselves to various causes within the community.

Longino (1982) points out that there is obviously self-selection among persons who choose to live in retirement communities. In general, persons who seek age-segregated living environments tend to have higher levels of health, educational attainment, and economic status.

Osgood (1982) created an empirical typology of residents in three retirement communities. In her study, she observed six types of social roles: organizers, joiners, socializers, recreationalists, humanitarians, and retirees. The first types help create the activities that form the life of the community. As a community ages, residents tend to become increasingly retirees. Without an influx of new, younger residents, Osgood asserts that the community may decline.

In conclusion, the research on retirement communities indicates that these communities do not exist as isolated islands, but rather are connected in vital ways to their surrounding environments. They are a uniquely American phenomenon. Residents
of retirement communities tend to be healthier, better-educated and wealthier than non-residents. Residents may become important sources of volunteerism within their surrounding communities. As age-restricted environments, retirement communities offer special advantages to help residents face challenges associated with aging. They also have life cycles of their own, and the communities face special challenges as residents age in place. The age of the residents affects the viability of the community, and mature communities need to replace older residents to maintain leadership. The research also indicates that residents of retirement communities may prefer to leave day-to-day management decisions about the operation of the community and programming to others.

Senior/Alumni Learning in Higher Education

The idea of offering higher education to aging citizens is not entirely new. Its historical antecedents reach back to the early 20th century. This is a growing trend, both in America and in Europe, where the population is considerably “older,” proportionately, than here. Research indicates that senior and alumni learning are associated with improved lifestyles for seniors, and intergenerational involvement on campus can promote diversity and combat negative stereotypes of the aged. Institutes for Learning in Retirement are one way in which colleges and universities are meeting the demand for higher education among senior citizens.

Fundamental to this new and emerging area is an understanding that, in the course of human history, “active” retirement is a remarkably new phenomenon. Laslett (1991) points out that it is only very recently and among developed nations that a significant proportion of the adult population could expect to live long enough and be healthy
enough to enjoy an active period that extended beyond childhood (what he terms the “first age”) and adulthood (the “second age”). “Retirement” was synonymous with decline and withdrawal. Improved economic conditions and healthcare in developed nations have created a new “map of life” which now includes the possibility of a “third age”—a vital, active period following resolution of one's childrearing and career responsibilities. The concept of “Education as Leisure” (as opposed to education as preparation for career responsibilities) emerges from this new expectation for life.

Forman (1979) sees American alumni relations as having entered a stage in which it is moving into the mainstream of higher education administration, helping to define the mission, goals, and activities of our colleges and universities. As Executive Director of the Alumni Association at the University of Michigan, Forman describes how alumni relations has moved through three stages of development. The first stage involved moving from banding alumni together for social purposes to developing roles for alumni to take in support of their universities. The second stage involved learning how to plan and conduct programming. The third stage requires moving from “the kind of ancillary functions that most university administrators emphasize to the mainstream of safeguarding the life of our universities” (p. 8). Decreasing public support and declining enrollments will test alumni support for their institutions. According to Forman, the institutions that survive these challenges will be the ones with enlightened alumni relations programs.

Certainly, the incorporation of ULRCs would expand the influence of alumni on campus and give them more immediate access to information about news and
developments at the university. The opinions of alumni living in a campus-affiliated facility would be difficult for administrators to ignore.

During the mid-1990s, Manheimer, Snodgrass, & Moskow–McKenzie collaborated on several research projects dealing with lifelong education and older adults. Their work was sometimes funded by the AARP’s Andrus Foundation, and was conducted at the University of North Carolina—Asheville’s North Carolina Center for Creative Retirement. These studies focused on the new roles and norms possible for older adults in conjunction with higher education institutions and include recommendations for incorporating older adults and their needs for lifelong learning into academic institutions, but did not focus on university-linked retirement communities, per se. Manheimer, Snodgrass, & Moskow-McKenzie (1995), point out that the percentage of people over fifty-five formally enrolled in courses tripled between 1973 and 1983 (p. 86.) Manheimer & Snodgrass (1993) showed that senior citizens are more likely to engage in community volunteerism when organized under the auspices of a higher education institution.

Calvert (1987) approaches the subject of senior learning from the point of view of alumni management, and challenges colleges and universities to accept responsibility for the lifelong education of alumni. Calvert sees declining interest in social and athletic events, once considered sufficient to sustain the interest of the alumni upon whose support higher education institutions depend. He argues that providing lifelong learning opportunities for alumni is a valid and natural part of alumni services, saying, “Like any other alumni program, its purpose will be to keep alumni involved in the business of the university. Since that business is education (teaching and learning), alumni continuing education will actually serve this purpose better than most other alumni programs; but it
will not necessarily make a profit, any more than reunion programs” (p. 7). Calvert asserts that the incorporation of a learning component with traditional alumni programming can transform a university’s relationship with its alumni.

From a historical point of view, Calvert points out that the idea of involving college and university alumni in continuing contact with the intellectual life of the institution is not new. He traces the antecedents of alumni education back as early as 1916, when some college presidents argued for substantial intellectual involvement by alumni in their alma maters (p. 20).

Nonprofit Institutes for Learning in Retirement (ILRs), an American subsidiary of the Elderhostel movement, challenge the boundaries of senior involvement in the day-to-day intellectual life of the university, and encourage institutions to adopt a new institutional relationship with alumni and other seniors. Some of the work on this topic comes from Europe, where the population has aged in advance of the American population, and Australia and New Zealand. (In Europe and the United Kingdom, ILRs are typically referred to as “Universities of the Third Age” or U3As).

Fischer, Blazey, & Lipman (Eds.) (1992) reflect on lifelong learning as sponsored by academic institutions. Their book aims to extend continuing education to an already large and growing number of older Americans. The authors point out that several ad hoc arrangements have already arisen on the margins of academic institutions to satisfy this apparent demand, including tuition waiver programs for seniors, Elderhostel programs, alumni colleges and ILRs.

Fischer et al. cite the demographic fact of the aging of American society and the corresponding need for response by the academy. They also discuss the growth of
education as a “leisure” activity. They even predicted the development of ULRCs, stating their belief that as elder learners grow in number, position, and influence, suitable “on-campus” residential options may be designed and provided for them. As continuing educators, the authors discuss a growing aspect of their field—launching new ideas at the margins of their institutions, and the establishment of permanent programs, when these endeavors are found to be worthwhile.

Fischer et al. believe that the emergence of the “young elderly” has brought to light a significant group of people who can continue to participate in society after retirement. They see a role for higher education to act as a catalyst for mobilizing these people for productive roles in society for the 20 or 30 years of life after retirement. The authors also believe that colleges and universities have a responsibility to foster diversity in intellectual, cultural, and social life by educating students of all ages about aging and ageism.

Fischer, Blazey, & Lipman make an effective case that higher education has the responsibility of fostering the effective use of society’s limited resources by reducing older adults’ need for health and social services. They argue that mental stimulation has a positive correlation to improved physical health and well-being and refer to research showing that learning increases the strength of nerve transmission and changes the physical properties of cerebral nerve endings. Since some studies also correlate the maintenance of mental vigor with the capacity to survive, Fischer, Blazey, and Lipman argue that lifelong learning can be an important life extender.

Leptak (1989) offers a useful compendium on the research on older adults in higher education. Much of the research in this review is drawn from the field of
gerontology and is fairly new, beginning around 1975 with the publication of the first volume of the journal *Educational Gerontology*.

The research indicates that many common assumptions about older adults in higher education are fallacious. Older students neither require nor expect special services. The research shows that the older adults who enroll in higher education are generally well educated already, in good health, and have few financial problems. They enroll for personal satisfaction and intellectual stimulation, tending towards traditional liberal arts courses. Almost all of the literature notes the older adults’ interest in learning for its own sake. At this late stage of life, few adults have any vocational needs, so they are free to pursue learning for its intrinsic value.

A great deal of research has been devoted to studying the tuition fee waiver programs available to senior citizens throughout the country. Policies vary widely from state to state. The minimum age ranges from sixty to sixty-five; some institutions offer credit, while others allow auditing only. Many states limit enrollment on a space available basis only. It was assumed that many older adults would take advantage of this economical opportunity, but that has not happened. Leptak indicates that some researchers have noted that the special requirements attached to the fee waiver programs make older adults feel like second class citizens, which is a disincentive to enroll. The fee waiver itself suggests that the older adults are somehow inadequate or incapable of paying the fees. The common auditing requirement suggests that the older adults are incapable of real college level work.
Leptak points out that, at the time of his book, there had been little published qualitative research on older adults in higher education. He encourages researchers to conduct more qualitative research.

Bynum, L. & Seaman, M. (1993) conducted a study to identify and understand the underlying motivational orientations of older learners, in what they refer to as learning-in-retirement (LIR) institutes. The researchers administered a questionnaire to 452 older adults enrolled in six LIR institutes representative of LIR models in the southeastern United States. The data present a profile of LIR learners as members of a relatively high economic status group with extensive formal educational backgrounds. Four components from the data were chosen and identified as self-actualization, perceived cognitive gaps, intellectual curiosity, and social contact. The intellectual curiosity component was found to be the strongest motivator for LIR participants. This conclusion suggests that an intellectually stimulating curriculum is a pivotal factor in predicting the success and appeal of LIR programs.

Swindell & Vassella (1997) examined University of the Third Age (U3A) programs in Australia and New Zealand through data collected from 126 groups in Australia and 20 in New Zealand. The authors determined that U3As were extremely effective adult education organizations that have grown rapidly in both countries, with no coordination and assistance and little formal external support or funding. The authors explored a number of tentative links between the intellectual challenges and social networks provided by U3As and well-being, and estimated the monetary value of the U3A movement in Australia and New Zealand to exceed $4 million (Australian) annually.
Swindell, R. (1997) suggests that an aging population and growing competition for limited resources may increase the onus on older adults to maximize their own well-being. The author refers to recent literature that speculates that it may be possible for older people to improve, or at least maintain, aspects of their health by engaging in stimulating mental activity. If that is the case, Swindell argues that self-funding adult education organizations like the U3A are contributing, not only to the well-being of members, but also to the national economy. Swindell encourages the independent U3A groups to develop a more outward-looking focus if they are to continue to meet the needs of existing aging cohorts. Swindell sees electronic networking as one way to expand the reach of these learning communities.

Overall, there is considerable evidence to suggest that lifelong learning programs offer significant benefits for older Americans, and that institutions of higher education are one place in which this learning may occur. Society benefits when older Americans are empowered and engaged, and universities are uniquely positioned to facilitate this intellectual involvement. For this to happen, however, university administrators would have to reconsider traditional assumptions about the role of their institutions and the populations they should serve. This senior learning may occur in the traditional college classroom, or in affiliated age-segregated programs such as ILRs. The research on age-segregated programs indicate that these programs can be successful and self-supporting, and can even reduce the need for certain forms of expensive, taxpayer-financed social programming.
Universities and Joint Ventures

University-linked retirement communities represent more than merely an opportunity for universities to extend academic or health-related services to seniors. They are also a way for land-rich, resource-poor institutions to utilize land holdings for revenue. Hunt (1984), points out that revenue diversification is a worthy goal for universities to pursue in support of their academic mission. Because universities are not in the business of running retirement communities, however, they are likely to enter into a “joint venture” with an established management firm and/or continuing care provider to develop and manage a ULRC.

While university-sponsored retirement communities may seem like an entirely novel enterprise, in fact, they build upon a history of joint ventures between universities and private corporations. In recent decades, universities have entered into such business relationships as sponsoring a certain soft drink on campus, licensing their logos, or lending their names to a business park. Joint venture relationships between campus and industry can take a multitude of forms and cover a variety of activities, including real estate enterprises. Several works deal generally with the issue of joint real estate ventures by universities. Most of these articles pre-date ULRCs, however.

McDonald (1984), Vice President and General Council of Duke University during the 1980s, uses the term "joint ventures" in the general sense—not with the strict legal denotation of a corporate partnership—to describe campus-sponsored business activities. McDonald sees a joint venture as a "mutually satisfactory and financially beneficial undertaking with an independent business interest. Often there are other than financial
objectives for the relationship, such as currying prospective donors, students, trustees, or community leaders. But the principal goal is financial gain" (p. 50).

Duke University, for example, has been involved in several real estate joint ventures. In some of these projects, investment was important but not necessarily the sole, or even primary, objective. Other projects were undertaken exclusively for investment purposes. McDonald describes ventures ranging from a racquetball club to a hotel to office buildings. Some of these projects add to the university’s assets, while other projects are undertaken strictly to generate revenue.

According to McDonald, real estate joint ventures frequently offer opportunities for institutions to deploy and leverage their unused land in order to reap financial returns—sometimes without investment of new funds.

Hughes, Stein, & Klein (1991) point out that more and more colleges and universities have turned underutilized land into working assets by entering the commercial real estate market in recent years. Resulting projects include university-sponsored research parks with commercial laboratories, high-rise office building, industrial parks, market-oriented housing complexes, hotels, conference centers, and shopping malls (p. 31).

Hughes et al. expect that some of the best future projects likely will be what they term "hybrid"—i.e., combining two distinct purposes: generating revenues and supporting the institutional mission. Traditional, or pure revenue-generating, projects may be managed efficiently using a profit/loss motive to maximize returns while minimizing risk. "Hybrid" projects, however, will create special challenges, along with potentially larger rewards. These projects may require consensus-building among faculty,
administration, and, sometimes, alumni to undertake the project. They may also require a less efficient, more participatory management style with much greater input from faculty and administration (p. 31).

Hughes et al. also point out that colleges and universities have another motivation for real estate development that goes beyond the bottom line. Higher education institutions play a direct role in the economic development of their communities, and can work in conjunction with city governments and local businesses to create more jobs. The authors cite a 1989 survey by the National League of Cities which indicates the perception that sharing of economic development projects between higher education institutions and their surrounding communities is a "leading area of unrealized potential" (p. 32).

Universities embarking on real estate development and other income-producing endeavors seek revenue diversification. This is a goal supported by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education. An ideabook sponsored by CASE points out that diversification of revenue sources is a priority for all institutions of higher education, public and private, and suggests that a sound diversification program can and should enhance an institution's overall educational mission (Hunt, 1984). The most obvious contribution diversification can make is to generate discretionary income which can be used to strengthen research and institutional programs. But renting or leasing underutilized land can yield other benefits in addition to income; it can also strengthen linkages to the community, to other institutions, and to businesses (Hunt, 1984, p. 1-2.). Hence, ULRCs offer the opportunity for universities to expand their ties to alumni, and to develop additional "friends" of the institution.
The point that diversification can be inherently compatible with educational mission should be reassuring to administrators planning a housing community comprised of constituents as valuable to an institution as its alumni. Developing university land holdings to create income-producing ventures is a worthwhile goal for universities to pursue. Certain projects, including ULRCs, offer the potential not merely to produce revenue, but to advance a university’s mission and priorities, as well. This potential may never be achieved, however, if the project is conceived of solely as a profit-making endeavor. Consensus building plays a vital role in creating the vision required to maximize the potential inherent in projects such as ULRCs.

ULRCs and Institutional Mission

Universities contemplating or attempting the addition of a ULRC must typically justify the effort in terms of their institution’s mission, if only to the institution’s board of trustees. While a ULRC may bring financial resources to the university (and nothing else), ideally, the community will also serve to expand the institution’s overall tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service. The three institutions studied in this dissertation are public research institutions and two of them (Integrated and High Integration University) are land-grant universities. Several works address the traditional “land-grant” mission and public service orientation of state universities.

Veysey (1965) describes the development of American universities, including those land-grant institutions that owe their origins and missions to the Morrill Act of 1865. Veysey examines the competing goals, such as discipline, piety, utility and research, that animate universities and which universities must inevitably seek to
reconcile. Veysey asserts that the traditions of discipline and piety “gave to the ideal of public service its strong moral sense” (p. 55). He also ascribes an emphasis on public service among universities to the post-Civil War rise of the “newly energetic state universities, [where] emphasis on public service was enforced by the peculiar position of the president in relation to the legislature and other non-academic pressure groups” (p. 61). Veysey suggests that the Progressive Era, which “brought with it the expectation of prominently displayed altruistic motives in all lines of endeavor” (p. 124) may have affected university notions on the importance of public service.

Geiger (1986, 1993) has written a two-volume history of the American research university from 1900-1980. Building on the work of Veysey, Geiger details the immense practical contributions of research universities in responding to pressing, societal concerns. Geiger also discusses how universities attempt to balance the demands of their research activities with other institutional commitments. This history enumerates how American universities have been called upon many times to help solve societal problems. The second volume, in particular, addresses ways in which universities have attempted to become self-supporting in light of dwindling public support. Geiger documents decreasing state enrollments per dollar of tuition revenue, which resulted in the increasing “privatization” of public institutions. Describing the economic realities which began to weigh heavily on universities during the 1980s, Geiger points out that, “universities could no longer rely upon enrollment growth, state governments, or federal agencies to find the additional resources needed to accommodate the inherent expansiveness of their intellectual activities. With few other alternatives, universities increasingly turned to the private sector” (p. 311). During this period, the chief areas in
which universities sought to develop new sources of revenue were through nurturing new industries in research parks, and by obtaining equity in start-up firms based on the results of university research. According to Geiger, “during the 1980s university attitudes toward commercial relationships changed markedly” (p. 316). The greatest change of this era, however, “occurred in university attitudes towards standards of appropriate institutional behavior in commercial relationships” (p. 317). As Geiger describes,

An inherent tension nevertheless existed between the commercial activities into which universities ventured and the disinterested pursuit of teaching and learning for which they ineluctably stood. At its worst, this tension amounted to outright conflicts of interest that could impair the judgment of institutions and undermine public trust in their principal mission. . .Almost uniformly, however, universities in the 1980s made the judgment that the inducements to commercial activities outweighed the possible risks to their core academic roles (p. 320).

As publicly accountable institutions, state universities must continually balance the commercial activities in which they choose to engage with the competing aspects of their unique missions.

Dominick (1990) provides a case study of one institution’s efforts to revise its institutional mission and the immense amount of consensus-building required by this effort. Dominick points out that textbook discussions of institutional mission usually treat the subject as the sum of three components—teaching, research, and service—and that large, public universities usually embrace all three as equally important elements of their mission. Dominick also points out that is should not be surprising that similar institutions describe their missions in similar ways, since universities share many goals in common, despite differences in their circumstances or heritage.

Dyer (1999) provides a useful discussion of the land-grant traditions and the role of outreach in American universities. Dyer points out that land-grant colleges, despite
their rocky start, formed the basis for a utilitarian, democratic system of higher education that was unique in a worldwide context. He notes that the antebellum colleges bequeathed to their land-grant descendants a powerful emphasis on democracy and on the broadening of student access. Dyer states that democratic access and utilitarianism form the two primary pillars of the land-grant tradition. At the turn of the century, these ideals were subsumed by Progressive Era ideals of a university that would “engage” society. Dyer also points out that any history of the American land-grant university must consider the ways in which economic and corporate forces have shaped “outreach.”

Dyer points out the difficulties of defining “outreach” and questions whether applied research, clinical activities, and university profit centers qualify for the label. Dyer also points out the problems of definition in seeking a single label that will comprehensively designate those activities performed under the umbrella term “outreach and public service.” He offers a semantical discussion of terms such as “extension” (which he sees as having been appropriated by agricultural forces), and Cooperative Extension. Dyer suggests that even the term “land-grant” is beset with connotations, and that while insiders may speak of the land-grant tradition, the spirit of land-grant, and the land-grant idea, these terms have little meaning to the general public.

In very recent times, the term “engaged university” has gained usage to describe the many ways that institutions of higher learning connect with society. Dyer acknowledges the contributions of the late Ernest Boyer, who coined the phrase “the scholarship of application” —meant to convey the notion that academics can and should apply their skills outside the academy.
Dyer suggests that one might draw the definitional boundary for the term “outreach” at the door of the traditional classroom. ULRCs, with their emphasis on sharing university resources with a new population, certainly fall under the heading of “outreach.” He proposes that service is the “integrated application of knowledge through research, teaching, and technical assistance to solve problems confronting an ever-changing and increasingly complex society” (p. 61). Service, says Dyer, is principally involved in the identification, development, and rendering of educational and technical services to individuals, communities, organizations, and public agencies. Dyer sees service activities as basically oriented to the life-related and public-policy needs of society. According to Dyer, service activities are problem-centered, rather than subject-centered, and rely heavily upon integrating subject matter from many disciplines with experiences in the world of work, adult life, and human development. The problem-centered approach of outreach stands in stark contrast to the subject-centered world of the classroom.

Defining a university’s mission, and its proper application, is an ongoing and never-ending process, as universities both help form, and are formed by, society. As the aging of American society becomes a reality, institutions of higher education will need to ask themselves what role, if any, they will play in addressing this societal issue, and how this role will fit in with their institution’s mission.

Journalistic Accounts of ULRCs

Much of the current literature on ULRCs is popular (journalistic), and not scholarly, in nature. These articles tend to be “nostalgia” pieces, aimed at aging Baby
Boomers looking for a place to retire, and reporting on the phenomenon of a particular retirement community based in a university town. These articles describe the experiences of senior citizens who have retired near a college or university, and the types of university activities they may choose to pursue (Boss, 1999; Mangan, 1994; Manheimer, 2001a; 2001c; Tyre, 2002).

Most of these articles do not take the university’s point of view into account. An exception is Fitzgerald (1999), who codified information on several different types of partnerships between retirement communities and nearby colleges and universities. She divides the communities into three categories that she calls “working relationships”: campus-owned facilities; formal partnerships; and informal partnerships. Fitzgerald cites the Village by the Arboretum, a 600-home community owned by the University of Guelph in Ontario, as an example of a campus-owned facility. The three communities studied here would fall under Fitzgerald’s heading of “formal partnerships,” which she defines as involving “a limited financial or marketing arrangement between a campus and a retirement facility” (pp. 39-40). These categories begin to blur, however, when the community is located on land owned by the university, as is the case with Affiliated University and Integrated University. Informal partnerships include those situations where there’s a strong association between the academic institution and a community but there’s no formal organizational or financial link. She offers several examples of informal partnerships with retirement communities, such as Longview at Ithaca, and several communities operated by the Kendal Corporation. She also offers suggestions to administrators considering the establishment of a retirement community at their institution.
Manheimer (2001b) points out that the mere proximity of a retirement community to a college or university is no guarantee of interaction between the two entities, and encourages potential residents to assess the level of actual interaction between the community, and the nearby university, before moving in.

**Academic Research on ULRCs**

University of Michigan Architecture Professor Leon Pastalan (1994) has written the only academic book on the subject of ULRCs. He approaches the subject as a professor of architecture, drawing upon the work of students in a two-term course on aging and the environment. Pastalan focuses on the theoretical and practical design aspects of a retirement community created as an integral part of a university, and includes student conceptions of the forms such a community might take.

Pastalan is currently conducting a nationwide survey to compile a directory of existing alumni-oriented retirement communities in the United States. A summary of the unpublished results from his national survey indicates the following:

- Of 477 questionnaires sent to randomized colleges and universities, 151 replied for a response rate of 31.66%.
- 58 replied that they do not have programs or other activities for seniors.
- 28 said they have programs and activities, access to libraries, computers, and other equipment plus cultural and athletic events, but no residential arrangements for seniors on or near campus.
- 5 replied that they not only provide programs and events, but also have provided land and/or financing for a retirement community on or near campus through joint venturing with a private developer.
• 6 provide the same as above but have used their own land and financing, and manage these facilities by themselves.

• 8 have made a commitment to have such communities on their campus within 5 years.

• 37 are conducting formal feasibility studies to determine if such a community on their campus is viable.

• 9 said they were thinking about the possibility or wanted more information on the subject from the researchers.

Pastalan was particularly struck by the fact that 37 colleges and universities are currently doing serious feasibility work on the topic (Personal communication, June 4, 2002).

Pastalan is also conducting a longitudinal study (taking data every 6 months) at University Commons, a retirement community located near the University of Michigan. According to the community’s website, University Commons was developed “exclusively for retired faculty and alumni of the University of Michigan.” This community has no official connection to the university, however. Of this population, Pastalan reports that 70.6 percent are married (which he considers to be a huge percentage for a retirement community); 80% have post-graduate degrees; 93% report their health status as good or very good; 15% still work and 62% volunteer for a large number of activities. Almost 40% give guest lectures, mentor students, offer courses, serve as docents at local museums, etc., and 88% use the computer at least 10 hours a week. Eighty-eight percent are satisfied or very satisfied with the nature of the community, its opportunities and its services, but particularly view the connection to the university in a very positive light (Personal communication, June 4, 2002). A
comparison of these responses to the perceptions of this community by the couple in the introduction, reveals how amorphous the concept of “connection” to a university can be.

At Cornell University, the Bronfenbrenner Life Course Center has been actively conducting longitudinal data collection with over 800 senior citizens in the surrounding county since 1995. Many of these seniors live in “Kendal at Ithaca”—a retirement community founded by emeritus professors and located on land provided by Cornell University (but operated by the Kendal Corporation of Kennett Square, PA). The Pathways to Life Quality study is designed to promote understanding of patterns of housing choices and residential transitions over the life course. This project has resulted in numerous publications on senior housing and aging which can be found in a detailed bibliography at their website: www.pathwayslifequality.org/bibliography.html. This project has also created many working papers, and has numerous studies currently in progress.

This interdisciplinary research focuses on older people’s health and well-being and seeks to promote understanding of the various residential and lifestyle pathways leading to successful aging. It does not approach the subject of university-affiliated retirement communities from the university’s point of view, but rather as one possible housing choice for the seniors in the study. This project began as a small, satisfaction study of residents at “Kendal at Ithaca,” before the community even opened its doors. It has since evolved into a long-term study involving seniors and their different housing choices.

The original survey of Kendal residents was the first to look at the expectations of residents before and after their move to the CCRC, in an attempt to learn about the
impact of residential transitions. In this study, residents reported very high levels of satisfaction with the community. This study also indicates that residents’ social participation (defined as volunteering or being a member of a social, political, or service club or organization) increased considerably after their move to Kendal. Volunteerism increased from 61% to 79% and group membership increased from 55% to 67%.

Residents also reported that the need for continuing care was a vital factor in nearly every resident’s decision to make the move to the CCRC (Kendal Progress Report, May 1998. Available: http://www.pathwayslifequality.org). Many of the other ongoing studies of the Pathways to Life Quality Project involve following the residential choices made by senior citizens as they age, and the social integration they perceive when they choose to make the move to a CCRC (Pillemer, Moen, Wethington, & Glasgow, 2000). In Erickson, Dempster-McClain, Whitlow, & Moen (2000), the authors examined data from interviews with 101 individuals who relocated to a CCRC near a major university. The variable of interest—perceived social integration—was measured by having respondents complete a four-item Social Integration survey. The results showed emphatically that moving to a CCRC appears to enhance the social integration of residents. New residents visit more with neighbors and volunteer more than prior to their relocation. The authors contend that “taking charge of one’s last major residential move by relocating to a continuing care retirement community provides more than guaranteed health care. It also offers availability and accessibility to important ways to remain connected as one ages” (p. 224).

The Pathways to Life Quality Research demonstrates the value of communal living in enhancing the social integration of residents. The research uses, as its basic unit
of analysis, the individual retiree. There is a notable lack of research on retirement communities that uses the organization (the ULRC) as the unit of analysis. The current base of literature pertaining to ULRCs is inadequate for the purpose of informing practitioners involved with these new communities. While some quantitative research is underway, basic descriptive research and theory-generating research are needed to begin to build a useful research base on this topic.
Chapter Three: Procedures

Research Design Overview

This research is a qualitative, collective case study of three ULRCs at large, public, research institutions. This study follows the descriptions for case study research as described by Stake (1995) and Merriam (1997), who outline basic procedures for the conduct of qualitative inquiry. The work of Miles and Huberman (1994), on building graphical representations from qualitative research, informed the creation of figures for this study.

Because this investigation includes the development of aggregate themes from the gathered information, I also rely on the work of Eisenhardt (1989) on building theory from case study research. Eisenhardt describes the process of building theory using case studies, which she says is particularly well-suited to new topic areas (like ULRCs) (1989, p. 532). According to Eisenhardt, the “development of theory is a central activity in organizational research. Traditionally, authors have developed theory by combining observations from previous literature, common sense, and experience. However, the tie to actual data has often been tenuous” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 532). This study attempts to build theoretical constructs inductively from data collected from three ULRCs. These theoretical constructs are presented in a Model of Institutional Integration that seeks to explain how a university can effectively organize its relationship with a ULRC to advance institutional aims.

This research employs layers of analysis on multiple cases (Eisenhardt, p. 534). First, I seek to discover why universities are becoming involved in developing university-
linked retirement communities—a descriptive goal. Second, I seek to identify the organizational links that connect a university and its affiliated retirement community—an analytical goal. Finally, the researcher seeks to determine how these links are related to the advancement of the institutional mission—an interpretive goal.

Theory

This study draws from the organizational theory of resource dependence, as described by Pfeffer and Salancik (1978). Resource dependence theory asserts that no organization generates all the resources necessary for its own goal attainment or survival and hence must enter into exchanges with other organizations, thereby becoming more interdependent. Organizations must also determine the nature and scope of their domain and define their boundaries. The incorporation of an outside entity (such as a ULRC) into the university organization constitutes a redefinition of boundaries and creates uncertainty. In order to manage the uncertainty, organizations may choose to create and employ specific control mechanisms—described as “bridging strategies”—to maintain coordination between the two entities. Alumni constitute a valuable resource base for universities. From a resource dependence standpoint, incorporating this constituency under the university “umbrella” through a ULRC makes sense for the university’s economic and political survival.

Resource dependence theory informed this research in the development of initial interview protocols, the formation of hypotheses in this research, and the Model of Institutional Integration, which is also based on the themes that emerged from this research.
The Initial Interview Protocol, which follows, was based on the research questions and the theoretical constructs expected (based on resource dependence theory). As Eisenhardt (1989) describes, “a priori specification of constructs can help to shape the initial design of theory-building research” (p. 536). A potential hazard in drawing from existing theory is that exclusive focus on these constructs may influence or undermine a clear, unbiased interpretation of the facts as they reveal themselves. However, “If these constructs prove important as the study progresses, then researchers have a firmer empirical grounding for the emergent theory” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 536). The important thing for the researcher to remember is that, although it may be helpful to identify possible constructs early in the research, it is vital to recognize that constructs are tentative until validated by the data.

Eisenhardt asserts that.

Finally and most importantly, theory-building research is begun as close as possible to the ideal of no theory under consideration and no hypotheses to test. Admittedly, it is impossible to achieve this ideal of a clean theoretical slate. Nonetheless, attempting to approach this ideal is important because preordained theoretical perspectives or propositions may bias and limit the findings. Thus, investigators should formulate a research problem and possibly specify some potentially important variables, with some reference to extant literature. However, they should avoid thinking about specific relationships between variables and theories as much as possible, especially at the outset of the process (1989, p. 536).

Thus, resource dependence theory helped to guide the questions asked in this research and the direction of initial data gathering. As data gathering proceeded, however, emphasis was placed on following the trail of emerging information.
Initial Interview Protocol

Time of Interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
Position of interviewee:

(Briefly describe the project). The purpose of this project is to learn about retirement communities that are linked to universities. I am particularly interested in the ways in which the retirement community is officially connected to the university, and the ways in which this connection will advance the institution’s mission.

Questions:

Why did (Your Institution) Decide to Develop a University-Linked Retirement Community?

When and how did the idea for the URLC originate?

How long has this idea been in the works? What hurdles did this project have to overcome?

What were the benefits expected from establishing this URLC? Have these benefits materialized? What problems were anticipated? Did these materialize?

What type of background research did you have to do for this project? Who was involved?

How is this project financed?

Was it necessary to engage in consensus building in support of this project?

What is the business arrangement?

What departments/areas of the university are affected by/involved with this community?

What organizational links are there between the community and the academic side of the university? Other areas of the university?

How does this community support and enhance institutional mission?

Any other individuals/departments I should contact that I haven't identified? Anything I forgot to ask that you'd like to add?
Population

The population for this research consists of three ULRCs at large, public, research universities. Two of these institutions (Integrated University and High Integration University) are also land-grant institutions. Because ULRCs are such a new type of community, there are currently few suitable sites available for study. When building theory from case studies, cases are not selected randomly, but are chosen deliberately to fill theoretical categories or provide examples of variations of a concept (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 537). These three cases were selected because of the differences perceived to exist in the level of interaction between each ULRC and its associated university. Given the limited number of cases which can usually be studied, Eisenhardt recommends selecting cases such as extreme situations or polar types within which the process of interest (in this case, the level of interaction) is transparently observable. This strategy of “maximum variation” increases the probability that the cases represent a continuum of integration with the university (1989, p. 537).

In this study, Affiliated University represents a ULRC with relatively low institutional integration, High Integration University represents a ULRC with very high integration, and the level of integration of Integrated University's ULRC rests somewhere in between. These sites were also chosen because of the likelihood that their ULRCs would serve as models for other institutions contemplating the addition of a ULRC, the willingness of their administrators to participate in the study, and their accessibility to the researcher.

Affiliated University’s ULRC was one of the first in the country to be officially linked to a major university; it has been in existence for over ten years. It is an
established and mature community that is operated by a nationally-known hotel
management chain. Although the ULRC is officially linked to the university through the
hospital system, few other linkages currently exist. It is composed of 220 independent
living units, both cottages and apartments, and houses about 250 residents. Affiliated
University is the only university in this study that is not a land-grant institution.

Integrated University’s ULRC has been in the planning stages for about five
years, and construction has recently begun. The brainchild of the university’s president,
the ULRC at Integrated University hopes to offer unique opportunities for residents to
become involved in university life. The current phase of the community will include 150
units, plus common space and a 36-bed Health Care Center. Eventually, the developers
would like to build 271 units.

The ULRC at High Integration University is the largest of the three projects in
this study. Construction of this community has recently begun. This community will offer
unprecedented opportunities for resident involvement with university life, and currently
has forged sustaining linkages with every department on campus. This project involved
faculty members in the design of the facility, and the community will offer numerous,
luxurious amenities. The ULRC at High Integration University has already begun to offer
programming for residents, including an Institute for Learning in Retirement, a Speaker’s
Series on Aging, and a Book Club. The ULRC at HIU is expected to house about 450
residents.

Pseudonyms are used for the universities and identifying descriptive data are
disguised, in keeping with recommendations for the conduct of human subject research.
Interview subjects are identified by title, rather than by name.
Data Collection

Data collection in this research combines several procedures, including archival research, interviews, site visits, and observations, as is customary for case study research (Creswell 1998; Stake, 1995; Merriam, 1988). Materials reviewed in this research include websites, promotional materials, documents, reports, and news stories. These published materials supplement interviews with university administrators involved with creating these ULRCs. The use of multiple sources of data allows the researcher to look at the same information through various lenses, and strengthens the grounding of theory. Creswell, (1998), among others, describes the use of multiple and different sources, procedures, investigators, and theories as “triangulation.” Triangulation provides corroborating evidence from different sources to shed light on a theme or perspective (p. 202). The triangulation made possible by multiple data collection methods provides stronger substantiation of constructs and hypotheses (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 538).

Case study research is an iterative process making use of multiple methods and sources of data collection, and involves a frequent overlap of data analysis with data collection. As themes emerged and concepts became clearer, the researcher regularly shared and clarified developing impressions with informants. The researcher also used field notes, to keep track of impressions, emerging concepts, and their possible relationships. Data collection remained flexible and additions or adjustments were made to data collection instruments (such as the interview protocol), as research proceeded, to clarify developing concepts and their apparent relationships (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 539).
Sampling procedures

Interviews were conducted with key administrators at each site. Creswell (1998), in discussing subject identification in case study research, describes a “gatekeeper” as the source providing or controlling access to the most useful information at a particular site. To identify the “gatekeeper” or “lead person” at each institution, I began by doing background research of public information on the communities. This led to conjecture as to which university departments and administrators were most likely to be involved with each ULRC. To identify possible interview subjects, I contacted members of the appropriate university divisions representing Alumni Affairs, Business Affairs, Development, and University Foundations. In each case, responses yielded the identity of a “lead person” or “gatekeeper” at each school, as well as other potential interview subjects. Many expected interview subjects were eliminated, due to their lack of involvement with the retirement community. In each case, the identified “gatekeeper” willingly agreed to be what I have termed the “key informant.” Other administrators contributed additional information, and helped to corroborate or interpret developing impressions. Because each school is organized differently, the location, or title, of the lead person varies from school to school. I began by interviewing the “lead” person at each institution and then continued on to interview other relevant parties, until I reached the more marginally-involved administrators. Interviews continued until additional contacts failed to add significant information.

At two of the schools (Integrated University and High Integration University), the researcher interviewed Alumni, Development, and Business Affairs administrators first. At one school (Affiliated University), the lead administrator heads the Real Estate
Foundation for the School. A key interview sampling procedure involved probing each contact to identify other potential interview subjects. Data collection proceeded to encompass representatives from university agencies with marginal involvement with the ULRCs, including a Director of an Institute on Aging, and a Dean of the College of Nursing.

This research includes information from interviews with the following list of contacts. Several of these administrators bear multiple titles and roles. For instance, several serve as university administrators and also serve on the independent Board of Directors for their respective ULRC. For the sake of conciseness, throughout this report, these interview sources will be identified by the first title listed below:

List of Interviews

Affiliated University (AU):

Key Informant: CEO of the Affiliated University Real Estate Foundation and the Affiliated University Foundation.
Executive Director of the Alumni Association of Affiliated University.
Executive Director, Health Sciences Foundation.
Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer.
University Treasurer.
Director of Community Relations at the ULRC at Affiliated University.
Director of the ULRC at Affiliated University.

Integrated University (IU):

Key Informant: President of nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at IU; Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations.
Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer;
member of Nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at IU.
President of Development Corporation for ULRC at IU; former senior Vice President of Administration at Integrated University.

High Integration University (HIU):
Key Informant: Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU; Associate Vice President for Administration, High Integration University Foundation.
Assistant Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs Real Estate.
Dean of the College of Nursing and member of nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU.
Dean of the College of Health Professions and Secretary of Nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU.
Dean of Residents at ULRC at HIU.
Communications and Outreach Manager, HIU Institute on Aging.

Analysis of Data.

In qualitative, theory-building research, it is often difficult to describe the path a researcher takes to move from a mountain of data to results and conclusions. As Eisenhardt (1989) points out, “Analyzing data is the heart of building theory from case studies, but it is both the most difficult and the least codified part of the process.” (p. 539). As the researcher collected raw data for this study in the form of taped interviews, written reports, news releases, personal communications, or other written or electronic material, it was classified by school, reviewed, and beginning impressions began to form. As collection proceeded, new questions and gaps emerged which required returning to “the field” for clarification and additional data. Data gathering proceeded, replicating and triangulating as needed to validate key observations, until saturation was reached. Saturation is defined as the point at which additional inquiries failed to yield significant, new information. Analysis occurs when the researcher searches for patterns among the collected data. Stake describes this as a search for “correspondence,” or “consistency within certain conditions” (p. 78). In qualitative, case study research, this analysis frequently overlaps and coincides with data gathering. The researcher transcribed recorded interviews. The process of transcription and multiple reviews of the data sets
familiarized the researcher with the unique stories of each school, so that the case studies, or within-case analyses, could be written for each ULRC. Eisenhardt (1989) considers the within-case analysis to be a crucial, early component in the analytical process: “The importance of within-case analysis is driven by one of the realities of case study research: a staggering volume of data. . .Within-case analysis can help investigators cope with this deluge of data” (p. 540). Within-case analyses are generally pure description; nonetheless, “they are central to the generation of insight because they help researchers to cope early in the analysis process with the often enormous volume of data”. (p. 540).

In preparing the within-case analyses, four categories emerged that each school held in common. Thus, the three case studies are divided into the following categories: Background (story of the ULRC); Finances; Organization; and Links to the University. This process, aside from allowing the researcher (and reader) to become familiar with each individual case, also allows the uniqueness of each ULRC to become apparent. As Eisenhardt (1989) states, “This process allows the unique patterns of each case to emerge before investigators push to generalize patterns across cases” (p. 540). This familiarity with unique patterns accelerates cross-case comparison.

In searching for cross-case patterns, Eisenhardt advises that it is useful to look at the data in many divergent ways. Some of this analysis is coupled with the process of within-case analysis. One tactic is to select contrasting cases and then to “list the similarities and differences between each pair”. In this report, sections on Similarities and Differences follow the case studies. This information is then summarized in a Comparison Chart (Table 1). According to Eisenhardt, this tactic forces researchers to look for the subtle similarities and differences between cases.
The result of these forced comparisons can be new categories and concepts which the investigators did not anticipate. Overall, the idea behind these cross-case searching tactics is to force investigators to go beyond initial impressions, especially through the use of structured and diverse lenses on the data. These tactics improve the likelihood of accurate and reliable theory, that is, a theory with a close fit with the data (pp. 540-541).

The juxtaposition of seemingly similar cases by a researcher looking for differences can break simplistic frames. In the same way, the search for similarity in a seemingly different pair can also lead to a more sophisticated understanding.

The process of shaping hypotheses builds from this point. According to Eisenhardt,

From the within-site analysis plus various cross-site tactics and overall impressions, tentative themes, concepts, and possibly even relationships between variables begin to emerge. The next step of this highly iterative process is to compare systematically the emergent frame with the evidence from each case in order to assess how well or poorly it fits with case data. The central idea is that researchers constantly compare theory and data—iterating toward a theory which closely fits the data. A close fit is important to building good theory because it takes advantage of the new insights possible from the data and yields an empirically valid theory (p. 541).

Eisenhardt acknowledges that the process of shaping hypotheses described in her research has similarities with the work of others, and points out that, “Overall, shaping hypotheses in theory-building research involves measuring constructs and verifying relationships. . .The process also involves converging on construct definitions, measures, and a framework for structuring the findings” (pp. 545-546).

In interpreting the ULRC data, the researcher also found it helpful to draw from the work of Strauss & Corbin (1990). Strauss & Corbin offer specific techniques for analyzing data, which they term coding. Coding involves searching through documents and data texts for salient categories of information that are supported by the text. These
categories were circled and named on the texts in initial coding. Later, they were codified on computer. As categories of information are identified, additional texts are searched for further documentation of existing categories, and for new categories. This involves reviewing the data sets several times, because as new categories emerge, the researcher must review previous data for evidence of the newly identified category. This process is termed open coding and continues until no new categories can be identified, and each category is “saturated” with examples drawn from the data. When these categories are compiled, certain qualities become apparent. Some categories may turn out to be sub-categories of another category, and these can be combined. Some categories will assume greater importance than others, or will have more data to support them. Relationships between the categories may also reveal themselves. Strauss & Corbin are unique in describing the importance of the “central phenomenon”—the one category that is of primary interest. The job of the researcher is to identify this central phenomenon, and then to consider the ways in which the other categories are related to it. (Strauss & Corbin describe the process of identifying relationships between the categories revealed in open coding as “axial coding”). In this study, the use of Strauss & Corbin’s coding procedures was enormously helpful in constructing the Model of Institutional Integration. The “central phenomenon” in the model is institutional integration—the congruence of the ULRC’s goals and activities with the university’s mission and aims—and the other categories in the model demonstrate how this can be achieved.

The analysis of the data is presented mostconcisely in the Model of Institutional Integration (Fig. 2). This model presents the salient categories that emerged from analysis of the data, and depicts the relationships perceived to exist between them. These
categories are then examined in more detail, in Chapter Four. Examples drawn from the data and rich description are used to illuminate and expound upon the themes.

**Validation of Data**

Qualitative research strives to achieve an accurate understanding of complex natural phenomena and to convey a faithful analysis and interpretation. While there can be no “true” or “correct” account of a phenomenon, many techniques can be employed to establish the essential validity of the data collected in a qualitative study. Triangulation of data, member checks, and the use of thorough description are all important aspects useful in validating qualitative research.

According to Creswell (1998), in triangulation, researchers make use of “multiple and different sources, procedures, and theories to provide corroborating evidence. Typically, this process involves corroborating evidence from different sources to shed light on a theme or perspective” (p. 202). This study not only relies on multiple forms of data, but employs multiple cases, as well. This offers further substantiation, as “Each case is analogous to an experiment, and multiple cases are analogous to multiple experiments” (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 542). The researcher also relied upon multiple informants at each school. By employing different analytical procedures, such as within-case and cross-case analyses, and the coding of texts, the researcher subjected the data texts to scrutiny from various angles, which improves the validity of the findings.

Member checks are another important element of establishing validity. “In member checks, the researcher solicits informants’ views of the credibility of the findings and interpretations” (Creswell, 1998, p. 202). During this inquiry, the researcher shared
data and emerging hypotheses with the key informants and other participants to establish accuracy and validity. The researcher sent transcriptions of interviews to informants to confirm accuracy, and analyses were shared with key informants to verify information and impressions.

Finally, the researcher uses rich description and numerous examples and quotations drawn from the data texts to establish validity. “Rich, thick description allows the reader to make decisions regarding transferability because the writer describes in detail the participants or setting under study. With such detailed description, the researcher enables readers to transfer information to other settings and to determine whether the findings can be transferred” (Creswell, 1998, p. 203). Readers can decide for themselves whether the findings appear to be applicable to their own institutions.

Organization

The findings (Chapter Four) include within-case analyses; cross-case analyses; The Model of Institutional Integration with discussion; and the analysis of themes in the Model of Institutional Integration. The three case studies are first presented separately, to establish the background and distinctions of each case (within-case analyses). The similarities and differences between the three cases are then presented in aggregate form (cross-case analyses). Graphical representation is used to consolidate this information (Table 1). Analysis of the various concepts that emerged from this study is then presented thematically, drawing upon the research data for illustration and verification. This thematic information is organized into the comprehensive Model of Institutional Integration, which depicts the relationships between the relevant concepts. Finally,
summary conclusions and recommendations for university administrators (Chapter Five),
along with suggestions for further research (Chapter Six), conclude the study.

Discussion of Abbreviated Model

The following model (Fig. 1) is a simplified depiction of the relationship expected
to exist between a university and its affiliated ULRC. This model began to develop
during an initial pilot study for this research, which was conducted at High Integration
University. It is presented here to prepare the reader for the basic constructs that will be
discussed in Chapter Four: Findings. Predicated on resource dependence theory, the
model depicts the way in which a university might implement its vision of its relationship
to a ULRC through various bridging strategies. These bridging strategies would
coordinate the development and maintenance of a consistent and shared vision at the
ULRC. The overlapping area enclosed by the dotted line represents the new concept of
institutional integration—the area of coordinated activity with shared goals of the two
separate entities. This coordination would enable the institutional mission of the
sponsoring organization (the university) to be implemented through the advancement of
the university's teaching, research and service missions at the ULRC. Ideally, successful
institutional integration will lead to the flow of resources back to the university from the
residents of the ULRC—a potentially valuable university constituency. This model is
expanded and explored in greater detail in Chapter Four: Findings.
Definition of Terms

*Institutional mission* is defined herein as “teaching, research, and service.” This definition is chosen since all three of the universities studied are public research universities, with service, or outreach components. *Institutional integration* is defined as the congruence of the retirement community with the university's institutional mission. This term is loosely based upon the concept of “integration” as defined by Vincent Tinto (1987). Tinto described the social and academic integration of students in higher education.
institutions. He uses the term “integration” to describe the extent to which an individual student shares the prevailing attitudes and values of peers and faculty and feels personally connected to the institution. The term “institutional integration” as used here refers to the extent to which the management and residents of a ULRC share the normative attitudes and values of the sponsoring academic institution, and also the extent to which they interact, both formally and informally. The level of institutional integration will be said to be high or low depending upon the extent to which the goals and structure of the ULRC match the overall goals of the academic institution. A ULRC which is closely linked to the university will be said to have high institutional integration. Conversely, a ULRC with few or no links to the university will be said to have low institutional integration. Because the residents of a ULRC possess important resources for the university, they form a constituency of considerable potential value. Based on the theory of resource dependence, the flow of resources back to the university can presumably be affected by the level of institutional integration, as depicted in the abbreviated model. This abbreviated model will be expanded in the next chapter.
Chapter Four: Findings

The three ULRCs studied here each have unique histories and different goals. They also employ different strategies in structuring the relationship between the community and the university. The differences in organization and approach yield different levels of institutional integration of the ULRC with the sponsoring academic institution.

Affiliated University has adopted what amounts to a “hands-off” policy with regards to its ULRC, leaving the management of the facility in the hands of the managing partner. What connections exist derive mainly from the affiliation of the community with the university hospital, or from the initiative of individual residents. Integrated University is currently adopting a “laissez-faire” approach, preferring to let many of the anticipated linkages develop through the planned, future involvement of residents on the community's Board of Directors. High Integration University currently has adopted the most “proactive” approach in forging links to the retirement community, and the members of the board (many of whom are university administrators) have taken the lead in securing written commitments from various university entities to collaborate with the ULRC.

Universities with the greatest formal, organizational linkages with their respective ULRCs are positioned to achieve higher levels of institutional integration; this integration facilitates the advancement of institutional mission through the avenue of the ULRC. This integration also encourages the flow of vital resources back to the university.
Case 1: Affiliated University

**Background.** The ULRC at Affiliated University (AU) is one of the first retirement communities with ties to a major university in the country, and has been in existence for over a decade. This continuing care retirement community (CCRC) is located on a 59-acre plot of land leased from the holdings of the university's Real Estate Foundation about a mile from the university campus. This facility was developed and is run by the managing partner, a well-known, national hotel development firm. It is composed of 220 independent living units, both cottages and apartments, and houses about 250 residents. According to the Director of Community Relations, upwards of 60 percent of the residents are connected in some way to the university. Many of these residents are alumni, or retired faculty or staff. In fact, attracting alumni was an initial university goal for the community. One unexpected development is the number of current residents who have retired to the community to be near their adult children who work at the university. The Director of Community Relations points to a recent survey conducted by the ULRC’s managing corporation that revealed that thirty to fifty percent of the residents are parents of children working at the university. The Director points out that having a nearby, quality CCRC facility for aging parents has come to constitute a significant benefit for employees at the university.

Residents need to be at least 62 years old to enter the facility; the current, average age of residents of this community is low to mid-eighties. This community includes such amenities as dining services; a library and woodworking room; indoor pool, spa, and exercise room; a bank; an arts & crafts center; barber and beauty shop, and the services of
a full-time coordinator of recreational activities. The community also houses a medical clinic staffed by university gerontologists. There is no regularly scheduled transportation to the university.

This ULRC was created when three foundations of Affiliated University—the Health Sciences Foundation, the University Real Estate Foundation, and the University Alumni Association—decided to pool their resources to create a retirement community for alumni of Affiliated University. The ULRC is officially authorized by the university to use the words: “Sponsored by foundations of [Affiliated University]” in all of its marketing and publicity materials. According to an official marketing letter from the community, “The Health Science Foundation was interested in a community where their student nurses could gain practical experience and the Real Estate Foundation generously provided the land. The University Alumni Association wanted a community where their Alumni could retire here in [Affiliated Town].” Of course, the Real Estate Foundation receives a market rate of return on the land that they “generously” provided. The University's Health Science Center was also interested in using the community as a living laboratory to study aging and related health issues.

Different administrators convey slightly varied interpretations of the main impetus behind the creation of the community. According to the University Treasurer, the university's goals in creating this retirement community were threefold. First, the university wanted to have a place to study aging as residents moved from a healthy, active retirement lifestyle to requiring the services of a nursing home (the Medical Center's goal). Second, the university wanted to have a place nearby for alumni to retire (the Alumni Association's goal). Finally, the university wanted to use university property
for the benefit of the university (the Real Estate Foundation's goal). She also feels that the university wanted to strengthen ties with alumni and retired faculty and staff. The Chief Executive Officer of the University's Foundation prioritizes the reasons behind the creation of the community as follows: 1. To create income on land that was sitting idle. 2. To bring alumni back to town. 3. To find ways to link elderly people with the university hospital. The Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of the university feels that the chief reason for developing the community was as a response to interest expressed by alumni in living near the university. In an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Affiliated University officials say they became involved in this endeavor because the community contributes to the university's fund-raising, educational and community-service goals. All of these factors apparently played a role in the decision to create this groundbreaking community. These are the stated goals behind the creation of this community, and university administrators agree that the community has succeeded in meeting the goals set forth for it by the three University Foundations which created the facility.

According to a report issued by the University Treasurer in 1993, the managing partner entered into this joint venture with the university because they wanted to benefit from the good name and reputation of the university. The managing partner also wanted to have a ready-made market of alumni, staff and faculty and others related to the university. The earliest residents wanted the assurance of quality provided by the combination of a nationally-known developer and the involvement of Affiliated University, since Affiliated University provides another party interested in the success of
the facility. Residents were also intrigued by the desire to have a relationship with Affiliated University that was “distinct and special.”

The ULRC at Affiliated University has been in operation for over a decade, and therefore, not unexpectedly, has more written material available on it than more recent ULRCs. According to the Treasurer's report (issued in 1993), this project was first explored by the University Alumni Association as a joint venture with a developer as far back as in 1975. The Health Sciences Foundation hired a consultant to look at a possible nursing home in the mid-1980s. At the time of this ULRC's creation, there were few precedents for combining retirement living with university sponsorship. The general manager of this ULRC (an employee of the managing partner) declared in a 1993 interview for the [Affiliated University] Alumni News: “We're building a new institution based on a new kind of partnership.” While the managing partner runs several other retirement communities across the country, the ULRC at Affiliated University is its only one connected to a university.

In the same Alumni News article, the Associate Vice President for Health Sciences Planning and Facilities observes that “we are all learning together as we go along. But one thing we know: The [ULRC at Affiliated University] has been good for the University, good for [the managing partner] and good for the people who live there.” The chief way in which the facility has benefited the university has been financially, as discussed below.

**Finances.** This facility is located on university-owned land, and the university receives payment for use of the land. The university leases the land to a real estate investment trust that in turn leases the space to the managing partner. The university's
rent payment is in two parts — first, a base monthly rent; second, a share in the proceeds of the project on a percentage basis. According to the CEO of the Affiliated University Real Estate Foundation and the Affiliated University Foundation: “[Affiliated University] loaned money to our foundation to purchase a farm. We carved a piece of the farm off to lease it to the managing partner. After our fees, we give the proceeds of the lease back to [Affiliated University].” The management partner assumed full responsibility for financing construction of the facility. The University Alumni Association assisted in the marketing of the facility by providing prospect data.

According to the Executive Director of the Alumni Association of Affiliated University, “The [Affiliated University] Alumni Association received financial consideration for providing prospect data during the initial marketing of the project, but does not have an ongoing relationship with the [ULRC].” Of the connection of the university to the community, the CEO of the University Foundation observes, “In reality, the link to the hospital is not as strong as anticipated. The financial rewards, however, have been great!” The university has benefited financially from the community for many years, and will continue to receive revenue from the community into the foreseeable future.

**Organization.** The land on which the facility is built is held by a 501(c)(2) corporation. A 501(c)(2) corporation holds land for the purposes of transferring proceeds to a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation—in this case, the university's foundation.

The ULRC at Affiliated University does not have a Board of Directors. The managing partner is entirely in charge of running the facility, which operates the community as a for-profit venture. According to the Director of Community Relations for
the ULRC, the community has been tremendously profitable for the managing partner, and is a considerable success with a waiting list of over 250 people. The key informant for this case study is the CEO of the University's Real Estate Foundation.

**Links to the University.** According to the Sales and Community Relations Director, residents of the ULRC at Affiliated University have access to the same activities at the university which are open to other senior residents of the surrounding area. Sporting and cultural events are especially popular among the residents.

The strongest formal links of this community to the university appear to be healthcare-related. The university's medical school runs a medical clinic on the site of the facility and provides access to the university healthcare system. The university Medical Center also provides the medical director for the nursing home, and provides interns, residents and nursing students for rotations and to do studies.

According to the article in the *Affiliated University Alumni News*, an Associate Professor of Geriatrics at the university operates the clinic as part of her duties as the medical director. The clinic completes a geriatric assessment for each new patient. “We review their medical history, check their hearing and vision, look for easily reversible causes of decreased function and work with the residents to develop a preventive health care program.” If residents need more specialized attention, the professor and her staff can help connect them with the appropriate specialist at the university’s Health Sciences Center. To keep resident abreast of developments in geriatric medicine, the medical director writes a regular column on health for the newsletter.

Written reports indicate that the role of coordinating university services for the benefit of the ULRC residents was once taken up by the university's Center on Aging and
Health, whose mission is to bring together education, research, and service initiatives related to aging. “We act as a bridge between the ULRC's residents and the university,” said the director of the center during the early years of the community. “Our job is to open doors and make contacts.” This relationship has since faded, according to the current Director of Community Relations for the ULRC. Many of the original administrators who were involved during the creation of the community, and who expressed early, voluntary interest in coordinating activities, have since moved on. Their replacements have not continued some of the initial connections, and there are no formal contracts or structures in place to compel them to do so.

The ULRC employs a recreation director who, according to promotional materials, “works full-time to fill your calendar with social, cultural, and educational events.” A review of a recent month's scheduled activities reveals lectures on “Qi Gong: Chinese Movement Therapy; “The Moths Among Us”; and historical lectures. There is also a planned outing to the University Art Museum. Professors from Affiliated University give some of these lectures.

According to the [Affiliated University] Alumni News article, university planners envisioned a close relationship between Affiliated University and the ULRC from the very beginning, but the exact nature of that relationship was not fully worked out. “We have had to wait until the ULRC was up and running to give it shape and color,” says the Director of the University's Center on Aging. For instance, the center has worked with the Division of Continuing Education to create a system that would enable residents to audit University classes. The center has also organized a lecture series by university faculty on health and financial issues. Residents may sit in on any university class for free
and use libraries and physical education facilities. Access to the university's physical education facilities is a perk not available to other seniors. According to the Director of Community Relations, however, this option is rarely utilized by residents, due to the difficulty of obtaining transportation to the university.

One connection university planners did envision was the use of the ULRC as a teaching facility. According to the head of the Division of Geriatrics: “From the outset, we conceived of the ULRC as a training site for fellows in geriatrics.” Second-year medical students visit the facility as part of their “Introduction to Clinical Medicine” course. They meet with patients, take a life history and make an assessment that is reviewed by members of the faculty. Nursing students used to receive their clinical experience at the facility. Now that the university has recently built its own rehabilitation center closer to campus, there is less involvement by the College of Nursing at the ULRC.

While administrators downplay the connection between the university and the community, residents apparently manage to involve themselves actively in university life in many ways. Residents have access to the university's athletic facilities, such as the recreation center and golf course, although they must pay standard fees. They frequently attend athletic events and once hosted the entire women's basketball team for Thanksgiving dinner at the facility. They regularly attend performances at the university's repertory theatre, and the community has hosted opening night galas. The community library is a subscriber to all periodicals of the University. Residents have participated in at least two university research studies: Growth Hormone for the School of Medicine and Motor Skills for the School of Education. The community has also
brought in university lecturers on various subjects, such as Ophthalmology, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, and art. The Department of Continuing Education has also held courses at the facility, including “Chinese Civilization” and the “History of Art.” Residents enjoy an annual dinner with the president of the university.

An article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* quotes the Affiliated University Treasurer as saying, “We're doing everything we can to tie the two together so it can be a really meaningful relationship.” She points out that the university encourages students and faculty members to get involved with the retirees, and that retirees join students in community-service projects. The CEO of the University Foundation says the ULRC “puts us in the position of building friendships with people who care about our institution and who are interested in staying active with the university.”

The ULRC promotes itself in its marketing materials as offering “senior educational enrichment.” While it is not clear that this involvement differs significantly from the opportunities available to other senior residents of the town, certainly the proximity to campus facilitates visits to university museums, libraries, and public lectures. Most states now have provisions to allow senior citizens to audit courses at state universities on a space-available basis, and residents of this ULRC may take advantage of this opportunity, as well.

Discussions with administrators indicate that the university has taken a fairly "hands-off" approach in linking to this community, allowing the managing partner to handle the entire operation of the facility. In the course of discussing the linkages between the ULRC at AU and the university, the CEO of the University Real Estate Foundation informed the researcher, “The relationship between the residents and the
university may not be as close as you envision. We lease the ground to the managing partner, which in turn runs the facility. Other than providing some healthcare there, we are not intimately involved.” There is some indication that the managing partner would now like the university to take a more active role in facilitating involvement of the residents with the university. The CEO of the University Real Estate Foundation acknowledges this, saying, “The involvement between the residents and the university is not as strong as the managing partner would like.”

The University Treasurer suggests that, “the Medical Center and Alumni Association would have liked it to be a closer relationship,” adding that “the managing partner began the relationship during a very difficult real estate market and early on in the development of university life care facilities.” She also suggests that “The university had high expectations (in hindsight probably unrealistic) about what this could be.”

According to the University Treasurer, early disputes over management of the facility, and rent increases, led the Alumni Association—which initially saw the ULRC at Affiliated University as a place to cultivate donors—to distance itself from involvement with the project. “They did not want to be a mediator,” she says.

The CEO of the University Real Estate Foundation describes the project as very successful, but says, “The managing partner would like the university to provide discounted tickets to university events and to be more active in sponsoring collaborations with the residents. The university will do this, but does not want to unilaterally subsidize these efforts.” He suggests that allowing residents to gain preferred access to Affiliated University events would help residents, and would help the managing partner market the community, but would not necessarily help Affiliated University. “There are lots of
people in town who would like discounted tickets, for example. So, we have always felt this would be fine if [the managing partner] wanted to pay for it.” The Director of Community Relations at the ULRC at Affiliated University says,

> We would like our residents to have special privileges in the community. We want the residents to have priority. From the university’s point of view, people who have priority for tickets and other events are people who donate money to support the university’s development needs. It's difficult for them to hand out something like that. The only contact person that we have right now at the university is [the CEO of the University Foundation/real estate], but he's there from a development standpoint, not customer service. They make their money from the land, not the people.

The executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for Affiliated University, when asked to characterize the relationship between the ULRC and Affiliated University, calls it, “a business relationship.” He points out, however, that the university was involved in “encouraging participation by residents in university activities.” This initial interaction and involvement by the university has apparently not persisted, however.

According to the Director of Community Relations at the ULRC,

> The Alumni Association was a big part of the [ULRC at AU] when we started out, but their involvement hasn't continued. It could be the communication. You don't know what was said, or what was planned, and the people who were there at the beginning are now gone. But we're not pushing it and saying we think we're being shortchanged. We do a lot of things with the university because they have a lot to offer and we take advantage as much as we can. We make that happen.

She points out that, in spite of differences over the desired level of university involvement, the residents of the community do feel a connection to Affiliated University, and that the university regularly offers public events to all members of the surrounding community. She also points out that the ULRC at AU is relatively small, and that the university would not have large turn-outs if certain programming were limited to
the ULRC. She refers to published research which documents that residents of the ULRC have been remarkably generous to Affiliated University contributing to one particular capital campaign at a rate almost double that of other alumni. The Director points out, “If somebody in development picked up on that and tried to draw the people from the community into the university, they might see even more of that. There are some residents who feel the university could do more and who would like the university to do more. The only university agencies still involved are the Health Sciences and Development Offices.”

Affiliated University is a mature community. As one of the earliest ULRCs in the country, the ULRC at AU faced the challenging task of creating a new type of community with no models to emulate. Since the average age of residents is now in the low-to-mid eighties, the level of activity among the residents may be changing. New, motivated residents could conceivably revitalize interest in forging a renewed, closer relationship with the university.
Case 2: Integrated University

**Background.** The planned ULRC at Integrated University (IU) will consist of two parts: the first part will be a CCRC that will be located on 80 acres of university land, approximately one mile from campus and overlooking the university's football stadium. The eligibility age to enter the community is 62. The CCRC part of the community is currently 65% “sold” (people have placed deposits), and the formal groundbreaking has begun. If all goes according to plan, the community should be open in 2003. The second part will be a planned residential development (PRD) contiguous to the CCRC on 80 additional acres. A PRD is a typical neighborhood of single, detached homes with no assisted-living services. This PRD will come after the completion of Phase I, and will be aimed towards a younger population of active retirees, aged 55 years and older. The CCRC community has been marketed through direct-mail solicitations to all Integrated University alumni who graduated prior to 1950 and who live in the same state as the university, or bordering states. The mailing also went to all residents of the same areas who are retired employees of IU. According to the President of the Board of Directors for the ULRC at Integrated University, about 75% of the current depositors have some prior connection with the university, as either alumni or retired university or staff.

This community was largely developed in response to an apparent demand for retirement living in the Integrated University vicinity. Presidential leadership was also an important catalyst. The design of the facility was approved by the nonprofit Board of Directors, which currently consists of four members of the university administration. This project has been “in the works” for about five years. Presidential boosterism apparently
played a big role in helping to launch this community. According to the official website for the community, “The idea for the ULRC at Integrated University originated with the University President. His conversations with alumni, staff and friends of [Integrated University] convinced him that many people were interested in moving to the [Integrated University] area to retire to again experience the numerous educational and cultural opportunities and the stimulating, vibrant environment of a university town.” The President has been an outspoken advocate of the community, and promotes the community frequently. According to a university-issued press release,

The University is involved in the project because it believes that a properly designed and operated retirement community at [Integrated University] can provide valuable services to its residents, enhance the already close relationship between [Integrated University] and its alumni, and promote increased educational opportunities for [Integrated University]. students and faculty. The University has been involved in the project because it believes that the [Integrated Town] area is highly attractive to retirees with [Integrated University] ties; that the University’s involvement will help ensure the success of such a community; and that the educational and volunteer relationships it makes possible would be beneficial to the retirees and to [Integrated University].

This project has encountered numerous obstacles that have interfered with the development of the community. The University’s Board of Trustees had initial reservations about involving the university in this project, and needed to be convinced that the project was consistent with the university’s mission. The Trustees were adamant that no university funds (tuition or state appropriation money) be used to finance it. When one of the trustees later stepped forward as an investor in the project, “appearance of impropriety” issues were raised. Other “big names” in the local community (including the university football coach and a local developer) also invested in the project, which may
have added to the complexity of the political issues involved. The ULRC’s financing bond issue was initially voted down by the town council. While this issue was later resolved, it caused a further delay and postponed construction.

Marketing issues have also been a cause of concern. Initially slow sales, blamed on personnel issues, got the project off to a slow start. A competing retirement community that failed, on contiguous property, may also have interfered with the marketing campaign, as many prospects apparently confused the two projects. The development company has also found reluctance among the targeted market to relocate beyond a limited market area. According to the President of the Development Corporation, “I think we made a mistake in assuming that [Integrated University] alumni would flock here in large numbers from points distant. Our [marketing] partners . . . said that their experience showed that it's an unusual event for people to move beyond a 50-mile radius. So we have a small, real market area.”

The development company is considering the possibility that some of the construction plans for the facility may have to be altered to accommodate changing time-frames. This could mean the delay of some of the planned amenities, such as the swimming pool, unless a donor can be found. The community plans to include amenities such as a dining hall; library/computer center; pub and lounge; branch of the university bookstore and “creamery” (ice cream shop); university-affiliated and staffed health center; arts and crafts rooms, beauty salon/barber shop; bank; convenience store; and billiards room. The second phase of the project calls for an assembly hall, which could be used for performances or lectures. “Right now, we're building a little more than half, and we're funding a little more than half,” says the President of the Development Corporation.
“What we can't fund, we're not going to build, obviously.” When the facility is complete, management of the CCRC will revert to the managing partner—a private company based in a different state, which specializes in marketing and operating retirement communities.

The university supplied the developers with alumni lists for marketing purposes, and received no financial compensation for extending this courtesy. Despite all of the unexpected difficulties in getting this project off the ground, the President of the Development Company [who is also the former Vice President of Administration for Integrated University] is confident in her positive assessment of the project: “I would say it's successful. Successful against the odds.”

Financing. Like the other ULRCs in this study, the ULRC at Integrated University is entirely privately financed. There is no state funding being used for this project. Private investors from the Integrated University community include a former trustee, the university football coach, and a well-known local developer. Because the continuing care retirement community will be a non-profit operation, it qualifies for financing through the sale of tax-exempt bonds. Issuing bonds requires a certain number of presales or deposits (typically 65%) in order for the bonds to have financial backing from banks. Of course, it is difficult to make presales without having architectural drawings, a site plan, and marketing materials, which is why private investors were necessary to launch the project. Now that the presales have reached the predetermined level, the bonds can be issued to secure the funds to finance construction.

Although the university is not investing money in the community, the community will bear the university's name, and the university signed an agreement to license its name and logo to the developers in exchange for financial remuneration. The university
also owns the land on which the CCRC portion of the community will be built and will receive rent annually for use of the property. In addition, the university will also receive an annual fee for each unit on the property, in perpetuity. “It's not going to be huge amounts of money for the university,” says the President of the Development Corporation. “They're not going to live or die from the fees they get from the ULRC. The base rent is $50,000 a year. The university budget is multibillion—2.3 billion dollars a year. So that's not why they're doing it.” The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors concurs:

We did not enter into this thinking we were making any money off it. The university has no equity position. None. In other words, we have put no financing into this, whatsoever. The business agreement, there is a licensing agreement and a marketing agreement, a ground lease agreement with the developers. So we are being compensated for the use of our name, for the use of our land. There's no state money in it because there is none. There's no reason to. And there's no taxpayer money going to this either from the university or elsewhere. It's all being privately funded. The bonds will be sold to private investors. There is also the licensing agreement that covers the use of our name and the trademark. And then the PRD is going to be on land that [Integrated University] doesn't own.

Financing the project has been a challenge, and the development corporation understood that the university could not even support the project by “backing” a loan. According to the President of the Development Corporation, “It's been tough, because there have been times when we could have used the university standing up as sort of a “letter of credit” institution, and the answer is—and I knew it—no. We told you you're going to have to succeed in this on your own. And there was a time in the past when we thought we're not going to make it.”
The expected cost to finance Phase 1 of the CCRC is 58 million dollars, and the bonds were recently issued. Construction for Phase I (150 units, plus commons space and 36-bed Health Care Center) has begun. The developers would like to build 271 units overall and decided that it would be wise to work in phases. So the project will begin by building 150 of those 271 units, along with infrastructure (electricity, sewage) for the rest. Plans for an assembly hall have been put on hold. The developers are hoping that as construction proceeds and the facility begins to take shape, it will stir more sales activity. The developers also have a plan to build the facility in such a way that will allow the pool to be added as soon as is feasible.

**Organization.** The ULRC at Integrated University is set up as a nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation with its own Board of Directors. The four members of the Board of Directors currently are officers at Integrated University. The President of the Board is the Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations; and the other members are the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer; the Executive Vice President and Provost; and the Vice President for Administration. The community by-laws are written so that the residents will assume a majority presence on the board when the facility is open. The Board of Directors will have responsibility for making decisions regarding operating the facility, forming links and bridges to the university, and planning. In fact, once the facility is open, the development corporation will dissolve and the Board of Directors will, in effect, “own” the facility. The key informant for this case study is the President of the Nonprofit Board of Directors of the ULRC, who also serves as the Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations of Integrated University.
Links to the University. While Integrated University has already made several commitments to its relationship with its ULRC, most administrators still see this as a relationship that will not fully begin to develop until the first residents arrive. The structure of the Board of Directors, which will include the participation of administrators and residents (with the majority going to residents) is the main vehicle by which an ongoing relationship between the university and the ULRC will be fostered. According to the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated University, the university is committed to cultivating an “enriched” relationship with the community, and wants to maintain an open dialogue with the residents.

The university apparently has high hopes for the level of integration that can be achieved between this community and the university. According to a press release dated Nov. 5, 1999, “Retirement community residents could get involved in virtually every part of [Integrated University], including attending classes, volunteering at artistic and cultural events, volunteering in [Integrated University's] day care centers or libraries, or helping at athletic events. Also, the community will be able to provide internships and work opportunities to [Integrated University] students.” The President of Integrated University was recently quoted in a press release as saying, “The [ULRC at Integrated University] is an exciting project because of the opportunities for teaching, research and service programs of the university to connect with the residents.” The President gave several examples of these connections:

One example is the demand for greater training and knowledge in the field of gerontology and related disciplines such as medicine, nursing, family studies, nutrition, and health administration—all strengths of [Integrated University]. In addition, many of today’s retirees are interested in volunteering their considerable expertise, taking classes and attending artistic, cultural and sporting events. The
wealth of untapped expertise of our alumni and friends for teaching or volunteering also is waiting to be explored.

Commitments that have been made by the university thus far include offering group lessons in golf, tennis, and swimming, available from coaches and athletes, for residents. The community will receive daily delivery of the college newspaper. Residents will enjoy access to the university tennis courts and swimming pool. Residents will be able to audit classes (that aren't impacted) starting at age 55 (which is 5 years younger than the age for other seniors). They will be given special, priority opportunities to enjoy university cultural events. According to the President of the Board of Directors, “Performing arts came to us early on. They are always looking for audiences for dress rehearsals, recitals, and it's often hard for them to find an audience for their students. And they said, would the [ULRC] be interested in us having a regular schedule of entertainment? And that's one of the reasons why we actually added an auditorium.”

The university has allocated 200 football tickets to the ULRC to use at their discretion, which puts residents on a par with student groups in vying for coveted seats. While the residents will have to pay the standard price for the tickets, the availability is considered a substantial amenity. Administrators also expect that residents may want to volunteer at university events—perhaps as docents at a museum, or ticket-takers at a concert or athletic event. Along with priority access to football and other concert tickets, residents will be placed on mailing lists for schedules of all university sporting events. The university is committed to working collaboratively with the ULRC to provide blocks of tickets to events of interest to residents.
The CCRC will be linked to the medical facilities of the university, which are located in a different town than the undergraduate campus and ULRC. Administrators expect that medical and allied health students will be involved as interns, and that teaching may take place at the ULRC. The university hospital's role in the ULRC will allow the off-campus medical school to have a more active and visible presence in the college community. There is hope that there may be opportunities for research at the facility, as well. Certainly, the residents will constitute a resource of senior citizens who may be willing to volunteer for research studies. Administrators envision the possibility of studies of various aspects of aging, such as Alzheimer’s. Residents will receive a comprehensive annual medical examination, eye examination, hearing examination, fitness evaluation, recommended exercise program, nutrition evaluation and counseling, provided by the College of Health and Human Development through their students and faculty. Other departments expected to become involved with the community include geriatrics, gerontology, health and wellness, and hotel and restaurant management. “We always have conversations that this is going to be a teaching and learning environment,” says the President of the Board of Directors.

The President of the Development Corporation points out that the senior citizen residents of the community will enjoy “a more organized approach to [the university opportunities] already available. A priority approach.” There will be a “concierge” (to be hired by the developers) who will help plan activities for the residents, including those in conjunction with the university. The university's Manager of University Relations will provide training and support for the concierge’s office.

Promotional materials for the community tell prospects that,
The [ULRC at IU’s] unique official association with [Integrated University] gives you special status at the university. . . You are welcome to take university classes free of charge, become a mentor to a promising young student, or share your lifetime of knowledge by teaching a class. Renew your spirit by volunteering at a day-care center, serving on events committees, or joining one of our many organized advisory boards. You have so much to offer!

When asked how residents could teach a class, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated University acknowledged that such a resident would need to have an area of special expertise, and would have to be invited by the appropriate faculty member. “It would be impromptu,” he said. “All of those things happen because they make sense for the parties. All those things are happening today. And we want to stimulate that. We like to have active alums.” The President of the Nonprofit Board for the ULRC at IU concedes that these types of contacts are unlikely to occur spontaneously, saying, “Somebody is going to have to do that. Somebody is going to have to actually make that happen.” The party who will take responsibility for forging these hoped-for connections remains unclear.

The ULRC will be connected to the university's online library system. Integrated University will assist the ULRC at IU in making faculty and staff available for presentations on various topics, including gardening, computers, investments, literature, travel, and current events. Integrated University will also make environmental education and nature programs available for residents both at the ULRC and at the university's environmental service location.

Transportation will be provided to facilitate connections to the campus, where it is usually difficult to find parking. Administrators are currently adopting somewhat of a “laissez faire” approach to forging connections to the coming ULRC—they are willing to
let the connections happen, according to the will of the residents and the interests of the
parties involved. Thus far, the university has not pursued specific agreements with or
commitments from various departments of the university. According to the Senior Vice
President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated University,

I think those things will happen, just because there's self-serving
interests on both parties' parts. I think the only structure is that we
will have a minority presence on the board that will help to be part of
our consciousness and to make those things gel. Be a catalyst. . . We
may wind up with some written agreements. I hope we're not being
complacent. I think we'll wind up with some agreements that will be
put into writing but I think it's premature to say we're going to talk to
this dean today, who three years from now. . . I don't like to do
business like that. I think in time we'll have two entities that will
want to sit down together and say we've got some good things to do
together, do we want to incorporate that into a written document?

The Board of Directors anticipate that the residents of this new community will
bring a great deal of initiative and activity to the ULRC, and they look forward to their
active contributions. Says the President of the Development Corporation, “These are not
people who want to just sit around and watch television and fritter away their retirement
years. These people will be creative and participatory.” This facility has been marketed to
younger, active retirees, who want to be involved in a bustling university environment.

While the eligibility age for the CCRC portion of the ULRC at IU is 62, the average age
of depositors is currently 72, nearly a decade younger than the residents of the ULRC at
Affiliated University.
Case 3: High Integration University

Background. The ULRC at High Integration University (HIU) will be a continuing care retirement community directly affiliated and planned in conjunction with a major public university. The facility will be located 2 miles from the university campus on a 136-acre site, and will include apartments, homes and villas. Construction began during Spring of 2002. According to promotional materials, the facility “offers the intellectual stimulation, educational programs, recreational and cultural opportunities of a university setting.” The university has authorized the ULRC to use the words “at [High Integration] University” in its official name and for marketing purposes.

The community has ties to the university's large hospital and medical system which provides comprehensive healthcare, and will have a university-staffed health care center on site. The ULRC at HIU will provide over 73,000 square feet of commons area, which will include numerous amenities, such as lounge areas, dining rooms, a health and rehabilitation center, and physical and occupational therapy suites.

High Integration University is differentiated from the other ULRCs in this study by having engaged in an unprecedented amount of consensus-building in creating its vision for this community. Administrators spearheading the project invested a significant amount of time and energy in meeting with every dean and director on campus to identify connections that could be made to the new community, and to engage cooperation and commitments to interact with the planned ULRC. These commitments, called “Affiliation Agreements,” are written commitments signed by the department chairs and directors in collaboration with the university attorney. This project is also the only ULRC with an
explicit mission statement that speaks to the community's direct affiliation with the university. Numerous written materials contain the following, official mission statement:

The mission of [the ULRC at High Integration University] is to support the well-being of its residents and create an active, caring community by providing a continuum of quality lifestyle and healthcare programs, and outstanding enrichment opportunities in conjunction with [High Integration University].

HIU is also unique in having involved university faculty from various departments in designing the physical facilities of the community. The project administrators recognized that the university possessed a significant pool of talent to consult in conceptualizing and creating this new community, and they drew heavily from this resource. Again, the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU:

We spent hundreds, literally hundreds and hundreds of hours dreaming our dream and designing it. We have an academic community, so when we designed the fitness center—we have a College of Health and Human Performance here—we invited the faculty and the dean to sit that day with us and design the fitness center so that it was state-of-the-art. The same with nursing, pharmacy, physical therapy, and occupational therapy. It took an enormous amount of time.

The investment of time this collaboration required may increase the likelihood of continued faculty involvement and interest in the developing life of the new community.

The impetus for creating this university-linked retirement community began with sustained alumni interest over several years, According to the Executive Vice President for the nonprofit Board Of Directors of the ULRC, “A number of people were interested in the concept, over a long period of time. I've been here twelve years, and I've been involved with this project since the inception, but the idea precedes even my being here.”
Alumni broached the idea with several presidents, over time, before it took hold. Several administrators mentioned the importance of presidential boosterism in getting this project off the ground. The President who finally took an active role in this project formed an ad hoc task force that traveled to many other communities to gather ideas. According to the Executive Vice President, also a member of that task force, “we didn't find any with the kind of connection to the university that they were hoping to create. So we set out to create it ourselves.”

The knowledge the task force gathered during this research phase convinced them that this project was unlikely to produce income for the university, but that didn't stop the idea from gathering momentum and adherents. Task force members agreed that this was an inherently valuable project that could, according to the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors, “enrich the university enormously.” So the Task Force went back to the President and “we all agreed that it was an intriguing concept and we saw many many ways to link with the university.” When the decision was made to proceed, however, it was with the understanding that the university could make no financial investment in the project.

The administrators and other individuals involved with High Integration's ULRC share enthusiasm for what they see as a compelling and unique project, and share, as well, a clear and consistent vision for the ways in which this retirement community will enhance the larger community. Again, the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC:

As you will tell from talking to me and talking to the other people you will meet when you come down, we're doing something very cool down here. We're all very excited about it, and we can get
evangelical on the subject, so I need to warn you that we can get very carried away. We're doing something very different. There is no project we know of that is as integrated with the university as we are. I think that we're building the state-of-the-art in every way, and I realize that you're state-of-the-art for one minute. I realize that from the moment we open our doors, ten minutes later we won't be state of the art, but currently, this is it, in the United States. This is the model. And it's very exciting to be involved in something like that.

The ULRC at HIU is expected to house about 450 residents, and will cost over $100 million to complete, making it larger and more costly than the ULRCs at either Affiliated or Integrated Universities. The facility will have a large common area with numerous amenities, including aerobic and lap pools; whirlpool; fitness room with full-time, university-affiliated wellness coordinator; grill and ice cream parlor; performing arts center; a university staffed medical clinic; classrooms; hair salon and barber shop; convenience store; and woodworking shop. People will move into [the ULRC at HIU] at an average age of 73—about ten years younger than the average age of people moving into the typical continuing care community. According to the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors, “This is not a retirement community. We want active, young people who can bring a lot back.”

Finances. Because HIU is a state university with limited resources, it was agreed that if this project were going to proceed it would have to do so without university investment. “That was our charge from the president,” says the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors. “Make it absolutely first class with no money [laughs].”

Like Integrated University, HIU decided to finance its ULRC through the formation of a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation and the issuance of tax exempt bonds. The
project will be financed through the sale of $120 million in bonds, underwritten by banks. Land for the facility has been optioned by the University Foundation for several years, and will be purchased when the bonds for the project are issued. No university land is involved in this transaction. Like IU, HIU has optioned Phase II land for a possible future, second area aimed at younger retirees. Presales of residences (with deposits) proceeded according to plan, and—like Integrated University—when sales reached a specified number, the bonds to finance construction were issued. The university is working carefully with its management team of professional CCRC developers, financiers, and managers to create this project.

Administrators deemed this project unlikely to make money for the university. Therefore, before the university was willing to commit to this project, they needed to be convinced that the facility could at least support itself. This required market research. A feasibility study required money, however, and administrators were not allowed to use university resources for the project. This posed a considerable obstacle towards the advancement of the project until the university was able to secure a $300,000 targeted alumni donation to pay for the feasibility study. According to the Executive Vice President of the Nonprofit Board for the ULRC at HIU,

We had one donor in particular, university alumnus, who lived in Washington, DC, who was very interested in this, really was very high on the idea. And we decided that the next step was we really needed to do a serious feasibility study, because, two reasons: 1) at the time, well, it's still the rule. Most CCRC's get 75% of their residents from a 25 mile radius. We do not have the demographics here in town to support that. This is a college town. It's a small town. So we needed to be sure that this was gonna be a go. That this was going to work. The only similar projects were airforce and naval continuing care retirement communities, that had drawn people from the armed services to come to a place like
San Francisco . . . So we didn't know if it could be done, because not only do you have the issue of filling to capacity but you have to get people to pick up and MOVE. It's not just that they have to retire, but they have to come from someplace else. So the donor gave us $300,000 as a gift to support the feasibility study and the preliminary marketing work. So, honestly, it wouldn't have happened without that gift. We would have had no way to do it. Without [the donor's] dream and his vision, this would not have happened. He felt the university had so much to offer.

The university commissioned a feasibility plan; hired consultants and a marketing firm, and did an extensive feasibility study. This marketing study relied on the University Foundation's database of alumni. “We didn't go to the outside world,” said the Executive Vice President. “We wanted to see if we could fill it with [High Integration University] alums. The study came back very positive, showing that, in fact, the university could fill a community.”

Because the banks issuing the bonds require a certain level of presales (again, 65% presold deposits), the university was faced with a new dilemma. Marketing a community requires architectural drawings, a model, floor plans and marketing materials; these things cost money, which the university will not provide. Again, this problem was resolved through the generosity of another targeted alumni donation. The project had to secure a loan for 4.2 million dollars. This loan was underwritten, or personally guaranteed, by another university donor. “Otherwise,” says the Executive Vice President, “we had no assets, we never would have gotten it. And, in fact, we've just extended that with another million to get us to the end of marketing. So on net we will have borrowed $5.2 million to get to bond financing.”

The Assistant Vice President for Administration-Real Estate at HIU describes the complicated financing involved, which will all culminate at “one giant closing table in
some big law firm. You know, the bonds will be issued, the land will be bought, the construction contract will be signed, the reserves will be established, because you borrow the construction costs and the reserves and the interest, in the interim you've got to pay interest on all that money for twenty months before you start having cash flow.” The university has two partners for this project: a managing partner and a financial partner. The managing partner has expertise in building and running continuing care retirement communities, while the financial partner has expertise in launching CCRCs with no start-up equity.

High Integration University stands to receive no funds for the use of its name or future revenue from the operation of the facility. The ULRC will be self-supporting and won't use any public money. Its only relationship with the university will be through the programming.

**Organization.** The ULRC at HIU is organized as an independent, nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation. The Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC considers this separate incorporation vital, because if the ULRC were part of the university, then the university could not maintain “control” of the board because of technical problems with the state.

High Integration University has collaborated and contracted with corporate partners for the construction and for the management of the facility, but maintains a Board of Directors to ensure the perpetual involvement of the university in the management of the affairs of this community. Currently, the Board of Directors includes many top level administrators of the university, as well as influential members of the surrounding community. The Board includes the Associate Vice President for
Administration of the University Foundation; the Dean of the College of Health Professions; the retired President Emeritus of the State University System and Provost Emeritus of HIU; the Director of the University’s Institute on Aging; a retired Dean of the College of Health Professions; Dean of the College of Nursing and a former Vice President and Interim President for the University.

By incorporating separately, the corporation's board can act autonomously, without interference from the state. The bylaws of High Integration ULRC, Inc. require four board members to be High Integration University employees at all times. This guarantees significant participation by HIU in the operation and management of [the ULRC at HIU]. Another four board members must be alumni of High Integration University, “thereby strengthening the care and concern of the board for the reputation and quality that [HIU] expects,” according to the community's “Leadership and Vision” brochure. The Board of Directors at High Integration University does not have a plan to have residents on it (although there are discussions to have a non-voting member). The board consider this to be a conflict of interest issue. According to the Executive Vice President of the Nonprofit Board, “We consider it to be a conflict of interest because the Board of Directors will, among other things, be responsible for the financial well being of the community, which may necessitate raising monthly fees, for example. If a board member were a resident, he/she would obviously have a conflict between not wanting fees to go up and the fiduciary responsible for a sound community.” The Executive Vice President also speaks very highly of the composition of the board, which includes prominent members of the university administration and the surrounding community. All of the members donate their time to the board.
The key informant on this case study is the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors, who is also the Associate Vice President for Administration, HIU Foundation.

**Links to University.** Of the three ULRCs studied herein, High Integration University currently has created the most institutionalized links between the retirement community and the university. HIU has been the most proactive in taking the initiative in forging the linkages. What sets High Integration University's ULRC apart from the others is its consistently-articulated vision for connecting with the university—which is shared by all interview subjects of this research—and the implementation of these connections. This vision extends to what the residents of the community can bring to the university and how to maximally capitalize on this anticipated asset, for the benefit of the wider campus community.

The ways in which the community and the university will interact are clearly and explicitly spelled out in writing. These expectations are indicated first, in the mission statement, and then reinforced and stipulated in the unique Affiliation agreements—written contracts spelling out the expected ways in which each department or division within the university will interact with the ULRC when it is open. These agreements are the result of deliberate and prolonged consensus-building among the deans of this very large university. They cover activity such as providing interns in areas like physical therapy, occupational therapy, and psychology; producing a neighborhood newsletter and special television programs by the Journalism and Communication students; and offering lectures on numerous topics by university faculty.
In fact, some of the overlapping connections are already in place and operating. The so-called “Dean of Residents,” whose job is to serve as a liaison between the residents and the large, bureaucratic university, has already been hired by the managing partner. A former administrator in the university's Continuing Education Department, the Dean of Residents has begun building community among the residents through surveys, personal conversations, a newsletter, and the creation of two boundary spanning initiatives—an Institute for Learning in Retirement and a Speaker's Series on Aging. Both the ILR and the Speaker's Series are cosponsored by the ULRC and the University's Institute on Aging (IOA). She has also recently added a Book Club, in collaboration with a university museum. These programs are not limited to the residents of the ULRC; they are also open to other alumni, or any interested senior citizen from the surrounding community. These programs will rely on using public community space until the ULRC is open. The Dean of Residents currently serves on university-wide committees that may impact the community, such as the “HIU One Card” committee, and Performing Arts committees. According to the Dean of Residents, the university is open to her participation because they are very excited about the ULRC and “it's just the spirit in which the retirement community has been conceptualized.”

The ULRC at HIU residents will become official members of the HIU community through an “HIU One Card”—the same university ID card issued to students, faculty, and staff. “The idea is to make residents of [the ULRC at HIU] full members of the university community,” says the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit board. Many of the privileges afforded to HIU faculty and staff will thus be available to residents of the
ULRC at HIU, including access to libraries, athletic facilities, academic programs, cultural activities, and meals.

Regular transportation will be provided to connect the ULRC residents with the university campus. Classroom space will be built into the ULRC. Residents will be hooked into the same internet—with library access—as traditional students. The College of Health and Human Services will staff the ULRC's fitness center. In return, the ULRC will serve as a research facility for the college. The Gerontological Staff of the College for nursing will staff the ULRC clinic. The facility will incorporate permanent areas for students from The Colleges of Pharmacy, Dentistry, Allied Health and Fine Arts to come to the ULRC and practice what they are studying. The university expects to offer the residents weekly fine arts performances, as well as workshops on topics such as pottery. Even the small animal clinic from the Veterinary college, will come and provide care for small animals on-site. “There are many ways that I think the outreach and the bridging will nicely fold in to the university's mission,” says the Dean of Residents. While most amenities and activities are included in monthly maintenance fees, some optional services, such as pet care or art classes, may entail additional fees for residents.

The Project Manager of the Development Corporation says, “I don't know of any other care facility that is so closely linked to a university as this one will be. The main objective of on-campus retirement is to stay involved with the school. There is a tangible participation by the university.” Of the exemplary nature of this community, the Project Manager also says, “There's probably not a university in the country that is not going to want to take a look at this.”

According to a university press release in the Spring of 2001,
The $120 million dollar retirement community will become a national model for retired and semi-retired adults who desire a healthy, active lifestyle in a resort-style setting along with the intellectual stimulation, educational programs and recreational and cultural opportunities of the [HIU] environment. The unique affiliation with [High Integration University] will add immeasurably to the quality of life, from continuing education to leading-edge health benefits.

The planned linkages between the university and the ULRC at HIU are expected to create a new model for retirement living, featuring unprecedented opportunities for residents. The formal arrangements that already exist may later be supplemented by informal arrangements, as residents move in and assert their preferences.
Similarities Between Cases

The three ULRC cases studied herein bear many similarities. All are located at established, major, state universities with large, avid, and aging alumni bases. All three indicate that a major impetus behind the idea of starting an affiliated retirement community was alumni demand. All three universities have medical schools, and have chosen to create continuing care retirement communities. All three were created, essentially, de novo; while administrators may have looked at other communities while doing research for the project, they did not copy anyone else's model. In fact, these three are among the earliest ULRCs in the entire country. Administrators at all three schools agreed that ULRCs are very time-consuming, expensive and difficult projects to launch and to operate. Each school was very concerned with the quality of the finished community, since the university's name was going to be attached to the project. All of the schools refrained from using university money to launch the project, and relied on experienced, outside firms to construct and manage the projects. Let us look at these similarities in more detail:

Large, avid alumni base. All three institutions enjoy large, enthusiastic, but aging alumni groups. These alumni constituted built-in marketing bases for the ULRCs, and alumni lists were used to create mailing and marketing lists. In fact, all three institutions acknowledge that they were reacting to alumni demand in creating these communities, rather than trying to stimulate or create a demand for them. From a resource dependence standpoint, the fact the universities rely on their alumni for crucial support makes them liable to be responsive to alumni pressure. At Affiliated University, one of the stated goals for developing the community was to provide a place for alumni to retire in
Affiliated town. According to the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Affiliated University, one of the benefits expected from establishing this community was to build a “closer relationship with alumni and friends of the university in the later years of their life.” According to the University Treasurer, a major goal of Affiliated University in creating the ULRC was, “To strengthen ties with alumni and retired faculty and staff.” The University Alumni Association helped with the marketing of the facility, by sharing prospect data.

An article in the [Affiliated University] Alumni News magazine remembers the origins of the community this way:

When the University Health Services Foundation, the University Real Estate Foundation and the Alumni Association decided several years ago to pool their resources to create a retirement community, one of their goals was to give [Affiliated] alumni a chance, not to relive the past, but to resume a way of life they had put aside to raise families and build careers. 'We wanted to do something for those alumni who wanted to return to Affiliated town and participate in the kind of academic environment they first encountered 40 or 50 years ago' said [the former director of Alumni Affairs].

At Integrated University, the administrators see themselves as merely accommodating a trend that was already well underway. The President of the Board of Directors for the ULRC at Integrated University states, “The reason we got into it was because we had learned, anecdotally and empirically, that alumni were coming back to this community because they wanted to be engaged with this institution. We see great benefits, great benefits, and we think our retirees do, too. Keeps them very active. Gives them a lot of things to do. It's stimulating.” In fact, at Integrated University, the President of the Board of Directors for the community is also the Associate Vice President for
Development and Alumni Relations due to the anticipated close ties between the alumni association and the community. The official website for the community details the President's assessment of alumni demand for a retirement option in the Integrated University vicinity, saying, “The idea for the [ULRC at IU] originated with [the University President]. His conversations with alumni, staff and friends of [Integrated University] convinced him that many people were interested in moving to the [Integrated University] area to retire, to again experience the numerous educational and cultural opportunities and the stimulating, vibrant environment of a university town.” The Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer at Integrated University concurs:

Absolutely [there was] a perceived demand. Well, look what's happened here. A lot of alums, a lot have moved back. They may have preferred to live here all along, but they had jobs. But when they had the flexibility to choose, after retirement, where they wanted to live, many of them have chosen to come here. So it's already existing. When you see these surveys that discuss 'Where is the best place to retire?', many of them cite university towns. [Integrated Town] is one of them and it shows up in the surveys. So it's just a matter of being responsive to the demands and making what's going to happen anyway happen to the greatest advantage to the parties involved—the retirees and us.

High Integration University appeals to its alumni constituency in its marketing materials, stating, “One of [HIU's] greatest strengths is the vitality and loyalty of its alumni and friends. The [ULRC at HIU] provides an opportunity to embrace these experienced and wise friends as an essential part of the [HIU] family.” The Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU calls for four university alumni (non-residents) to be on the board at all times. In fact, the retirement community at High Integration University owes its very existence to the benefaction of involved alumni, who supported the project with targeted donations at crucial moments.
While none of the three ULRCs require residents to be alumni of the university, the majority of residents have some prior relationship with the community (either as alumni or retired faculty, or staff).

**Presence of Medical School.** The presence of a medical facility appears to have been a factor in the desire of university administrators to involve their institutions in a continuing care retirement facility. The need to train doctors, nurses, and allied health professionals seems to be a natural fit with a campus-based retirement community, and offers the medical schools a built-in community which may prove useful for training health professionals in a variety of fields. This constitutes a substantial benefit to the university and helps to advance the institution's teaching and service missions, simultaneously.

**De novo creations.** Private firms, such as Kendal, have been operating retirement communities in college and university towns for many years. But when the administrators of these three universities set out to create their university-affiliated communities, they started from scratch. There were no “models” of university-affiliated retirement communities from which to draw. Each of these three communities is innovative in its own way, and reflects the character of the school that created it. These ULRCs are likely to become the models other institutions will emulate.

The ULRC at Affiliated University was one of the very first in the country to be officially affiliated with a major university. Says the University Treasurer, “We began this relationship early on in the development of university life care facilities.”

The Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated University discussed visiting other retirement communities in preparation for this project,
but adds, “Whether we looked at them as a model, I'm not sure. We visited some Kendal sites. . . But I don't think we went on a national tour. We read about them more than we actually visited them. We did not copy anyone else.”

The President of the Development Company for the ULRC at Integrated University acknowledges, “I went to a conference where we saw some other university town retirement communities. They were not the kind of concept [the President of Integrated University] put forth, that has this constant kind of flowing back and forth.”

The Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU, says, “What we wanted was a vibrant community, conferences, intellectual things going on, but really there were no good university models that we went to look at because there weren't any when we were starting this. There was [the ULRC at Affiliated University], and Kendal at Oberlin, which were in college towns but not at all what we were looking at terms of the integration of the facility with the university. So we just set out to make it up.”

**Difficult to launch/run.** Affiliated University and Integrated University's projects averaged at least five years from initial concept to commencing construction. (There is evidence that the idea was being pursued as early as 1975 at Affiliated University.) The idea for High Integration University's project has been “in the air” for over a decade.

These projects are time-consuming and involved. They require a great deal of coordination of activities among several agencies. Marketplace realities may impact the best-laid plans.
In the case of Affiliated University, the University Treasurer states, “The Managing Partner began the relationship during a difficult real estate market and early on in the development of university life care facilities . . . These are tough places to run.”

According to The President of the Development Corporation for Integrated University, when the idea started it “was 1995; [the development corporation] was formed in 1997; it's now 2001—why aren't we up yet? And the answer to that question is it is incredibly difficult, I have found, to get one of these things off the ground.”

The ULRC at HIU, while running approximately on schedule, is also an incredibly complex financial arrangement that will culminate when the tax-exempt bonds are issued. According to the Assistant Vice President —Real Estate at HIU, “it's all a very complex financial plan, but it works.”

No university money. None of the universities studied here invested university or state funds to build or operate these projects (although two of them did contribute university land to the projects, for a market rate of return). The projects all had to raise their own construction and operating capital.

The President of the Development Corporation at Integrated University says, “[The university president] said that the university would not be putting any money into this community. This would be something that would have to 'float on its own bottom.' Which is a very typical way for [Integrated University] to advance projects. It's a resource-poor university and it's very creative in getting people to help it do things it wants to do.”

Said the key informant for HIU's project, “It had to be self-sustaining. That was our mission. . .Our charge from the president. Because we couldn't take resources away
from the academic mission of the university. We're a state university, we are not rolling in money, there is never enough money to do what we need to do. The university was not going to dedicate any resources to this. The resource that they dedicated was some of our time.”

At Affiliated University, the goal was not only not to spend university money in creating the community, but to provide an additional source of revenue to the University Foundation. The ULRC achieved both goals.

*Concern for quality/outside partners.* All three universities indicated concern that the reputation of the community would reflect upon the university. Because the university's names are attached to these projects, and because university alumni are the population largely being served, all three universities were highly concerned with assuring the quality of the community.

When the President of the Nonprofit Board for the ULRC at Integrated University was asked about what the official affiliation of the retirement community with Integrated University might signal to a potential resident, he responded,

Trust. They trust the fact that [Integrated University] endorses this. To them, this is [Integrated University]. And they know it is. They do, when they investigate us. [Integrated University] is going to help develop this, and manage this. They have a long history of these things, and they know what they're doing. When they see “[Integrated University]” they look at us and think, 'I trust that this is going to be well-run. It's going to be run efficiently. It's going to be what I expect.'

The President of the Development Corporation for the ULRC at IU agrees, adding, “The fact that it's connected to the university is reassuring to a lot of people. The university has a good reputation. It's going to be here forever.”
The Assistant Vice President of Development and Alumni Affairs Real Estate at High Integration University describes his similar perception of what the university affiliation means to prospects there: “Absolutely quality. They expect efficiency. . .World class. That's our goal. To exceed all current standards and create a world-class facility.”

Of the use of the university’s official name in the promotional literature, a brochure states, “[The ULRC at HIU] bears the name of [HIU], assuring [HIU’s] vital interest in the success and quality of [the ULRC at HIU].”

**Outside partners.** All three universities were concerned about the quality of the partners they chose to create their vision for the ULRCs, and all speak highly of their collaborations with their chosen partners. None of the universities considered running the projects themselves, and all chose to form a joint venture with an outside, experienced, CCRC management firm. Affiliated University chose to work with a national hotel chain, and to turn management of the facility completely to the partner. Integrated University formed a development company that includes the investors on its board and oversees the overall endeavor. The development company relies on the services of an experienced real estate development corporation, and a retirement community marketing and management firm. When the facility is complete, the retirement community marketing and management firm will operate the community at the discretion of the ULRC’s Board of Directors.

HIU, after performing “due diligence,” chose to work with a firm that specializes in starting CCRCs with no start-up funds. The company has a financial arm that handles the complicated financing involved. They will also manage the facility when it is complete, under the oversight of the ULRC’s Board of Directors.
According to the University Treasurer at Affiliated University, “These are tough places to run and I am glad that we chose a quality partner,” while pointing out that the residents felt that the combination of involvement of [the managing partner] and Affiliated University provided an added assurance of quality. The CEO of the University Real Estate Foundation at Affiliated University agrees, “We wanted to get an operator with a strong reputation since we had no experience in this area.”

The Assistant Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs Real Estate at HIU describes the university's thinking on the subject of contracting with an outside partner for the ULRC,

You know, I remember when we did our hotel and conference center, our President was very smart, he said you know, let’s take a piece of campus land and let’s enter into a long-term lease with a hotel operator. We know about teaching, research, and service: let's just admit we don't know anything about running hotels. So let's get the pros in here to run the thing. What we want is the function the facility provides. We don't want to get bogged down in the food service delivery. So I think that's what we're after here is the function that the facility delivers.

In fact, choosing an experienced partner with established credentials can be vital in obtaining desired levels of financing for the project. The Assistant Vice President for Real Estate continues,

Part of the way that you get the super low interest rate is that you put together a world class team so that if some bank in Switzerland, that is bigger than the Bank of America, is going to guarantee your bond, they're going to do their due diligence to see if this is a good loan for them to be involved with. They’re gonna want to see somebody who has designed many, many CCRCs, they're gonna want to see a contractor who has built many many CCRCs, they want to see a management firm that has a long track record not only of managing them, but of filling them up.
Support for Active Retirement and Lifelong Learning. Whether explicitly or implicitly, all three communities willingly foster the intellectual and social needs of residents, and support the concepts of “active retirement” and “lifelong learning.”

According to Steven Cohen, regional director of operations for the development corporation which helped create the on-campus ULRC at Lasell College in MA, “Colleges and universities should understand what establishing a retirement community is all about. It's a natural part of the continuum of education, not a separate service. To be successful, you need to have a strong commitment to lifelong learning” (Fitzgerald, 1999, p. 41).

At Affiliated University, promotional materials boast that the community “offers senior educational enrichment.” An article on the community in the Affiliated university Alumni News points out that,

Although the high quality of life and the excellence of health care are extremely important to the residents, the chance to participate in the intellectual and social life of the University proved decisive for most of those who now live in the [ULRC]. . . In its own way, the [ULRC] has become a center of intellectual social life at the University, much like the two residential colleges. The only difference: these residents are just a little older.

Of the residents, the article claims, “These are bright, articulate, successful people who have the skills, inclination and time to participate in community affairs.”

The lead agent for the ULRC at Integrated University offers a similar assessment of the residents at his university: “These are not people who want to just sit around and watch television and fritter away their retirement years. And I suspect that those people will be creative and participatory.” The President of the Development Corporation for the ULRC at IU agrees,
We have a very active group of people signed up for this. When we marketed this, [the President] emphasized that this was a place for active retirees. One of his lines was, 'If you want to go retire someplace and sit down and watch television, this is not the place for you. This is place where you will be engaged with students, where you will be engaged with the intellectual life of the university, social life of the university, and so on.' The people who have bought in are all people who like that idea.

The Assistant Vice President of Development and Alumni Affairs Real Estate at HIU offers a similar assessment, and points out that the residents “want to get into an active lifestyle, and we have such a variety of it—for a town our size. . .So, I think there's a whole lot of that change of lifestyle, change of pace, but don't want to go home and sit in a rocking chair. You could go out and buy a brand new suburban thing on the edge of a golf course, but that gets old after awhile.” Says the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors at HIU,

Our entry age is 62. We're taking young people. I mean, 62 is very young. Our average entry age for folks right now is 69. I think the average entry age for CCRCs is 78, so we're like a decade younger at this point. , and I've been quoted in lots of newspapers as saying, ‘If you want to play bridge every night, don't bother coming to The ULRC at HIU.’ You'll play bridge if you want to, but there's going to be so much going on. We want active, young people who can bring a lot back.

The Dean of Residents concurs,

I had lunch with a group of residents, and one of the resident's sons was visiting from DC and he said 'I am so excited for Mom and Dad. I feel so good and he said everyone is so positive and so interested in continued living and learning. Living in DC, I feel relieved.’ And that's just an entré into the individuals we have coming to live here in [the ULRC at HIU]. They are all engaged, continuously seeking to learn new things. One of them I was talking to today, I'm going to be starting a Great Decisions Group. It's a group the National Foreign Policy Association compiles annually through an advisory council. They have eight issues facing our country. With each topic they have suggested readings, and they do summaries. And I said will you facilitate this group? And he said, ‘Well, my goal every day is to learn something new.'
So I could probably work that in and postpone some of the other things I do.’ I would say the majority of them are interested in, not just their past professional lives, but in continuing upon that, and learning new things.

Active involvement in university-based, lifelong learning activities is what differentiates ULRCs from traditional retirement communities.
Differences Between Cases

These communities were developed separately from one another, for separate reasons, and reflect the characters of their individual schools and histories. As such, there are many distinguishing features which differentiate them. One obvious difference is that two of these communities are just beginning construction of their facilities while the third has been operating for over a decade. Other differences include distinctions in which university department or administrator took the lead in developing the community, how the university developed its vision for the community, and how the community's relationship with the university is organized.

The communities also differed in the way each approached the initial financing of the construction of the communities, and in their view of whether or not the community could be a source of revenue for the university.

Vision. Each university differs in the clarity and in the quality of its expectations for the purpose of the community, and in its vision for the ways the community will be linked to the university. In many ways, the reason for developing the community can impact the expectations for it.

The community at Affiliated University was developed to meet specific goals. Primarily, the university wanted to create income on land that was sitting idle, and to provide a place for alumni to retire in Affiliated Town. The connection between the university and the ULRC is best characterized as a business relationship. As the CEO of the University Real Estate Foundation states, “We lease the ground to [the managing
partner], which in turn runs the facility. Other than providing some healthcare there, we
are not intimately involved.”

High Integration University, on the other hand, has distilled its vision into a
unique and explicit mission statement that speaks to the direct affiliation between the
university and the community. Integrated University's vision continues to develop, and is
expected to be partly contingent upon the involvement of the future residents in creating
it.

At Integrated University, the vision continues to evolve, and is expected to
develop more fully when the residents arrive and assume positions on the community’s
Board of Directors.

Organization/Approach. Each university has chosen a different method of
organizing its relationship to its ULRC; these differences reflect the separate visions for
the communities.

Affiliated University has basically adopted a “hands off” model, and leaves all of
the details for running the ULRC to the managing partner. There are some bridging
agencies from the university which have stepped forward to help engage the residents in
university activities—most notably the university's Center for Aging, and Division of
Continuing Education. These relationships were largely informal, however, and have not
persisted. There is no formal, university governing presence in the ULRC.

Integrated University, on the other hand, has created a Board of Directors to run
its retirement community. Significantly, this Board, which now consists of four university
leaders, will grow to include a majority of residents, along with a mandated university
presence, when the community is open. This combination of resident-administrator
presence on the board virtually guarantees interaction between the university and the community. The university is currently adopting a laissez-faire approach to organizing the university's relationship to the community, preferring to allow linkages to develop as they serve the desires and needs of the parties. The current members of the Board of Directors for the ULRC at Integrated University were selected by their position at the university. Currently, the board includes four university officers: the Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations; the Senior Vice President for Finance & Business/Treasurer; the Executive Vice President and Provost; and the Vice President for Administration.

High Integration University has taken the most proactive approach in forging linkages between the university and the community. They have also taken more responsibility for managing the community—as indicated by the structure of their Board of Directors. At HIU, the nonprofit board will include university administrators, non-resident alumni, and community leaders. Unlike IU, the board at HIU will not include residents due to the perceived conflict of interest. The board member administrators have taken the lead in advancing the cause of linking to the university, and have sought and received written commitments of collaboration from colleges, departments, and centers across campus, known as the “Affiliation Agreements.” These are “good faith” agreements, which are expected to be executed free of charge due to the perceived benefits for both parties.

**Financing.** Each school was faced with the necessity of raising a significant amount of money to finance the launch of their respective ULRC. While all three were similar in circumventing university funding for the projects, they differed in the approach
to obtaining the necessary start-up funds. These differences may have contributed to the way each community was organized, administratively.

In the case of Affiliated University, the managing partner—an established hotel development firm—assumed responsibility for funding the construction, start-up, and marketing of the community. They also continue to assume responsibility for the day-to-day operations.

At Integrated University, private investors helped to finance the initial marketing and research costs, while a tax-exempt bond issue will finance the bulk of the construction costs. The notable connections of the private investors (former university trustee, football coach, local developer) at Integrated University caused “appearance of impropriety” issues which may have contributed to political complications for the project.

At High Integration University, administrators were fortunate enough to secure targeted alumni donations at crucial points, which allowed the university to engage in enough research and marketing to bring the project to the point of issuing tax exempt bonds.

**Lead Agent.** At each school, the title of the person charged with taking the lead on this project differed. These differences reflect the different ways in which the projects were conceived. At Affiliated University, the CEO of the Real Estate Foundation serves as the key administrator for the project. His department took the lead in putting together the deal between the university and the managing partner, and the foundation he represents receives the university's share of the financial returns from the operation of the community (which are then used in support of Affiliated University, after administrative fees).
At Integrated University, the lead university administrator and the key informant for this case study is the Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni, reflecting the anticipated close ties between the alumni residents of the ULRC and the university. Says the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated State, who is also a member of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at Integrated University, “When you talk about alumni, retirees, alumni association just falls right in. We made [the Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations] the President [of the Board of Directors] because we figured he's got more direct contact with alums. The relationship between the [ULRC] and the alumni association that we envision is very strong.” At High Integration University, the lead administrator and key informant for the case study is the Associate Vice President for Administration at the University Foundation—the fundraising arm of the university. Serendipity may have played a role in her “selection.” The Executive Vice president of the nonprofit Board for the ULRC at HIU initially served on the president's original task force for the ULRC, studying the project's feasibility. She says, “[The university President] and I, and one of the other founding [HIU] people on this board who is the Dean of the College of Health Professions; he and I were sort of left in charge of this, and I can't really tell you how that happened. That just happened. So one day I woke up and I was in charge of building [the ULRC at HIU]. I don't really know how that happened.”

In each case, the lead agent from the university also served as the “key informant” for the case study.

Revenue Generation. The universities, and their respective administrators, differed in their view of whether or not the ULRC could be a source of revenue for the
university. Two universities stand to receive income from their involvement with the ULRC (by renting land or licensing their name), and one does not.

At Affiliated University, the desire to generate revenue from idle land was a primary motivating factor behind the creation of the community. The university receives an annual rent for use of the land and a percentage of the facility's annual revenues. According to the CEO of the University Real Estate Foundation, “The financial rewards have been great.” The University Alumni Association also received financial consideration from the managing partner for sharing alumni/prospect lists during the initial marketing phase of the community.

The University Treasurer concurs that one of the university's goals in supporting the creation of this ULRC was “to use our property for the benefit of the University (Real Estate Foundation's goal). This goal has been achieved, says the treasurer, as “the property has produced income for the Real Estate Foundation.”

At Integrated University, the university will be financially compensated for the use of its name and logo, and for the use of university land, on which the CCRC portion of the ULRC will be located (annual revenue plus a fee for each unit, in perpetuity). The university Alumni Association did not receive compensation for sharing alumni lists for marketing purposes. “That was just the university being gracious,” says the President of the Development Corporation. University administrators downplay the role of finances in the decision to become involved in this project, however. “It was not a business reason. I'll put it that way. We did not enter into this thinking we were making any money off it,” says the President of the nonprofit Board of Directors.
High Integration University, in contrast, stands to make no money from its involvement with its ULRC. “Not a penny,” says the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors. The knowledge the initial HIU ULRC task force gathered during the preliminary research phase convinced them that this project was unlikely to produce income for the university. That didn't stop the idea from gathering momentum and adherents, however, because it was agreed that this was an inherently valuable project that could, according to the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors, “enrich the university enormously.”

**Emphasis on Active Retirement/Lifelong Learning.** Although all three of these communities are Continuing Care Retirement communities with formalized links to the respective university hospital systems, the researcher found an increasing emphasis on providing for the healthy, lifelong-learning aspects of retirement living as the communities became more integrated with the non-hospital-related portions of the university. Affiliated University's formal linkages to the community are mostly centered around the hospital; Integrated University has more formalized links to non-hospital-related university entities; and HIU has forged an unprecedented level of linkages to lifelong learning enrichment and educational opportunities for residents at the university. The emphasis on providing for the intellectual needs of the healthy, active residents is what distinguishes these university-linked retirement communities from typical CCRCs. The differing emphasis on lifelong learning between these three communities may bear some relationship to the average age composition of the residents of each ULRC, and may also influence the target age group they are trying to attract. At Affiliated University, the eligibility age is 62, but the current average age of residents is in the low to mid
eighties—the oldest of the three ULRCs. The eligibility age of depositors at IU and HIU is almost a decade younger, around age 72.

At IU, the eligibility age will be as low as 55, for the planned second phase of the community—thereby deliberately targeting a very young, vital constituency. Right now, the average age of depositors for the CCRC portion of the ULRC at IU is 73—similar to HIU’s average age.

Level of Institutional Integration. Finally, the three ULRCs currently differ in their level of institutional integration. They vary in the extent of their current linkages to the university, and the extent to which these linkages further the institutional missions of teaching, research, and service.

The CEO of the University Real Estate Foundation at Affiliated University points out that the community is “very successful, but the involvement between the residents and the university is not as strong as the managing partner would like.” Many of the linkages between the ULRC at Affiliated University and Affiliated University appear to be illness-based, and to derive from the ULRC’s direct affiliation with the hospital. Even the link to the hospital is “not as strong as anticipated.” Those areas of integration which were forged during the early years of the community have largely dissipated over time, and no formal structure is in place to coordinate and maintain the relationship between the university and the community. As the Director of Community Relations for the Managing Partner at the ULRC at AU says, “Right now, our only university contact is [the CEO of the University Foundation], and he's involved because of the development issues.” Residents do routinely show up at campus cultural and sporting events. Other than that, there appear to be few formal linkages between the community and the
university, although residents may informally and individually avail themselves of a number of opportunities on campus (the same as any other senior resident of the surrounding community). Affiliated University had specific, stated goals in creating its community. The university wanted to provide a place for alumni to retire nearby, produce income on university land, and link elderly people to the hospital. The community also was conceived of as a training facility for doctors and nurses. These goals were all achieved. It may be that there is now interest in setting some new goals for the community. This may require a certain renegotiation of roles and coordination between the involved parties—the university, the residents of the ULRC, and the managing partner. One current issue involves the stated desire of the managing partner for the university to provide “discounted tickets to university events and to be more active in sponsoring collaborations with the residents.” According to the CEO of the Real Estate Foundation at Affiliated University, “The University will do this, but does not want to unilaterally subsidize these efforts.” Again, coordination of activity may be required to find a satisfactory solution. New residents could conceivably bring renewed vitality to the leadership of the retirement community and lead to new efforts to cultivate closer relationships between the two organizations.

The availability of university tickets apparently constitutes a significant issue for the university and alumni residents at all three ULRCs—particularly football tickets, traditionally the mainstay of university alumni activities.

Integrated University currently stands alone on the football issue in setting aside 200 tickets for the residents of its ULRC to use at their discretion. The ULRC will be able to purchase a block of tickets to distribute to residents at the normal price. The President
of the nonprofit Board of Directors at Integrated University points out that access to
football tickets is a very important issue to alumni. “That may be a little thing to you,” he
says, “but for us to have said ‘we think this is close enough to us that just like a student
group we're going to allocate football tickets’ is pretty significant.” The logistics of how
the tickets will be allotted at the ULRC remains to be determined. From the point of view
of the university administrators, including residents of the ULRC in ticket allocation
constitutes a significant gesture of inclusion within the university community. As
discussed in resource dependence theory, organizations must continually redefine and
renegotiate their boundaries. This act of inclusion seems to denote that the residents of
the ULRC would be considered on the “inside” of the university organization, at least as
far as it comes to obtaining football tickets.

The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at IU anticipates
that the residents will have certain expectations for their relationship with the university,
“They expect, I think, to have opportunities to be involved and to be a part of this larger
community. That’s what they're buying, quite honestly. They're not just buying their
home in this community. Their community is now this campus.”

While Integrated University has made numerous commitments—everything from
providing golf or tennis lessons, opening access to classes and university recreation
facilities, and providing special performances by the performing arts—the relationship is
expected to be something that will evolve over time. The structure of the Board of
Directors, which allows for a majority resident participation, in collaboration with upper-
level Integration University administrators, is the main vehicle through which the
linkages between the community and the university will be fostered and maintained.
The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors at Integrated University anticipates that the Colleges of Arts and Architecture, Health and Human Development, and Medicine will be the ones most active with the new community. Residents will enjoy a wellness program, coordinated by the College of Health and Human Development, which includes a comprehensive medical examination, eye examination, hearing examination, fitness evaluation, recommended exercise program, nutrition evaluation and counseling. This will most likely be provided by students and faculty, through internship programs, and is included in the monthly maintenance fees paid by all the residents.

Of the evolving nature of the relationship between Integrated University and the affiliated retirement community, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of IU says,

I think what you're hearing is that we just don't know [what all of the links will be]. We just don't know what the interests are going to be. Right now, the board is [Integrated University] administrators but over time it's going to be dominated by residents. I think a lot of things are just going to have to be nurtured. . . There's teaching opportunities, practicums. In fact there's opportunities for research. We will have speakers come in. So, you know, I think those things will happen, just cause there's self-serving interests on both parties' parts. I think the only structure is that we will have a minority presence on the board that will help to be part of our consciousness and to make those things gel.

Integrated University will offer priority access to events at their entertainment centers, university classes on a space-available basis, along with university transportation to group activities. “Priority access” means the university will allow the management of the ULRC to purchase blocks of tickets for events which appeal to residents. Administrators expect that university faculty and staff will offer presentations, lectures
and workshops, on different topics at the ULRC. “[The ULRC] was formed on that basis, that they [alumni] would come and be active members of this community” says the President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at Integrated University. Says the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of IU, “There's the arts, athletics, there's volunteers, all kinds of other ways that we can teach. There's guest lecturers.” The President of the Nonprofit Board for the ULRC at IU says, “I think it is our hope, and we do this now, these people have a lot of knowledge in a particular field, and they'll connect with a professor and teach two classes. We have captains of industry who may teach a class once in a while. So our hope is that we'll find some matches from within the community.” The President of the nonprofit board concedes, however, that these connections are unlikely to occur spontaneously. Whether or not the residents themselves, or a hired program director, will take responsibility for forging these hoped-for connections remains unclear at this point.

Football tickets are not part of the deal at HIU, although, according the university's alumni magazine, ticket availability is the most common question asked by potential residents. But many other campus initiatives are included. HIU is unique in having pursued and obtained written agreements with every significant dean and director on campus in advance of the ULRC’s construction, so that the various divisions can plan the ways in which they can interact with the new community. These written agreements, called “Affiliation Agreements,” spell out the particular commitments made by each department vis-a-vis the new ULRC, while underlining the university's commitment to the new community.
Many of the linkages at HIU have been created by the already-hired Dean of Residents. This individual, who has a background as an administrator in the Continuing Education Department at HIU, has responsibility for managing and making connections between residents, the university, and the wider community. She has already created two lifelong learning initiatives which are already operating in anticipation of the opening of the community—an Institute for Learning in Retirement, a Speaker's Series on Aging. She recently added a book series, in collaboration with a university museum. These educational, public forums provide opportunities for residents not only to learn, but also to interact with one another, and to begin to build a sense of community.

The ULRC at HIU is the only community studied here to incorporate dedicated classroom space into the facility. It is also the only community that consulted with faculty in the overall design of the facility. The Executive Vice President of Nonprofit Board of Directors at HIU was involved in this process:

When you have an academic community, when we designed the fitness center, we have a College of Health and Human Performance here, so we invited the faculty and the dean to sit that day with us and design the fitness center so that it was state of the art. Same with nursing, pharmacy, physical therapy, occupational therapy. It took an enormous amount of time. We have a performance theater—a 250 seat auditorium with a stage that was designed in conjunction with the College of Fine Arts to make sure that the acoustics were right for concerts and plays. So, that was very, very time consuming and very very valuable, although it ended up adding a lot of cost. For example, our health and fitness center has a lap pool, and an aerobics pool. Which I don't think you'll find anywhere in the United states—it cost a fortune—but our experts said, and they're right, that if you're a serious lap swimmer you need a different environment than for aerobics. Having big whirlpools for physical therapy. We had everybody dreaming their dreams and we have everything you could want. We also built in space for classrooms and students. So although we'll be well beyond meeting what the staffing ratios are required
by the state, we will have students in many, many programs, enhancing those ratios.

The Club Center will also include a large performing arts center, a woodworking shop, creative arts studio, game room, computer/business center, library, planned recreational and educational activities, barbershop and post office. The fitness center will be staffed with a wellness coordinator from the university.

According to an undated, university press release titled: “Residents of [ULRC at HIU] plotting course of retirement for next generation: World-class retirement community promises best that college and life can offer,” the community is, …closely affiliated and planned in conjunction with [HIU]. It offers residents college ID cards, ties with a world class medical system through the university medical center and the HIU faculty, and a vision for positive aging reflected in its programming and design. While other universities in the country have undertaken similar efforts to attract the aging population . . .few can claim as close ties with the university, benefiting [ULRC at HIU] residents in all facets of life. [ULRC at HIU] residents will be an integral part of the HIU community—its residents will carry the same ID cards as students, faculty and staff.

The following Comparison Chart (Table 1) summarizes the main similarities and differences between the three communities, as well as the researcher’s assessment of their current level of institutional integration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affiliated University</th>
<th>Integrated University</th>
<th>High Integration University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES. University presence, no residents, alumni presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University ID's for Residents</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Managing Partner/private firm</td>
<td>Private Investors/Tax-exempt bonds</td>
<td>Alumni donations/Tax-exempt bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue to University</td>
<td>Annual lease plus fixed portion of revenue</td>
<td>Annual lease plus perpetual fee for each unit</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Land</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Tickets</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Involvement</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Hands-off</td>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Date</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2003 (expected)</td>
<td>2003 (expected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Age</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Residents/Depositors</td>
<td>Low to mid-eighties</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Consultation on Design</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO/(they added auditorium for performing arts)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key University Administrator</td>
<td>CEO of University Real Estate Foundation</td>
<td>Associate VP for Development and Alumni Relations</td>
<td>Associate VP for Administration—University Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Status</td>
<td>For profit</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Institutional Integration</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium / (Still developing)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Model of Institutional Integration**

The Model of Institutional Integration is an expanded version of the abbreviated model presented in Fig. 1. Figure 2 illustrates in greater detail the expected way in which a public university may form bridges to its linked retirement community for the purposes of advancing the institution's mission, based upon resource dependence theory. The Model of Institutional Integration incorporates the themes that emerged from the research into an explanatory framework that attempts to depict the relationships between them.

**Discussion of Model.** The discussion of the Model of Institutional Integration begins at the top of the illustration and moves downward. At the top, we have the original sponsoring institution, the *state university* with an *institutional mission* that we have defined as “*teaching, research, and service*.” In order for the university to create and connect to a satellite retirement community, the various university agents must first determine a *vision* for the form this new community will take.
**Fig. 2 Model of institutional integration**

**A Model of Institutional Integration**
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As a potentially “hybrid” project (Hughes, et al. 1991), university administrators will need to engage in *consensus-building* among various constituents to establish a coherent *vision* for the way in which the retirement community will be linked to the university. The various constituents may include the Board of Trustees, the President of the University, the faculty, administration, and directors of allied centers or institutes. This vision needs to advance the overall mission of the university if it is to win support. This vision is then connected to the ULRC through the building of various “bridges” as described by Pfeffer & Salancik (1978).

The vision for the community will impact the way in which the university will structure its connections to the ULRC. *Bridging strategies*, as described in Resource Dependence Theory, are structural or organizational entities that are created by one organization to increase coordination or to maintain a level of control over another, separate organization. Boundary spanning and contracting are two examples of bridging strategies.

For example, members of the university community may also take on active roles at the ULRC. Resource dependence theory would describe this as *boundary spanning*. A Board of Directors with clearly defined rules of succession may be established to ensure the perpetual involvement of the university and its agents in the management of an allied retirement community. Of course, from the point of view of the ULRC, this involvement ensures a permanent vested interest in the success and involvement of the ULRC by the university.

A boundary spanning individual or organization would have roles in two separate organizations—in this case, both the university and the ULRC—and would hence span
the boundary between them. For example, individuals may be hired whose job
responsibilities include forging and maintaining alliances between the ULRC and the
university on behalf of the residents of the retirement community. Institutional entities
may also serve a boundary spanning role. An Institute for Learning in Retirement and a
Center on Aging are examples of possible boundary spanning agencies for a ULRC.
Practicum advisors, who oversee student practicum work at a ULRC may also span
boundaries as they work with both university students and ULRC residents.

Likewise, written contracts may be enacted between representatives of both
entities (the university and the ULRC) to ensure a clear commitment and understanding
of expectations.

Other examples of bridging strategies which may be employed to increase
coordination between the university and the ULRC include the cooptation of community
representatives onto a ULRC’s board of directors. The university may also erect tangible,
physical connections to campus (physical bridges); or cultivate symbolic bridges or
connections between the two organizations.

Physical bridges that may be erected to integrate the retirement community with
the university include dedicated classroom space, walkways or bike paths, university
transportation routes, lecture halls, concert halls, and other meeting places. The university
may also erect special places for ULRC residents on campus. An allied medical center
may elect to build adjunct office space at the ULRC. The same is true for university-
based physical or occupational therapy programs, counseling practicum offices, and so
on.
Symbolic bridges can also be used to emphasize and underscore the perceived closeness between the retirement community and the university. The promotional literature for the studied ULRC communities is replete with examples of this symbolism, much of which is nostalgic in nature. School colors are employed on the literature, old photographs of undergraduates from the 1950s are used in some of the brochures, and messages from the university president inviting prospective residents to come back “home” are common. Academic terminology can also be used to extend the metaphorical connection. For example, the site of the ULRC may be referred to as a “campus,” the residents' investment in the community may be referred to as an “endowment,” and so on.

Pfeffer & Salancik (1978) also describe bridging strategies such as joint ventures, mergers, and bargaining that were not observed in the three cases studied here.

To the extent these bridging mechanisms are present and functioning, they lead to the central concept of the model—institutional integration—which is defined as the congruence of the retirement community with the university's institutional mission, and which is depicted by the overlapping area enclosed by the dotted line. Conversely, the absence of identifiable bridging mechanisms would indicate a low level of institutional integration of the ULRC. When the separate corporation of the ULRC shares the vision of the university (which may be articulated in a written mission statement), and bridging strategies are in place to allow the implementation of the university's vision, the result should be the advancement of the university's institutional mission at the ULRC.

Institutional mission advancement for the university occurs when the goals of teaching, research, or service are furthered. This tripartite mission may be advanced at the ULRC in many ways. The teaching mission may be advanced when residents take
classes at the university (for credit or not), or through a ULRC-based Institute for Learning in Retirement. Such Institutes extend the reach of the university’s teaching mission to new segments of the population. Residents may avail themselves of public lectures, library resources, public performances, and other educational outreach initiatives. The teaching mission may also be advanced when students from the university engage in practicum work at the ULRC. A ULRC may enlarge opportunities for hands-on engagement for undergraduate or graduate students in fields ranging from Dentistry to Fine Arts to Pharmacy.

The research mission may be advanced if the ULRC serves as the site of various research studies. The residents represent a certain segment of the population that might be worthy of investigation by medical researchers, gerontologists, community planners, sociologists, or other researchers interested in studying various aspects of aging. The residents may be willing to volunteer for certain studies and trials, for which they qualify, at the university. Of course, it must be pointed out that the residents of a ULRC will by no means constitute a random sampling of aged people, and probably will represent a highly stratified, well-to-do population; this could limit research potential for sociology and other fields.

The service mission may be advanced when a university extends medical and allied health resources to the residents, but the university may also be the recipient of service in the form of senior volunteerism. Seniors residents may enjoy taking tickets at football games and other university events. They may wish to become docents at a museum, or tour guides on the university campus. They may enjoy mentoring or becoming friendly with homesick students. Similarly, university students may enjoy
volunteering their time at the ULRC and enjoy benefits from associating with a greater range of age diversity than is typically found at a university campus. The extension of university institutional mission through the vehicle of the separate ULRC is depicted in Fig. 2 by the arrows labeled teaching, research, and service.

As the model indicates, the advancement of the mission at the ULRC requires consensus-building at the university, the development of a clear vision for how the mission is to be extended, and the presence of bridging strategies to ensure the presence of a shared vision at the ULRC. These concepts are all united within the model by the dotted line that connects the university and the ULRC. The dotted line represents the central concept of the model: **institutional integration**. Institutional integration is defined as the extent to which the external organization (the ULRC) shares the goals and mission of the “parent” organization (the state university). Without this integration, it is entirely possible for the ULRC to operate as a completely separate organization, with minimal, if any, connection to the university or advancement of the institutional mission.

*Alumni, friends, and retired faculty and staff* of the university are likely to comprise a significant proportion of the residents of a ULRC. These residents constitute a potentially valuable constituency for the respective university. They control resources of value to the university, including *time, expertise, support, gifts, donations, and influence*. By integrating the ULRC with the university, a university increases the likelihood for *potential resources returning to the university*. The university also decreases the likelihood that allegiance to the university among the members of the valuable constituency may be transferred to another institution.
Resource dependence theory states that no organization can provide all of the resources necessary for its own survival, and hence is required to engage in exchanges with outside organizations or agencies to survive. With the aging of the well-educated Baby Boomer Generation, alumni now constitute a significant, numerous, and affluent potential resource base for universities. By structuring the organization of these retirement communities in such a way so as to maximize and facilitate the involvement of these vital constituents with the university, administrators can increase the likelihood that resources controlled by this constituency will flow back to the university.
Chapter Five: Analysis

Analysis of the data from research at the three ULRCs yielded findings that helped form the categories comprising the Model of Institutional Integration. The model attempts to consolidate and depict the relationships perceived to exist between the various categories. Discussion of the thematic evidence uncovered by the research follows, in the order of the Model of Institutional Integration from top to bottom, and supported with examples from the data.

Consensus building

In encouraging universities to transform land holdings into developable projects, Hughes et. al. (1991) distinguish between real estate projects undertaken purely for profit, and those which support and expand institutional mission—what they term “hybrid” projects. According to the authors, standard projects can use traditional, top-down managerial processes, while a “hybrid” project requires greater consensus-building among the various constituents to gain support.

Because university-linked retirement communities have the potential to advance institutional mission, they may be considered “hybrid” projects (Hughes et al. 1991). By engaging in consensus building activities with various university constituents, proponents of a ULRC can help to establish a coherent, shared vision for the way in which the retirement community will be linked to the university. The various constituents may include the Board of Trustees, the President of the University, the faculty, administration,
and directors of allied centers or institutes. This vision needs to advance the overall mission of the university if it is to win support.

Building consensus appears to be a pre-requisite to developing a clear, unambiguous vision for the role of the ULRC, and its integration with the larger organizational entity—the university. Because the idea of incorporating retirement communities into the campus environment is so new, it may challenge conventional perceptions of a university's proper role. It appears that unless significant agents of the university are brought “on board” and feel an investment in the community, the community may remain isolated and disconnected from the functioning life of the university, because there is insufficient impetus for changing the status quo.

Leading the way in establishing consensus for the integration of its ULRC throughout the university community is High Integration University. The investment of time and effort by the key informant, along with the President of the university and the Dean of the College of Health Professions, led to an unprecedented and clear establishment of shared vision throughout the university. This vision is articulated and documented through the formal mission statement for the community, and through the unique Affiliation Agreements between various agents of the university and the representatives of the ULRC. According to the Dean of the College of Health Professions and Secretary of the Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU,

[The Executive Vice President of the nonprofit board] and I met with all the deans at [HIU]. We also met with several center directors. The purpose of the meetings was to introduce them to the [ULRC] and consider opportunities for their programs at [the ULRC]. My recollection was these meetings followed an introductory meeting that occurred the previous year. At that meeting, the President described the project and encouraged deans
to consider opportunities. The next year, [the Executive Vice President of the ULRC’s Board of Directors], a university attorney and I met separately to consider the opportunities. These meetings were useful as they focused on only one college and its programs. Once you get the Dean in a meeting with only one topic, something is bound to happen. It helped that [the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit board] who is Vice President at the Foundation and I, another Dean, were arranging the meetings. Overall, the high level of support for the project at [HIU] has made a difference. The President was very supportive and that was very important.

The Dean estimates that he and the Executive Vice President engaged in about 20 consensus-building meetings that lasted about 1 to 1.5 hours each, between 20-30 hours overall. According to the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU,

The three of us [HIU President, Dean of the College of Health Professions, and Executive Vice President of the nonprofit board] met with every dean and significant director on campus— and [High Integration University] is enormous. So we met with every dean and director all over campus, doing consensus-building, that this was a good thing for the energy of [HIU] to go into, and I think that, as time-consuming as that was, it was probably a key component. Because if we had foisted this upon the community, it would have been a very different result. What we did is say, “Here is an opportunity, we’re thinking about doing this. Do you see any academic synergies or benefits for your unit? Do you think this is a good idea? Should we commit our time to it? And we got, really, unanimous support. And it was very interesting. We have obviously gone back to those parties many times, and developed—we have a written affiliation agreement with the university that outlines what every unit thinks they're going to do with the [ULRC].

The involvement of relevant HIU faculty in an advisory capacity during the design phase of the ULRC may have also increased their overall level of interest in the future of the community.
Consensus at Integrated University was not so easily achieved. According to the President of the Development Corporation at Integrated University,

The Board of Trustees bought the concept, but it was not an easy sell. Several people raised their hands and said, “Why are we doing this?” We’re in the business of teaching, research and service . . . It was a big issue, once upon a time. Five years ago. Now I think everybody is hoping the project will go forward as we want it to.

When the President of the Board of Trustees for the ULRC at Integrated University was asked how much consensus building had to be done to get this off the ground, he replied, “More than we thought. Quite a bit, actually. I would say primarily because the developers are all household names around [Integrated University]. I think the perception is that they are making a lot of money off this.” The overall vision for this community remains more in the developmental stages, and is still somewhat of an open question, although the structure of the Board of Directors calls for a resident majority. This is expected to ensure the involvement of residents in shaping the eventual form that the community's relationship with the university takes.

Because Affiliated University has turned the day-to-day operation of its ULRC over to the managing partner, and because the facility has been operating for over ten years, it is difficult to assess how much consensus building may have gone on at the inception of the community. When I asked the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Affiliated University how much consensus building was required to launch the ULRC at AU, he responded, “Not that much actually. On a scale of 1 to ten this was maybe a ‘3.’” Of course, the ULRC at AU is not as integrated with the university as the other, newer ULRCs, and probably did not challenge conventional opinions about the university's role, as did the newer communities at IU and HIU.
Consensus is not a fixed entity, by any means, and can change over time to accommodate altered goals, expectations, and realities. Building consensus may be a renewed concern at AU, as witnessed by the apparent desire for a re-negotiation of roles by the managing partner of the ULRC at Affiliated University. As the ULRCs mature and change, their roles, programming, and relationship to the university may need to change as well, to accommodate new priorities and needs.

**Vision**

When an organization is creating a new relationship—a new entity—it can be difficult to envision what form this should take. These retirement communities are all novel, and have virtually no established models to draw from in their conception. One important theme that emerged from this research is the value of being able to create a solid, clear vision for the ULRC—and its role vis-à-vis the university—that can be articulated and shared with others.

The most clearly articulated vision among these ULRCs is that of High Integration University, which has encapsulated it in its explicit mission statement that speaks directly to the official affiliation with the sponsoring university.

Because university presidents span departments and are instrumental in establishing and maintaining institutional “climate,” they can be extremely effective in articulating and disseminating this vision among constituencies. Consider the following open letter from the now President of HIU, in the ULRC at HIU Newsletter entitled, *A Partnership of Learning and Sharing*. He states,
In many ways, the [ULRC at High Integration University] provides the same opportunity facing a first-time college student because of what it offers its residents—opportunities for lifelong learning affiliated with a prestigious, comprehensive research university. Many [High Integration University] alumni and friends want more from retirement than just comfort and security. As [High Integration University] evolves, we will expand the ways in which we offer learning opportunities. Web-based courses are one example, and extensions such as the partnership with the [ULRC at High Integration University] is another.

Inherent in the [ULRC at HIU] experience is the limitless opportunities for residents, students, faculty and staff at all of the colleges and units at the university to interact in a partnership of learning and sharing. The [ULRC at HIU] residents immediately become a part of this outstanding institution and they will also add to its luster. They will enjoy the same privileges provided to our students and faculty and will become part of the university learning and research enterprise. In many ways [High Integration University] benefits from a partnership with the [ULRC] by gaining access to current and former professionals from all walks of life with valuable life experiences to share. There will be opportunities for [ULRC] residents to be guest lecturers at [HIU] and to serve as mentors to students. . . . I could not be more pleased with the strides that have been made in the planning of the [ULRC at HIU] and the enormous opportunities that are unfolding.

HIU is so proud of its vision for the ULRC at HIU that it has published a separate booklet entitled “Leadership and Vision,” which outlines the history of the community and the university's role in facilitating this endeavor. This booklet begins with the history of university interest in this community. The idea, which was encouraged over many years by retired faculty, alumni and friends, really began to take shape when a professor from the Department of Sociology became a proponent of the concept. He completed research on the benefits of living in such a community and organized a presentation that led to the creation of a task force to look into the development of the community. This booklet also details the impressive credentials of the current Board of Directors for the
community, and outlines in detail the meaning of the affiliation of the retirement
community with the university.

While the vision for the ULRC at Integrated University appears to be still in the
formation stages, many credit the University President with creating the vision for the
community he champions. According to the President of the Development Corporation
for the ULRC at IU,

The idea came from [the President of the University]. . . He's a family sociologist, so he has special interest in the welfare of people, and he came up with this idea very early in his administration which began in 1995. And his idea was pretty simple and pretty grand. That the university would have a connection with a retirement community that would be particularly welcoming to alumni, but also open to others. And the idea was that this would be better living than is available, essentially, anywhere else, because it would be associated with the university, and the people that lived in this community would not only experience all the benefits that a big university brings, athletic, cultural, social—he saw people volunteering, for example, in the university's day care centers. He saw students doing research studies with the residents. A real connection with young and old people being together in interesting and productive ways. So what we have here, as far as my limited experience suggests, is pretty neat. And I credit that to the president of the university who has this vision. And he's been very very supportive at every turn. He will go and talk and explain his vision, he's been really a wonderful support in that way. So that's how it started.

When the President of the Development Corporation was asked to describe her own vision of the mission for the ULRC at IU, she replied, “That's an interesting question. To provide the best living environment possible to the residents. And by “living environment” I mean connected intimately to [Integrated University].”
The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors at Integrated University concurs with the assessment that the President of Integrated University was the animating force behind the overall vision for the ULRC,

The idea originated with our President who wanted to build a community that served not only those in their late retirement years, who needed long term health care—that would be your typical continuous care community facility—but also a younger population. There are really two portions of this village—one is your basic planned residential development, PRD, you know small, townhomes, etc. and the other is what would typically be referred to as your CCRC and that was, quite honestly, his vision to do that here. I would say that it has been in the master plan for some time. [The President] brought clarity to it.

Affiliated University, rather than having a “vision” for the community, had clear goals for what the various actors hoped to achieve by creating the community. Perhaps significantly, these goals served the various actors who created the community: the University Real Estate Foundation, the Alumni Association, and the University Health Sciences Foundation. The goals included having a place to study aging; providing a place at the university for alumni to retire; and using university land for the benefit of the university. Administrators at Affiliated University agree that the community has fulfilled its initial goals, while conceding that the links between the university and the community are not as strong as might have been expected.

Perhaps significantly, there was apparently no “university-wide” agent, like the President, in “charge” of managing the university's proposed relationship with the community at Affiliated University. While the precipitating goals have apparently been met, and the community supports institutional mission through revenue, it appears there may be room for a renegotiation or expansion of vision sometime in the future. For
example, while the Alumni Association was involved during the initial marketing of the facility, it currently has no ongoing involvement with the community.

The establishment of vision, early on in the planning for a ULRC, can influence the structure of the community and its relationship to the university. Ideally, a university will have engaged in a significant amount of consensus building activity in arriving at and disseminating this vision, so that university-wide interest in the community can be maximized.

**Bridging strategies**

Bridging strategies are structural or organizational entities which are created by one organization to increase coordination or to maintain a level of control over another, separate organization. “Bridges” are created to ensure that the vision for the community created by the sponsoring organization (the university) is, in fact, implemented in the separate, satellite organization. Pfeffer & Salancik (1978) state that “the typical solution to problems of interdependence and uncertainty involves increasing coordination,” and bridging mechanisms help achieve this goal (p. 43). Data analysis from this research yields five types of bridging strategies or mechanisms by which these three universities maintain coordination with their respective, affiliated retirement communities. They are cooptation; symbolic bridges; boundary spanners; physical bridges; and contracting. Every bridging strategy is not currently used at each university, but High Integration University currently employs all of them.
Cooptation

Cooptation is a mechanism described in resource dependence theory by which external elements are incorporated into the decision-making or advisory structures of an organization (Scott, 1998, p. 71). This strategy can be used to gain leverage or political support, to ensure cooperation, or to serve mutual self-interest. Allowing representatives of other organizations to participate in decision-making in the focal organization is an important indication of interdependence and an effort by the linked organizations to coordinate their activities.

Affiliated University currently displays few examples of cooptation, since the governing structure of the ULRC is the responsibility of the managing partner, and is completely separate from the university administration. If the managing partner or the residents of the ULRC were to pressure the university to increase coordination between the two organizations (as appears to be happening), then the university may wish to consider enacting some form of cooptation in response. The university could ask to have a representative administrator placed on an advisory council with the managing partner, or may invite some members of the ULRC community to become involved on an advisory council at the university. At this point, it is not apparent that the university is dissatisfied with the current relationship with the ULRC, however.

Integrated University has utilized cooptation by planning to have residents comprise the majority on its ULRC board of directors. In one of the more interesting examples of cooptation in this research, the former Vice President for Administration at Integrated University was hired by the development corporation managing the ULRC project, and became the President of the Development Corporation. Her successor now
has a seat on the ULRC’s Board of Directors. The President of the Development Corporation remains in frequent contact with her former colleagues, and keeps them apprised of activity within the Development Company. She does this,

...because of my history. Because I used to be with the university, and I know all of these people, because I worked with them closely, and so they have been gracious enough to ask me to go and it's sort of a mutually beneficial thing, because I can make sure we're on the right track with them and I can also give them enormously helpful information because my hands are on it everyday, and theirs are not.

The Board of Directors for the ULRC at High Integration University has coopted very influential members of the HIU surrounding community, including the mayor and prominent business people. This has political advantages for the ULRC, and helps to short-circuit the sort of problems encountered by Integrated University when the Town Council refused to approve their initial bond issue.

**Boundary spanners**

Boundary spanners are individuals or agencies that function in two different organizations—in this case, both in the ULRC and the sponsoring university. The ULRCs in this study exhibit numerous examples of boundary spanning activity, to help link the two entities. For example, an individual hired to personify and animate the linkages between the two entities, such as a concierge, program director, or “Dean of Residents” would be considered a boundary spanner. Organizational entities (such as centers or institutes) that are created or mobilized to manage the task of bridging between the two separate organizations would also be considered boundary spanners. Examples would include an Institute for Learning in Retirement or a Center on Aging. University faculty
internship advisors, who oversee student work at a ULRC may also span boundaries as they work with both university students and ULRC residents. Certainly, the members of a ULRC Board of Directors who also serve as university administrators would be examples of boundary spanning individuals. Finally, the residents themselves, who are likely to be alumni or retired faculty or staff can also be considered boundary spanners, due to their prior, established relationship to the university. They may, in fact, be the most “potent” boundary spanners of all, depending on their interests and initiative for becoming involved with the university. In one particularly interesting twist, the ULRC at HIU has announced that four former, retired HI university presidents have currently signed up to become residents of the ULRC at HIU. Clearly, the composition of the residents is in itself potentially an influential, boundary spanning catalyst for integration with the wider campus community.

At Affiliated University, representatives of the medical school who are involved in healthcare initiatives at the ULRC serve boundary spanning roles. The Center for Aging at the Medical School has also served a boundary spanning role, in launching initiatives to link the community with the university. Internship supervisors, overseeing student work at the facility, also serve as boundary spanners. Traditional students who volunteer at the community are boundary spanners. The Division of Continuing Education at Affiliated University served a boundary spanning role, in seeking to facilitate resident lifelong learning.

At Integrated University, the members of the ULRC Board of Directors who also serve in administrative posts at the university would be considered boundary spanners. The Concierge, or Program Director, when hired, will likely serve a boundary spanning
role in forging linkages between residents and the university. Coaches or athletes, offering athletic instruction, or taking part in a practicum at the facility would be other examples of boundary spanners. The President of the Development Corporation, who frequently shares information with her former colleagues at the university, could be considered yet another boundary spanning individual.

The ULRC at HIU, however, currently exhibits the most examples of boundary spanning activity, beginning with the composition of its Board of Directors. In this research, key members of the university community may be placed in active, decision-making roles at the ULRC (which is set up as a separate corporation). For example, a Board of Directors with clearly defined rules of succession may be established to ensure the perpetual involvement of the university and its agents in the management of an allied retirement community.

The bylaws of the ULRC at HIU require four board members to be High Integration University employees at all times. This guarantees significant participation by HIU in the operation and management of the ULRC. Another four board members must be alumni of HIU, thereby strengthening the care and concern of the board for the reputation and quality that HIU expects. The aforementioned “Leadership and Vision” brochure details the background and accomplishments of each member of the Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU.

The Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors at HIU points out that,

Obviously, the composition of the Board of Directors was very important. So what we have is a board that is structured where there are four university employees on the Board of Directors at all
times and those are the President, me, Dean of the College of Health Professions and the Dean of the College of Nursing. Then there are four university alumni on the board, and then four friends of [HIU]. For example, the retired Provost of the university is on the board, he is not an alumnus. We have the mayor on the board. Some developers and insurance people. . .Getting a fabulous board was critical. An unbelievable board that was willing to spend a huge amount of time—for free—and we're all volunteers.

While the HIU Board of Directors currently includes future residents, unlike Integrated University, there will be no residents on the Board of Directors when the facility opens, due to the issue of conflict of interest. There will, however, be a resident council, and the board is contemplating allowing the president of that council to be an ex officio, non-voting member of the Board of Directors.

The Institute of Aging is a boundary spanning agency that has co-sponsored another boundary spanning initiative in collaboration with the ULRC—the Institute for Learning in Retirement. The Institute on Aging, whose mission is to “work together as a university community to advance the health, independence and quality of life of the increasingly diverse older population and their families” is another boundary spanning agency. In working toward this goal, the Institute “will identify, test and disseminate innovative approaches to optimizing later life.” The IOA’s motto is “Adding Life to Years” and their involvement with the ULRC project advances this mission. So far, the most collaborative project that has involved the Institute and the ULRC has been the recent establishment of the Institute for Learning in Retirement at the ULRC. This initiative was conceived by the Dean of Residents, who, when she presented the idea to the Board of Directors, found an enthusiastic reception with one particular member—the Director of the Institute on Aging. The collaboration on the Institute for Learning in
Retirement was a natural fit for both the ULRC and the Institute. The Dean of Residents says, “I had found out about ILRs... and said to myself, maybe you could convince the Board to open up the ILR to everyone whether they lived in [The ULRC at HIU] or not. And so I presented it to our Board. And one of our Board members is the Director of the Institute on Aging. And he said, ‘That is in our strategic plan, but several years out.’ And I said, ‘well, we don’t need to recreate, why don’t we partner together?’”

The Communications and Outreach Manager of the IOA at HIU anticipates that more collaborative projects will emerge over time, including involving [ULRC] residents in future research project opportunities. She sees the involvement of the IOA with the ULRC as “a natural fit to work together—especially since our Director serves on their Board of Directors.” She adds that staff at both organizations work well together on joint projects.

The Speakers Series on Aging is another boundary spanning initiative which brings together representatives of the university (including faculty), the ULRC, the alumni community, and the larger HIU town community in offering its programs.

Perhaps the most influential boundary spanner, however, is the Dean of Residents, who was hired specifically to bridge boundaries between the ULRC, the university, and the wider HIU town community. Her presence has apparently made a huge difference in the level of institutional integration at HIU. Her job title, “Dean of Residents” bears obvious educational implications, and her full-time job is to be a liaison between the residents and a very large university. According to the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU,
When a new community member joins [the ULRC at HIU], [the Dean of Residents'] job is to get to know them, and to sit down with them, and help them plan what they want to do. Did they always want to get a degree in Anthropology? Would they like to audit a class in Greek History? Do they love animals? Would they like to volunteer in the birthing barn—the equine birthing barn? To be a docent at the museum? Do they like classical music, would they like to get on the music series board? Then, also find out the expertise that the residents are bringing to the community, take that expertise, and share it with the university community. If we have the retired CEO of a bank, [the Dean of Residents] would make contact between that person and our finance professors who teach banking classes and say, ‘Here's a person that might make a great speaker, or an advisor, or a mentor to a student,’ and try to get the richness of the expertise of the community back into the university community.

The Dean of Residents conceives her role thusly: “I would say that I am the liaison between the actual community, its members, and the university. And I see myself as the liaison for the community at large as well as for the residents, who each have determined different goals and different functions that they want to contribute to or participate in at the university.” The Dean of Residents also serves a boundary spanning role by sitting on university-wide committees that affect the university and might potentially affect the retirement community. These currently include the committees for the Performing Arts and the future of the HIU One Card.

**Physical bridges**

The availability of physical, or tangible bridges or connections to the university from the ULRC underscores the perceived closeness between the two entities and can serve to facilitate interaction. The most obvious, and arguably most important, physical “bridge” between the ULRC and their sponsoring universities is physical proximity. This
is the crux of the community—a vital element that has the potential to establish and intensify the relationship between the university and the alumni (or former faculty) residents of these communities. Two of the three ULRCs (IU and HIU) plan to provide regular transportation between the community and the university, thereby facilitating interaction—particularly important for older alumni who find driving (and parking) difficult. Other physical bridges that may be erected to integrate the life of the retirement community with the university include dedicated classroom space, walkways or bikepaths, lecture halls, concert halls, and other meeting places. The university may also erect special places for ULRC residents on campus. An allied medical center may elect to build adjunct office space at the ULRC. The same is true for university-based physical or occupational therapy programs, counseling or practicum offices, and so on.

The importance of physical proximity in connecting these retirement communities with their sponsoring campuses cannot be overstated. All three ULRCs are located within three miles of their sponsoring university. Two of the communities, (those at Affiliated University and Integrated University) are located on university-owned property. According to the President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at Integrated University, “The retirement community is adjacent to our property, adjacent to our campus, taking advantage of everything that we have here.” At Integrated University, the ULRC will be located on a hill overlooking the university football stadium within 1 mile—feasible walking distance. Leon Pastalan points out that even though many retirement communities are only a 15 or 20-minute walk from campus, “proximity doesn't guarantee participation.” If the college or university isn't committed to cooperation, “the retirement community might as well be a hundred miles away”
(Manheimer, 2001b, R8). He sees it as important that the community be an integral part of the campus, where residents can walk to classes and cultural events.

The community at HIU, while not on university property, was strategically located near the campus. According to the Assistant Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs Real Estate,

> It's very close to campus. We did some market surveys of our target age and income qualified group, a scientific survey, and asked them what kind of facility they wanted. And the questions ranged from high-rise urban to very suburban campus and north, south, east or west from campus, since our initial target group was drawn from our own database, so we assumed that they were familiar with the university. And there wasn't any real directional preference but [laughs] the natural preference was, you know, give us a huge tract right in the heart of campus. But the conclusion was that we wanted a campus-type setting, not an urban setting—you know, a high rise—as close to campus as possible. So we secured the largest tract of land as close to campus as possible which is about a mile south of campus proper and about two miles south of the quadrant of campus most people remember.

The presence of common space, and classroom space, can also serve to facilitate involvement by various campus-based entities at the ULRC. By building space for lectures, performances or health facilities into the design of the community, the administrators indicate their expectation that these activities will comprise a major part of the life of the community. All three communities are designed with a considerable amount of common space, for maximizing the interaction and involvement of the residents.

All three communities will have a university-staffed health clinic on site to bring university medical practitioners to the ULRC on a regular basis. According to the [Affiliated University] Alumni News, Affiliated University established its in-house
ambulatory care clinic, “to help bridge the distance between the [ULRC] and the Health Sciences Center.”

The presence of ULRC-based libraries, classrooms, and performing arts auditoriums say much more about the wellness-based, educational goals of the community. Until the completion of the facilities for the ULRC at HIU, the Dean of Residents there is improvising in her search for common space for activities:

My goal that I see for myself, besides building and bridging communities, the [ULRC and HIU] and the surrounding community at large, I also see that it's important that before we have the actual physical structures, that we start forging community, so that when everyone moves in there's a sense of community and belonging... I said [right now] I don't have the classroom space. [We] can't get on campus, so what I've done is gone around the community and asked for space to have classes.” The ILR will be holding classes at an elementary school, the university museum, and a botanical garden. You name it, I've been there. And we're going to use our [the development corporation's] conference room.

Contracting

Contracting refers to the negotiation of an agreement for the exchange of performances in the future (Thompson 1967, p. 35). Written contracts may be enacted between representatives of two organizations to ensure a clear commitment and understanding of expectations.

Contracts may be formally drawn up, or they may be more informal. The critical point is that they represent attempts by organizations to reduce uncertainty by coordinating their future behavior, in limited and specific ways, with other units. Naturally, all three universities employ formal, legal contracts to stipulate the terms of their agreements with their managing partners. At Affiliated University, contracts specify
that the responsibility for the operation of the facility belongs with the managing partner.

At Integrated University, contracts currently specify that the responsibility for launching the community is the responsibility of the managing partners who will be overseen by the development company. Upon completion of the facility, the development corporation will dissolve. Ownership of the facility will then revert to the Board of Directors.

Contracts also are used to stipulate the agreements for financial remuneration for the use of university land, the use of the university name and trademark, and profits to investors.

“When we signed a licensing agreement that says you can use our name, that shows that it's a formal relationship,” says the President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at IU. “There is an agreement between [Integrated University] and the partners. There are very formal contracts. There is the entity comprising the managing partner and the developers, and the board oversees that entity.”

According to the President of the Development Corporation at IU, “The development agreement is the agreement that Integrated University signed with the Partnership. . .which says, you're going to build it and you're going to manage it, and it talks about how they're going to do that.”

Aside from detailing the structure of the business agreement, however, this contract also stipulated the role of the university vis-à-vis the ULRC. The President of the Development Corporation at IU points out that the agreement details that, “Integrated University is going to do, how shall I put this, nothing that costs money.”

HIU, as well, has formal contracts with its development and financial partners, detailing the expected arrangements. Beyond these formal, legal documents, however,
more informal agreements can be enacted to stipulate the arrangements expected between various agents of the university and the retirement community.

“There are obvious educational synergies for the university and its students,” says the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors of the planned ULRC at HIU. “We have met with each and every dean and unit head to see what they'd like to have in their relationship with The ULRC at HIU. It's been a terrific surprise.” A recent press release (June 15, 2001) entitled, “Residents of [ULRC at the HIU] plotting course of retirement for next generation” details many specific, written pledges of support and involvement by 15 college and university entities at HIU. Highlights include:

- Wellness and prevention programs at the Fitness Club run by the College of Health and Human Performance.
- Health clinic staffed by the College of Nursing.
- Occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech pathology, audiology and clinical psychology through the College of Health Professions.
- Institute for Aging research programs by the College of Medicine.
- “Keeping Families Healthy” program by the College of Pharmacy.
- ULRC newsletter and special television and radio programming by the College of Journalism and Communications.
- Leisure time activities through the Department of Fisheries, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences.
- Poetry readings, online participation in architectural digs, and trips to the astronomy observatory through the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
The Dean of Residents does not see the current Affiliation Agreements as all-inclusive. “I see those as becoming larger in the formalization. I see that as only the beginning,” she says.

Written in the form of a legal contract, and bearing the signatures of the University President, the President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at HIU, and the University Attorney, these Affiliation Agreements delineate the “good faith” expectations of each party for their mutual future performances.

Each Affiliation Agreement opens with a summary of the background and other information on the planned ULRC, along with the university's goals, expectations, and commitments to the facility. For example:

This Affiliation agreement is effective as of the 1st Day of February, 2001 between the [ULRC at HIU, Inc.] (a not-for-profit corporation) and [HIU] for and behalf of the Board of Regents of the State of [x] (“the University”).

Background.

The [ULRC] Corporation is developing a continuing care retirement community (“facility”) to be located in [HIU town] in close proximity to the campus of [High Integration University.]

It is anticipated that a substantial number of the residents of the facility will have an existing relationship with the University or desire to establish a relationship with the University, and the University, as part of its service mission, desires to enhance that relationship by supporting the development and operation of the facility. It is the University's wish that the residents of [the ULRC at HIU] become an integral part of the University community.

It is anticipated that a large number of residents of the facility will desire to participate in University sponsored events and activities while living at the facility and the University is willing to facilitate resident participation in University activities and events.
The University would like to have access to the facility and the residents for research, teaching and service purposes; the University is willing to offer University faculty, staff and student the opportunity to participate in such activities at the facility.

In furtherance of these mutual interests, the parties agree as follows:

Dean of Residents

The [ULRC at HIU] shall employ a Dean of Residents whose responsibilities shall include, but not be limited to, developing and coordinating opportunities for interaction between University faculty, students and staff with residents of the facility and managing such activities in a way to facilitate a positive interaction between the parties.

Use of the university name

In consideration for [the ULRC at HIU] granting the University access to the facility and its residents for educational, research, and service purposes, the University authorizes [the ULRC] to utilize the phrase [“at High Integration University”] in the name of the facility. Subject to the terms of this agreement, the University further authorizes [the ULRC at HIU] to utilize the name of [High Integration University] in its marketing materials so long as such use does not imply in any way [HIU] Ownership or control of the facility of [the ULRC].

Proposed Activities for university students, faculty and staff at the facility.

Certain colleges, units and affiliated corporations of the University have agreed to work with [the ULRC] to develop programs which will be of benefit to the residents of [the ULRC] as well as support the teaching, research and service missions of the University. The proposed activities are identified on Exhibit A to this agreement. While this agreement shall not create a legally binding obligation of the University to participate in the activities described in Exhibit A, the University and [the ULRC] will work in good faith to develop programs of mutual benefit to the University and the residents of [the ULRC].

Additional Activities/Benefits for Residents

In addition to the activities described in Exhibit A, and subject to prior approval by the University and available funding, it is anticipated that residents of the facility will be able to participate in the following activities and receive the following benefits from the University:
Auditing classes—audit university classes on a space available basis and participate in other educational programs offered by the University.

[HIU] One Card—The University will offer to residents a [HIU] One Identification Card that will allow the residents various benefits to be associated with the card. These may include, but not be limited to, access to cultural and sporting events, campus food services, vending machines, bank services, library services and other services offered to members of the University community.

Facilities for Educational Activities

[The ULRC at HIU] will provide adequate facilities and equipment within the Facility to be used by University faculty, students and staff in providing any agreed upon activities or services at the facility. [The ULRC at HIU] will work with the University during the design phases for the facility to incorporate such needs in the construction plans for the Facility.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have caused this Agreement to be executed as of the day and year first above set forth.

Signed by the [High Integration University], for and on behalf of the Board of Regents of the State of [x].

The ULRC at HIU [President of ULRC Corp.]

Approved by the Office of General Counsel of [High Integration University] and the Office of Administrative Affairs at [High Integration University].

Below are two examples of the agreements entered into by university departments and the ULRC—specifically the agreements by the College of Health Professions and the College of Journalism and Communications.

Exhibit A. College of Health Professions

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between High Integration University and [the ULRC at HIU].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Health Professions, acknowledges that the College supports the development of the [ULRC at HIU] and shall
explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities and projects:

1. Research projects through its various departments involved in geriatric research.
2. Internships at the Facility in the areas of occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech pathology, audiology, and clinical psychology.
3. Lectures on topics of interest to the residents.

Signed on Nov.15, 2000 by Dean, College of Health Professions.

Exhibit B. College of Journalism and Communications

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and the [ULRC at HIU.]

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Journalism and Communications, acknowledges that the College supports the development of The [ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Student clerkships to develop a student-run [ULRC at HIU] newsletter.
2. Special programming for residents by the College's TV and radio station.
3. Volunteer opportunities for residents at W[HIU] Radio Station.
4. Journalism intern rotations through the facility.

Signed on November 15, 2000 by Dean, College of Journalism and Communication.

Further, specific examples of the fifteen Affiliation Agreements with various colleges and departments at HIU are included in Appendix A of this report.

Symbolic bridges

Symbolic bridges can also be used to underscore and emphasize the perceived closeness between the retirement community and the university. The promotional literature for the three ULRC communities is replete with examples of this symbolism, much of which is nostalgic in nature. School colors are employed on the promotional
literature for the communities, old photographs of undergraduates from the 1950s are used in some of the brochures, and messages from the university presidents inviting prospective residents to come back “home” are common. Academic terminology can also be used to extend the metaphor of connection: the site of the ULRC may be referred to as a “campus”; the residents' investment in the community may be referred to as an “endowment,” and so on. The involvement and endorsement of university presidents is another example of universities cultivating a symbolic relationship with their ULRC. The dorm-like design of the facilities, which in many ways replicates the camaraderie of the college experience, is another way in which symbolic parallels are drawn connecting the university and the community. Use of the university ID card by residents of the ULRC at HIU is both a symbolic and physical connection to the university community. Of course, the use of the university's official name on the promotional materials for the community is partially symbolic. Symbolic connection of university presidents with the community can also be achieved in numerous ways.

Symbolism in promotional literature. All three ULRCs in this study are authorized to use the university's name in their promotional literature. Integrated University allows the ULRC to use the university's trademark, or logo, as well. Says the President of the nonprofit Board of Directors at IU of the importance of the symbolic value of the use of the university’s name, “There is a significant difference when you say The [ULRC] at [Integrated University].” Use of the name implies a certain perceived level of interaction, shared destinies, and mutual interest in the success of the ULRC. According to the “Leadership and Vision” Brochure produced for the project at High Integration University, “[The ULRC at HIU] bears the name of [High Integration University].
assuring [HIU]'s vital interest in the success and quality of [the ULRC at HIU].” The official website for the ULRC at HIU is unique among these three universities in linking to the official university Alumni Association. The content of the website speaks to the importance of the official affiliation with High Integration University:

The single most distinguishing attribute that sets [the ULRC at HIU] apart is its close affiliation with [High Integration University]. Residents will have campus privileges similar to those of university staff and faculty, including admission to most cultural and sporting events, library, museums, performing arts, and most classes being taught at the university. Arrangements for campus programs can be arranged through the Dean of Residents, who will have extensive access to university information and programs.

The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors at Integrated University's ULRC concurs that the official affiliation is symbolic of an important commitment by the university, and says, “when we signed a licensing agreement that says you can use our name, that shows that it's a formal relationship.”

Appropriated terminology. The three ULRCs also use “appropriated” college terminology, such as referring to the ULRC property as a “campus,” or calling a resident's financial investment in their community an “endowment.” Of course, use of the term “Dean of Residents” at HIU is designed to connote a more educational image than if this position were titled Program Director, or Recreational Director. Several promotional pieces for these three ULRS make use of the double entendre: “seniors.” The brochure for Affiliated University announces, “Find out how nice it feels to be a senior at [Affiliated University],” under a photograph of a college student walking past the most familiar portion of campus—the dorms which traditionally house senior undergraduate students. In fact, the community at Affiliated University is named after the most notable
campus architectural structure, with the most prestige and history. The literature for the ULRC at Integrated University refers to the residents as “The Distinguished Senior Class” and promises that the [ULRC’s] unique official association with [Integrated University] gives you special status at the university.” All the universities are quick to capitalize on the nostalgic ideas in their marketing brochures: High Integration University's ULRC touts itself as providing” the best that college and life have to offer” while Integrated University invites prospects to partake of “The Homecoming of a Lifetime.”

Dorm-like design. All three communities have chosen to design their communities around a significant amount of common, shared space with dining halls, libraries, and common spaces. This recreates the feel of dorm living and can conceivably help recapture some of the interaction and camaraderie of the college experience. Model homes and entryways commonly feature campus-based photographs or artwork, to underscore the connections to the university in the design of everyday living.

Symbolic connections to campus. Symbolic connections to the universe campus are fostered in many ways. Regular columns by university faculty or boundary spanning agents (such as a medical director or representative of a university Center on Aging) appear in ULRC newsletters. The ULRC may regularly receive campus publications, and calendars for sporting events or cultural activities. Residents of the ULRC at HIU will, as mentioned earlier, carry the official university ID card. According to the “Leadership and Vision” brochure for the ULRC at HIU, many of the same privileges afforded to HIU faculty and staff will be available to residents of the ULRC at HIU, including access to libraries, athletic facilities, academic programs, cultural activities, and even vending
machines. The “HIU One” Card symbolically addresses the issue of where the boundary between the university and the retirement facility lies. According to the “Leadership and Vision” brochure, ULRC at HIU residents will “become official members of the [HIU] community through a “[HIU One]” card, the official [HIU] ID card.” Thus, residents who carry the official ID card of the university community, are symbolically considered to be on the “inside” of the boundaries of the organization.

Presidential symbolism. University presidents, aside from serving as the administrative leader of their institutions, also serve a symbolic role. Their endorsement of, or involvement in, a project places the university’s imprimatur on the endeavor and, in the case of aULRC, enhances the perceived connections between the university and the retirement community. Presidential endorsements appear in the promotional materials for both Integrated University and High Integration University.

At Affiliated University, residents enjoy an annual dinner with the president of the University.

At Integrated University, the university president offers the following assessment in the official “Homecoming of a Lifetime” brochure: “The [ULRC at Integrated University] taps into the full life of a university community. It not only offers residents cultural and recreational opportunities available through the university, it also offers the chance to be involved in the [Integrated University] learning community by taking in lectures and courses, visiting our museums, and attending athletic events.—[signed President, Integrated University].”

The current President of HIU sends a personal postcard to people requesting information on the ULRC at HIU, inviting them to join the community.
Shared Vision at ULRC

To the extent that the bridging strategies between the university and the ULRC are active and functioning, they serve to establish a shared vision of the role of the new community—the ULRC, among the agents. This shared vision is a key component of the level of institutional integration. This vision is then implemented through the furtherance of the university's overall institutional mission at the ULRC.

Institutional Integration

Institutional Integration is unlikely to be achieved spontaneously. It needs to be deliberately encouraged by constructing and maintaining the appropriate bridging mechanisms. University-wide consensus building plays a vital role in establishing the appropriate vision to enable institutional integration to occur. Formalized channels and structures need to be erected to ensure the perpetuation and utilization of connections between the ULRC and the university.

The hands-off approach (employed by Affiliated University) is likely to limit the institutional integration that may occur at a ULRC. In fact, there is evidence that the managing partner for the ULRC at Affiliated University would like to pursue closer involvement with the school. It remains to be seen if the laissez-faire approach favored by Integrated University will result in the level of integration already apparent at High Integration University where the approach has been highly proactive.
Advancement of Institutional Mission

In order for institutions of higher education to justify their involvement with establishing affiliated retirement communities, it is imperative that the universities be able to point to the ways in which the community advances their tripartite institutional missions of teaching, research, and service. This mission may be advanced in many ways. The teaching mission may be advanced when students from the university engage in internships at the ULRC. The research mission may be advanced when a Center on Aging conducts research at the ULRC, or when the residents of the ULRC volunteer for aging-related (or other) research for which they qualify, at the university campus. The service mission can be advanced when the university provides access to university health service for the residents, performs outreach programming on aging-related issues, or encourages and organizes senior residents to volunteer their time and expertise either on the university campus or in the wider community. It is the researcher's impression that the universities are just beginning to explore the myriad ways in which their connections to these new types of communities may be maximized for the advancement of institutional mission.

Teaching. Many of the teaching opportunities envisioned at the new ULRCs pertain to the teaching of traditional undergraduate and graduate students rather than education for the future (or current) residents of the communities. All three school are using, or anticipate using, the ULRC facility as a training site for students in many fields—particularly gerontology and allied health fields. There are opportunities for nursing students, pharmacy students, dental students, hotel management students, and
numerous other students to find practical, experiential applications for their coursework at the ULRCs.

These are not the only teaching opportunities presented by the addition of a ULRC, however. Residents may opt to audit or enroll in formal coursework at the university. Residents may form or join an established Institute for Learning in Retirement, either as students or as instructors. Residents with significant and appropriate life experience may even share their wisdom and knowledge in the university classroom. Professors from campus may give lectures or courses at the ULRC.

When the Assistant Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs–Real Estate at High Integration University was asked why HIU decided to develop a ULRC, he listed three reasons: teaching, research, and service. When asked why he listed teaching first he replied, “Cradle-to-grave learning experiences. Lifelong learning. Teaching, research and service is our basic mission. So when we go over to the medical school and ask them why they're doing that heart transplant, they'd better be able to tell us teaching, research, and service.”

Of teaching opportunities for students at the ULRC at HIU, the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit board says,

In our clinic, students will have placements, so for instance, our nursing students, if they wanted to do a gerontology placement, will be able to actually work in [the ULRC at HIU]. Our dental students, we've built a dental clinic, and the dental school will have hygienists who will work, who want to do gerontology dentistry, will have the opportunity to do that. Pharmacy students, in terms of management of multiple drugs for senior living, is a big issue. PT and OT have designed their space for rehab purposes, for mild strokes and those kinds of issues. Hip replacements. [The ULRC] is going to have—in addition to its assisted living and memory support unit—it will have its own rehab unit and it will also have a hospice suite. So, we have all of
that available to be enhanced by our students. . .being able to provide this opportunity for education for our students is one of the main educational benefits for us. [The Dean of Resident’s] job will include having unending series of lectures from university people in [the ULRC at HIU], plus running the ILR, and the way that we describe it to people, let's say that a group of people at [the ULRC] would like to take a sailing trip to the Greek Isles, and they want to prepare for that. [The Dean of Residents’] task would be to make sure that they get Greek mythology classes during the year, Greek language, if they want, you know, everything that they could want that would enrich that experience. Architectural lessons on Greek construction, so they would pick a theme and they would do it. It sounds great to me. I'm ready to move in. We're billing this as the “next generation” of retirement living. [High Integration University] is the land-grant institution for our state, and so we have a huge agriculture program that runs throughout the whole state. including master gardener programs. We're going to have master gardener classes, and everybody can have their own plot of land and have a garden, all of that kind of stuff. . . They can do whatever, whatever the community wants to do. There is nothing that [HIU] can't provide.

Research. There is some expectation that the populations of these ULRCs may constitute valuable potential research subjects for studies on issues related to aging, lifelong learning, aging-related illnesses, and so forth. According to the University Treasurer, “Researchers here wanted to study aging from the time people were well until they were ill. In the hospital, you only see them when they're ill.”

Administrators at Integrated University anticipate that research will be conducted at the future ULRC there. The President of the nonprofit board for the ULRC at IU says, “I can think of a range of activities that the College of Medicine can be involved in to study aging, Alzheimer’s. We did have somewhat of a research interest in mind, students interacting with that community in terms of their own studies and volunteerism, geriatrics concerns and those related issues were on our minds.”
The College of Health Professions at High Integration University also anticipates that they will have opportunities to engage in research at the ULRC at HIU, and has spelled out in their Affiliation Agreement with the facility that it expects to conduct, “Research projects through its various departments involved in geriatric research.”

There is, however, recognition that the research potential for these communities may be limited by the self-selecting, elite nature of the populations of these communities. According to the Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board at HIU, “It's not at all a big enough community or a diverse enough community that there is any serious research that can take place. These are upper middle class, healthy well people, who have taken good care of themselves. So this is not going to be a research facility in any way, but there is a lot of teaching and student stuff going on.” Certainly, research projects undertaken at these facilities would have to take into consideration the nature of the population to be studied.

Service. As the American population ages, there is expected to be a continuing and growing need for services geared towards meeting the needs of the elderly.

Outreach to the elderly is likely to be an increasing societal concern, as society seeks ways to provide quality care for an aging population. Healthy senior citizens may also constitute a significant societal resource which universities can help to mobilize and organize in service to the university and to the wider community. In fact, research has shown that senior citizens are more likely to engage in volunteerism when organized under the auspices of a higher education institution (Manheimer & Snodgrass, 1993).
At Affiliated University, the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial officer for the university says, “One of our roles is outreach and development. The community is an important part of this role.”

At Integrated University, The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors describes his institution's interest in the ULRC:

The mission here is research, teaching, and service. Part of that service is the need to have involvement in these types of operations. Is it incumbent upon us to provide healthcare to our elderly folks? No. But can you do that and still provide an environment for your students, research for your teachers, and meet the needs of the people that we know want to come back and live in [Integrated Town], at no cost to us, and the answer is Yes. So we thought we could do all these things without a great cost to the university.

He also points out how the ULRC there will expand the service mission of the university,

You've now engaged a whole other population of people in a significant way. We believe we're providing a service to this community—we're filling a need. There's a need for this kind of quality care in this community. So we're making yet another link to those people and the community that fulfills part of our land grant mission of service.

The Assistant Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs–Real Estate at HIU says that the service component of the ULRC at HIU is “service to the people of the state and the nation in providing a wellness-based facility here.” High Integration University speaks directly to its desire to advance the service mission of the university through its involvement with the ULRC project in its introduction to the Affiliation Agreements between the university and the ULRCs, stating that “the University, as part
of its service mission, desires to enhance that relationship by supporting the development and operation of the facility.”

Leon Pastalan has been quoted in media venues as supporting the service value of ULRCs. “From the residents' perspective,” says Pastalan, a university provides so many opportunities for culture, learning and interaction that it “is an opportunity to increase the values and meaning of retirement. We cannot, as a society, afford to waste that human potential” ([HIU] Alumni News, 1999).

The service component of institutional mission is furthered, not only when the university provides services to the residents of the ULRC, but also when the residents of the ULRC provide services back to the university, and to the wider community, as well. The university may prove a vital resource in managing and directing the application of this significant potential volunteer resource pool.

The Dean of Residents at the ULRC at HIU points out that she is involved in helping determine ways in which the backgrounds and expertise of residents can be matched to needs at the university and in the surrounding community,

[Residents] want to not just participate at [the ULRC] but they want to contribute. For instance, let me tell you this. I'm so excited about this because this just happened by sheer accident. We have a couple in [a nearby city]. I didn't know [anything] about their background except they're very nice. Except I got an email. Our population is very technologically savvy. I get a lot of emails. And they were going to travel for a couple of months and they said, “we feel like we know you, and we'd like to come by and meet you.” So I said come by, we'll have lunch. They said we've got the survey to bring to you. I said Perfect! This was just a couple weeks ago. In the meantime, one of my former colleagues at the division of continuing ed. is now the financial person for the public radio and TV station on campus. Her name is Liz and Liz was saying to me, you know every break our TV and our radio station are managed by students and every break everything goes awry
because we don't have anyone to manage the TV and radio station. Why couldn't we get someone from your faculty to design a one-on-one broadcasting. I'll offer it through ILR, get people involved in TV and radio broadcasting, and then when the students are gone, you'll have a volunteer pool to draw from. Well, in the meantime, the couple comes, and I'm talking—he's retired from the University of [x]. Guess what he has his Ph.D. in and he taught? Radio and TV broadcasting. I'm like, would you guys sell your house in [the nearby city] right now because I can use you. So he agreed to let us use him as a consultant—since I'm not a curriculum person—on what type of class we should offer so it can be effective. So there you have it. And he's glad to do it. I'm very excited about it.

The Dean of Residents also believes that High Integration needs to reach out, beyond the residents of the ULRC, to bring services to wider segments of senior citizens in the surrounding area:

From my former position at the university, I was [ in Continuing Education]. And I always felt that the seniors from their questions and inquiries, I felt like we didn't do enough. There was not enough outreach. Because not everyone wants to go audit a class. I think every university, part of their mission is to have some community outreach, and this would definitely fall under that outreach to—not only the largest growing segment of our population but also one of the most ignored and vulnerable. And that makes me sad, but it's true.

In fact, the Dean has happily opened membership in the newly-created ILR not just to residents of the ULRC, but the wider community, as well. The university has been supportive of this outreach, and the response has been strong:

Many people have expressed interest. I would say at least a hundred. And that's not even the [ULRC] population. I think, I see that as part of my job because once we have the structure of [the ULRC], we want to expand by having people from all over the surrounding community. And we'll have classes at [the ULRC], but we'll continue to have classes wherever we find space. . .Like we're having classes in bank board rooms. And all I did was go and ask. How can we lose? I said to them, ‘It's a service to the community.’
The ULRC at HIU has also provided a venue for the extension of service and outreach by another university entity—the Institute on Aging (IOA). According to the Director of HIU’s Institute on Aging, the faculty are “committed to contributing to successful aging.’ It is a privilege to serve as the academic base of the Institute for Learning in partnership with [the ULRC at HIU]” (Undated press release: “[ULRC at HIU] establishes institute for learning in retirement: Joins other top-ranked universities encouraging love of learning in retirement years”). According to the Communications and Outreach Manager of the IOA at HIU, “Our affiliation (i.e., tangible projects) with [the ULRC at HIU] contributes to the IOA's community service mission, can help serve as a pool of potential research participants and also helps create good will for [High Integration University].”

Universities with service as part of their institutional missions can find numerous ways in which to leverage the capacities of their involvement with a ULRC for the advancement of service initiatives.

Resources back to university

Administrators from all three of the universities studied here candidly acknowledge that the ULRC residents (and depositors) are potential assets for the university, who may enrich the university financially, or otherwise. Part of advancing a university's mission involves improving university resources by seeking out development opportunities. Revenue to support institutional mission and other campus-based initiatives is certainly necessary for resource-strapped universities. The administrators
may not explicitly state this goal as the primary reason for starting the ULRC, but it is clearly an important issue for the three universities studied here.

**Development opportunities.** At Affiliated University, the desire to support the university financially was a major impetus behind the creation of the ULRC. As the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for the university points out, “One of our roles is outreach and development. The community is an important part of this role.” As mentioned earlier, residents of the ULRC at Affiliated University have already been documented to have contributed to a capital campaign at higher rates than other alumni. While 46.5 percent of alumni contributed to the campaign, 86 percent of alumni ULRC residents contributed to the campaign. Because these communities come with a high price tag, they are also likely to attract alumni with considerable assets. The ULRC at HIU—the only school to have documented evidence available on net worth of future residents—currently has depositors with an average net worth of 1.9 million dollars.

Integrated University administrators acknowledge that they will likely benefit economically from the generosity of residents of the planned ULRC at IU, but see this as only a side advantage to an otherwise worthy endeavor. The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at IU points to the many benefits of the university-integrated activities planned for the residents of the community and asks, “Now, would that, at the end of the day, make someone more prone to be generous with Integrated University? Sure. That probably will be the outcome. But all these benefits that we talked about are their own reward.” The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors also serves as the Associate Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations at IU. He notes the importance of bringing this vital community closer to the university and the
way in which it will facilitate and make more manageable the university's development of
an active relationship with them:

This will certainly make it easier to build a relationship with somebody. That's our hope, is that those residents will become active members of this community. And I think what we feel comfortable about is that we can get our arms around this. They're there. We know where to find them. We can contact them. This will certainly make it easier to build a relationship with somebody. There was talk that when people sign up they can will their place to the university, but we really haven't pushed that.

The Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated University agrees that, while development potential may have played a part in the decision to become involved with the community, it was certainly not the primary factor:

You know, I would say it was one of the things. How significant? In the end of the day, yeah. But I think we got there the right way. We felt that the [ULRC], and this bringing retirees into this community, I think it's beneficial. It enhances the relationship between the alums and the institution. It just makes so much more sense.

The President of the Development Company for the ULRC at IU agrees that the community will probably offer fundraising potential for the university, but points out that the university has deliberately chosen not to pursue development activity with the future residents of the community at the present time.

I suspect that over time, when people actually live in the [ULRC] and feel connected and start to feel close to it and feel that's their home, I suspect that some of these people will look to the university in a benefactor kind of way. We have not put that on the front burner with this project at all. . .We thought about it, you know. In our association with the university, do we want to encourage people when they sign up to, look at the fundraising stuff for the university, and the answer was and is NO. We needed to concentrate on THEIR life, and so on. It would only ever be a soft sell. It would never be anything drumbeating. But I believe that will happen. Over time.
The Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated University agrees,

We see great benefits, *great* benefits, and we think our retirees do, too. Keeps them very active. Gives them a lot of things to do. It's stimulating. Now, would that make someone more prone to be generous with [Integrated University]? Sure. That probably will be the outcome. But all these benefits that we talked about are their own reward. We like to have active alums.

While High Integration University does not stand to receive financial compensation for its role in helping to create the ULRC at HIU, the involved administrators do recognize the development potential inherent in this new entity. The lead agent is, in fact, a top-level administrator for the foundation—the fundraising arm of the university. She says that donations are

not something that you bank on. It's just that this is a fairly affluent group of people, and they're coming to spend the last 20 years of their lives associated with the [High Integration University]. The hope would be that something that they will be dedicated to will spur them to make gifts. But that's really...down the line. And that's just, you know. You hope.

The Assistant Vice President for Administration—Real Estate at HIU points out that HIU does, in its marketing for the community, offer plans by which the potential resident can make donations to the university while providing for their home in the ULRC. “We have a variety of plans by which, charitable remainder trust and things like that, people can arrange to pay their monthly fees for the remainder of their life, that sort of thing. And the mostly sort of unspoken thing is maybe they'll remember us in their will, too.” Other than that, he points out that there is no money back to the university, “Except for the fundraising potential. And the educational opportunities, and the research opportunities, and we imagine that there will be some development opportunities. And
we just know, we're professional fundraisers, we know that there will be.” He points out that, although there may not seem to be a great deal of fundraising activity,

There's a lot of development activity—it's just premature. The [ULRC at Affiliated University] has been open ten years. We've already received at least one gift, that I know I secured, of almost one million dollars. It's just premature for our development staff to get involved. If you go and look at the names of people who are depositors and people who give gifts and so forth, and so maybe the development people are talking to them about something else right now, because if you think about it, we're still two years from moving anybody in. So, make no mistake, there's a lot of development intent here. . . We're different from a lot of universities. The alumni folks are housed in the endowment corporation, we're all very tight, and in a lot of universities, my understanding is that they're almost separate entities their alumni activities, once the facility opens will include everything that's going on over at [the ULRC at HIU], but it's still premature. What will happen is we can get the facility built, [the Associate Vice President for Administration] and I, begin to fade away and the other alumni and development people begin to fade in with their activities.

David Schless is Executive Director of the American Seniors Housing Association, a group in Washington that represents the interests of developers and managers of retirement communities. Of universities’ relationships with ULRCs, he says “If they can bring some alumni into the loop, they may receive contributions and potentially, even entire estates. They may not openly acknowledge it, but clearly it's a big motivating factor for the universities” (Mangan, 1994, p. A31).

Enrich the university community. Of course, financial enrichment is only one way in which a ULRC may bring resources into a university community. There are other potential ways in which the integration of a ULRC could enrich the campus environment, besides financially. An article in the [Affiliated University] Alumni News points out that,
In the process of lending their support to [the ULRC at AU], its residents have added to the human resources of [Affiliated town] and [Affiliated County]. Many are active participants in local organizations. These are bright, articulate, successful people, many with ties to the university and to [Affiliated Town], who have the skills, inclination and time to participate in community affairs. The energy and experience they bring have made the residents of the [ULRC at AU] an asset to our community. We welcome them.

At Integrated University, the University President also reasoned that while IU’s alumni and friends would enjoy the superior lifestyle that close proximity to Integrated University provides, the university and surrounding community would also benefit in many ways by attracting retirees back to the area, as well as by encouraging local senior residents to remain in the area.

The President of the nonprofit Board of Directors for the ULRC at IU says,  

I think if you ask the question, why did the university want to do it, we thought that it would add to our overall community and another level of people that would simply add tremendous diversity to the university and the greater community. Returning alums, who would volunteer, who would keep a connection with [Integrated University].

The Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated University points out,  

I think that having a diversity of age in this community is a benefit to our students. So I think it helps our students, in general, with the climate and the culture. . . we see the fact that alums, and friends of [Integrated University] are retiring to this community as an asset, and want to leverage that asset to the benefit of the institution in a number of ways.

High Integration University explicitly speaks to this goal in its “Leadership and Vision Brochure,” saying, “The [ULRC at HIU] provides an opportunity to embrace these experienced and wise friends as an essential part of the [HIU] family.”
The Dean of Residents for the ULRC at HIU points out,

The university is doing many things, by welcoming and including [the ULRC at HIU] into the university community. I mean, gifts can be had in many ways, certainly. Gifts of money, gifts of time, gifts of sharing experiences—life experiences—becoming adjunct faculty, lecturing, mentoring students, that sort of thing. And I feel that they believe those are very, very meaningful contributions giving richness and texture to the university that we wouldn't have otherwise.

The Executive Vice President of the nonprofit Board of Directors at High Integration University points out that it will be the role of the Dean of Residents to try to harvest and direct some of these assets on behalf of the university community. She is the same administrator who felt strongly that the university should pursue the community in spite of its apparent inability to produce income for the university, because it would “enrich the community enormously.” An undated, university press release titled, “Residents of [ULRC at HIU] plotting course of retirement for next generation: World-class retirement community promises best that college and life can offer” says, “The idea is that this very vital group of individuals will join our campus community and bring a wealth of experience to us.”

Of course, if the resources contained within the ULRC are to be “harvested” for the benefit of the university, it is unlikely to occur spontaneously. Appropriate personnel will have to be mobilized to foster and create these connections.
Chapter Six: Conclusions

This research addressed the following questions: Why are universities becoming involved in developing university-linked retirement communities? What are the links between the university and the retirement community? How may these links be structured so as to encourage meaningful interaction between the university and the ULRC?

Analysis of the three cases in this research indicates that universities that form official links to retirement communities may do so for many reasons. They may do so due to alumni demand, because of a desire to diversify revenue sources, or in order to advance their institutional mission. There may be a combination of factors involved in a university’s decision to incorporate a ULRC.

The Model of Institutional Integration proposed in this research demonstrates the optimal ways in which a university may connect to vital constituents within an affiliated retirement community for the purpose of advancing institutional mission. Bridging mechanisms serve as the functional vehicles through which these connections are created and maintained.

High Integration University is the only ULRC in this research that currently exploits all five of the bridging mechanisms identified in the model: cooptation; contracts; physical bridges; symbolic bridges; and boundary spanners. As such, HIU currently stands as an example of the highest level of coordination between a university and a ULRC. The experiences of all three of these schools provide useful lessons and examples for administrators at other schools who are involved with creating or interacting with an affiliated retirement community.
This research indicates that universities with the greatest formal, institutionalized, organizational linkages to their ULRCs are positioned to achieve the highest levels of institutional integration. Formalized channels and structures need to be erected to ensure the perpetuation and utilization of connections between the ULRC and the university. This integration facilitates the advancement of institutional mission through the avenue of the ULRC. Based on the theory of resource dependence, this integration also enhances the resource base for the university by bringing vital constituents under the university’s purview. Institutional integration encourages the flow of vital resources back to the university, by involving the residents with the life of the university and thereby developing their allegiance to it.

As the example of Affiliated University shows, without the establishment of formal, institutionalized bridging mechanisms, high expectations for the level of integration are unlikely to be realized. Early enthusiasm may wane, and connections based on individual initiative may fade as people change within the organizations. Thus, while the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer of Integrated University expects the linkages between the university and their ULRC to be “impromptu,” this researcher recommends that, better still, the connections be deliberate and not left to chance.

A recent article appearing in the *Chicago Tribune* discusses the ongoing plans to create a ULRC at Stanford University. The community will begin construction in 2003. The article quotes an executive for the managing partner as saying, “At Stanford, plans are to 'let the connections happen'” (Adler, 2001, p. 5). Future residents may, in fact, forge informal connections with the university. However, Stanford, and other universities
considering the establishment of ULRCs, would be wise to consider the types of connections the university would like to forge with the community, and to begin hammering these out during the creation stage of the community. This allows the university to create connections that match institutional aims, rather than the entertainment desires of the residents (plays, concerts, sporting events). Without university initiative or formalized structures (such as a Board of Directors with a university presence, or a boundary spanning liaison), the connections that emerge may prove disappointing, limited, and ephemeral.

The Model of Institutional Integration can help guide universities wishing to create a ULRC by providing examples of ways to coordinate their involvement with the community. The model, along with the accompanying discussion, provides useful examples of practical ways in which administrators may forge vital connections with a new or existing community.

Leon Pastalan believes that the next era of university-based retirement living will require innovative developers of retirement communities and “visionary university administrators committed to the idea of the intergenerational campus” (Manheimer, 2001a, p. 71). The researcher sees the creation of a clear, institution-wide vision as fundamental to developing a connected retirement community. Crafting this vision in writing, as with HIU’s unique “Affiliation Agreements,” further cements the involvement between the university and retirement community, and the commitment of important parties.

Pastalan also points out that “The traditional retirement complex resembles a land-based cruise ship with no real direction or purpose.” Pointing out that no one has
expectations of how retirees can be of value to themselves or to society, Pastalan sees the opportunity for universities to fulfill this crucial role. “Universities have traditionally been agents of social change, so they're the right organizations to give meaning to retirement,” says Pastalan (Simon, 1999, A1). The trend among universities now appears to be headed in the direction of increased coordination with retirement communities, and HIU’s ULRC model is poised to become the standard-bearer for this movement.

Research indicates that residents generally prefer to leave the day-to-day management of their retirement communities to others—including management—as long as major disruptions in their communities are not involved (Streib, Folts, and La Greca, 1985; Streib, 2002). Therefore, the researcher recommends that university administrators planning a ULRC be proactive in making viable connections between the university and the community, rather than waiting for the residents to help assume this responsibility. Part of what residents of a ULRC are buying is the expectation that the connections between the university and the community will be in place. In fact, the clear existence of connections should assist in marketing the community.

Expecting residents of the ULRC to build bridges to the university is unrealistic, as they are unlikely to be able to navigate a large, complex, bureaucracy. Linkages are unlikely to spontaneously form, due to institutional barriers and inertia. Residents may be able to create informal, impromptu connections to the university, but these are likely to be temporary and driven by personal associations. These connections are also unlikely to advance institutional aims.

As Streib (1993) noted, retirement communities change as their residents age. Planners have to expect decreasing interest or ability to self-manage as the community ages,
and need to plan to assume some of these leadership responsibilities, to prevent the community from stagnating. In this research, Affiliated University, as the most “mature” community, would likely benefit from increasing university involvement or appointing fresh leadership to reinvigorate the diminished relationship between the ULRC and the university.

University administrators involved with the creation of a ULRC are encouraged to establish a clear vision for the community as early in the development process as possible. Goals for the community need to be explicit. Whenever possible, university faculty and other agents should be consulted for their advice and expertise during the planning and development process. This can have the double result of providing valuable assistance to the planners of the ULRC, while creating an “investment” by institutional representatives in the community.

University administrators should also examine their motivations when contemplating the creation of a ULRC. Is the purpose to create a closer relationship with alumni? To make money? To advance the service mission? These goals should be spelled out, for they will be the guidelines used in determining the structure of the relationship between the university and the ULRC.

Universities wishing to maximize connections to a ULRC are advised to appoint a boundary spanning individual or create a boundary spanning agency, with specific responsibility for forging connections to the university, as early in the project as is feasible. Ideally, this boundary spanner will be accountable to an agency of the university.

This research also indicates that there seems to be a high level of willingness among ULRC planners to allow the seniors residents to become involved in “spectator”
activities such as attending fine arts performances, art exhibits, concerts, lectures, and sporting events. These activities are all relatively “low risk” for a university, and entail little disruption of normal university life. They may even bring money to the university. More risky is moving beyond this sort of token, spectator involvement to engaging seniors with the intellectual life and educational core of the university. Such activities are more likely to challenge pre-conceived notions of university operation, clientele, and boundaries. What makes ULRCs unique from other, traditional retirement communities is their link to a university. Those with greater institutional integration will emphasize the lifelong learning and enrichment opportunities associated with this formal relationship, rather than the healthcare and assisted-living services available at a traditional CCRC. These endeavors are most likely to lead to meaningful institutional integration. These activities are the ones most apt to impact the lifelong learning of the seniors, and also most likely to require the involvement of a boundary spanning individual to enable them to happen. Hence, institutions interested in maximizing the institutional integration of their ULRC are encouraged to incorporate a significant and perpetual lifelong learning component into the community’s programmatic offerings. The establishment of an ILR is one effective way to provide for the lifelong learning interests of residents without significantly impacting traditional undergraduate enrollments.

ULRCs are a novel and revolutionary concept in retirement living. These communities may impact university administration in several ways. First, by bringing vital university constituents under the university’s purview, ULRCs challenge conventional notions of how a university’s relationship with alumni and retired faculty and staff ought to be structured. By extending core university services, such as access to
classes or library facilities, to senior citizens, ULRCs increase campus diversity by incorporating a previously underrepresented segment of society—the aged. From a resource dependence standpoint, ULRCs offer the possibility of increasing the university’s resource base by extending its reach. Finally, by creating communities designed to provide a new model for successful aging, ULRCs may assist in negotiating the demographic changes expected as the Baby Boomer generation reaches old age.

Research in this area is just beginning. There is a need for quantitative and qualitative descriptive research, empirical research, and theory-generating research on this topic. Numerous aspects of this phenomenon await further exploration.

Future researchers may wish to look at the role of ULRCs in facilitating the continued involvement of retired faculty and staff in the life of the university, and the implications of their continued involvement. The experiences at Affiliated University indicate that ULRCs may also be perceived as important “benefits” of significant attraction to faculty and staff dealing with aging parents; this topic may be of interest to researchers looking for factors useful in retaining faculty.

Researchers interested in development and fundraising issues may seek to compare the alumni giving patterns of residents to nonresidents. While many universities pursue the project of creating a ULRC with the implied hope of encouraging benefaction, there is little empirical evidence documenting the reality behind this expectation.

Institutional researchers are encouraged to measure the actual amount of interaction between residents of these communities and the universities. This may aid in programming and allocation decisions. The quantity and quality of these interactions may prove revealing and may challenge traditional conceptions of the university’s clientele. It
would be worthwhile to look at the university involvement of outside (non-ULRC resident) seniors, as well.

Since some universities planning ULRCs seem determined to “let the connections happen” (as the Stanford representative stated), researchers may wish to follow and compare the quantity and quality of institutional integration of ULRCs where the connections were pre-planned, to the interaction in communities where university administrators followed the laissez-faire approach.

The ULRC is a relatively unique and recent phenomenon demonstrating not only our changing demographics, but also our changing American lifestyles. The idea of senior citizens looking to their alma mater to engage and care for them in the final years of their lives is a radical one. Researchers in education and sociology may wish to explore the reasons why this is happening. What does this discernible trend reveal about American society, and what are the responsibilities of higher education institutions in light of this development?

This research has mainly dealt with what are expected to be positive outcomes from the incorporation of a ULRC. The other side of this issue is well worth exploration. Society’s resources are limited, and universities play a vital role in preparing future generations to assume leadership positions. We need to ask ourselves whether society’s limited educational resources are wisely expended on elderly citizens who are taking classes for their enrichment value, when young people need these classes for financial and career reasons. As the number of older people on campus increases, we will also have to address the question of whether it is equitable for older people to be offered tuition waivers for classes that younger students need, but cannot afford to take. When
seniors on campus reach a “critical mass,” might there conceivably be a backlash from more traditional campus residents? The issue of whether seniors fare better in the traditional college classroom, or in age-segregated programs such as ILRs, is also worthy of exploration.

Researchers may explore the role of institutional size in determining the nature and quality of ways in which the two entities may connect. A ULRC may have a greater impact at a smaller institution like Lasell College than on a larger university. A truly intergenerational campus remains an idea; the reality may prove different from expected. The negative as well as positive impacts of intergenerational involvement need to be systematically explored in such a setting. Similarly, ULRCs may be compared between public and private institutions. The generalizability of the findings of this research may be limited, due to the types of institutions studied. Researchers may wish to examine the institutional integration of retirement communities connected to different types of academic institutions.

It is fair to say that no two models for connecting a retirement community to an academic institution are the same. Researchers may wish to document and examine these different models to determine which turn out to be most viable, over time.

The three retirement communities studied here combine the model of the Leisure-Oriented Retirement community with the Continuing Care Retirement Community, and target young retirees (beginning at age 62). This is a unique, new model that deserves treatment by researchers of retirement communities.

The Model of Institutional Integration is proposed to illustrate the relationship between a university and its satellite ULRC. Researchers may wish to examine whether
the Model of Institutional Integration is also useful for understanding the relationship of
other satellite agencies of universities, such as technology parks, hotels and conference
centers, or other extension service offices. Researchers may also examine whether the
Model of Institutional Integration can be used to help higher education institutions forge
closer, more meaningful connections to nearby, non-affiliated retirement communities.

Finally, the fact that ULRCs are becoming a reality is likely to impact institutions
of higher education across the country. Already, plans for several more ULRCs are in the
works. When one university opens a ULRC, a nearby, or competing university may feel
pressure to respond. As more and more colleges and universities become involved with
affiliated retirement communities, those who do not risk losing the allegiance of their
alumni (and potential future donations) to competitors. Whether or not a ULRC will
someday become a standard offering for major universities remains to be seen.

Institutional theory (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) would assert that once an entity
becomes a common, or expected feature at a particular type of organization, competing
organizations feel compelled to assume the same model. Future researchers may wish to
examine this trend.
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Appendix A: HIU Affiliation Agreements

College of Health Professions

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between the [High Integration University] and [The ULRC at HIU] at the [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Health Professions, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at the [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities and projects:

1. Research projects through its various departments involved in geriatric research.
2. Internships at the Facility in the areas of occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech pathology, audiology, and clinical psychology.
3. Lectures on topics of interest to the residents.

Signed by Nov. 15, 2000 by Dean, College of Health Professions.

College of Nursing

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between the [High Integration University] and [The ULRC at HIU] at the [High Integration University].

The Undersigned, as Dean of the College of Nursing, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [The ULRC at HIU] at the [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [The ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Research projects involving various aspects of care for the aged.
2. Designation of the Facility as a training site for advanced clinical placements. These placements could include the areas of pain management, sleep disorders, Alzheimer's disease, exercise and health status and skilled nursing care.

Enrichment activities in the following areas:

b. Health risk assessment.
c. Medication management.
d. Sun safety/cancer prevention.
e. Grief, stress and coping support groups.
f. Safe proofing for home and travel.
Signed Dean, College of Nursing.

College of Health and Human Performance

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between the [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The Undersigned, as Dean of the College of Health and Human Performance, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Internship program for graduate students at the Facility in wellness and prevention.
2. Program for aging individuals at the Facility similar to the Living Well Program on the [HIU] Campus. The program would be staffed by graduate and undergraduate students from the College.
3. Practicum at the Facility for undergraduate students in exercise science and recreation therapy.
4. The [ULRC at HIU] Leisure Program for residents.

Signed by Dean of the College of Health and Human Performance.

College of Dentistry

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between the [High Integration University] and The [ULRC at HIU] at the [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Dentistry and Human Performance, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at the High Integration University and shall explore in good faith with The [ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Research by the Oral Facial Pain Center as a site for research on various topics of interest including facial pain syndromes.
2. Rotations by residents and dental students at the facility's dental clinic.

Signed by dean of the College of Dentistry.
College of Pharmacy

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HI] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Pharmacy, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Advance practice students to study pharmacology interaction management at the Facility and assist residents in managing their prescription medication.
2. Keeping Families Healthy program to interact with residents to improve their quality of life.

Signed by Dean of the College of Pharmacy.

College of Medicine

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between the [High Integration University] and The [ULRC at HIU] at the [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Medicine, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Clinical clerkships for medical students in the area of geriatric medicine.
2. Institute for Aging Research programs at the Facility in the field of gerontology.
3. Lectures to residents through the Institute of Aging.

Signed by Dean of the College of Medicine.

Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between the [High Integration University] and The [ULRC at HIU] at the [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Vice President of the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:
1. Horticultural Therapy Program research on the effectiveness of its programs on the elderly.
2. Department of Food Sciences and Family Youth and Communities research on age group living including nutrition and the welfare of the elderly.
3. Leisure time activities for [the ULRC at HIU] residents including activities through its Department of Fisheries.
4. Victory garden and individual gardens.
5. Master gardener classes, Master Conservationist classes and water quality lab programs.
6. Fishing for Success class through County Extension office.
7. Access to University's Natural Area Teaching Laboratory
8. Research and lectures involving residents in Human nutrition.

Signed by Vice President of the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences.

College of Journalism and Communications

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Journalism and Communications, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

5. Student clerkships to develop a student-run [the ULRC at HIU] newsletter.
6. Special programming for residents by the College's TV and radio station.
7. Volunteer opportunities for residents at W[HIU] Radio Station.
8. Journalism intern rotations through the Facility.

Signed by Dean of the College of Journalism and Communication

College of Veterinary Medicine

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:
1. Pet Therapy Research.
2. Coordinate pet sittings by students.
3. Student wellness rotations at the Facility.

Signed by Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine.

**College of Fine Arts and the Center For the Performing Arts**

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Fine Arts, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Public presentations of artistic events at the Facility.
2. Courses at the Facility in photography, painting, pottery, ceramics and other visual arts.
3. Internship programs at the Facility as part of its MA in Arts Administration Degree Program.
4. Establishment of Facility as an additional venue for cultural events.
5. Continuing education courses such as piano and painting.
6. Special packages for residents to designated events at the Center for the Performing Arts and other venues.

Signed by Dean of the College of Fine Arts.

**University Athletic Association, Inc.**

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Director of Athletics of the University Athletic Association, Inc., acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. The [ULRC at HIU] Night (special seating and/or discounts) at designated sporting events.
2. Multi-sport passes for residents to designated sporting events.
3. Video feed to facility for certain sporting events.
4. Contact person to coordinate events with the Dean of Residents.
Signed by the Director of Athletics

HIU Libraries

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned acknowledges that [High Integration University] Libraries supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Borrowing privileges.
2. Access to music collection.
3. Workshops on genealogy (as long as we have a genealogist on the staff).
4. Various classes including how to use the Internet.
5. Volunteer opportunities for residents.

University Museum of Natural History

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Director of the University Museum of Natural History, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

a. Volunteer opportunities as docents and membership volunteers at public programs
b. Lectures at the facility by museum faculty and staff.
c. Lectures at the museum.

Signed by Director of the University Museum of Natural History

University Art Museum

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Interim Director of the [University Art] Museum, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU]
participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Volunteer opportunities as docents and membership volunteers at public programs.
2. Lectures at the facility by museum faculty and staff.
3. Lectures at the museum.

Signed by Interim Director of the University Art Museum.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Addendum to Affiliation Agreement between [High Integration University] and [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University].

The undersigned, as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, acknowledges that the College supports the development of [the ULRC at HIU] at [High Integration University] and shall explore in good faith with [the ULRC at HIU] participation by the College, through its faculty, students and staff, in the following activities, and projects:

1. Lectures at the facility by Center of Gerontology and Center for Women's Studies.
2. Trips to the astronomy observatory.
3. Online participation in college activities including architectural digs.
4. Travel tours and classes.
5. Lectures on religion, ethics and the sciences.
6. Poetry readings.
7. Political science opinion surveys.
8. Talks by residents.
9. Student counseling, opportunities for residents.

Signed by Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Back to school: university-linked retirement communities and institutional integration
Principal Investigator: Bonnie Snyder, D.Ed. Candidate

a. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to document the links between universities and affiliated retirement communities, and the way in which these links contribute to the advancement of institutional mission.

b. Procedures to be followed: Participation in this research will include participation in taped interviews with the researcher, and/or sharing documentation about the retirement community.

c. Discomforts and Risks: While care will be taken to disguise identities of participants and institutions, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

d. Benefits:
The benefits to participants include contributing to the small knowledge base on this new type of retirement community and its implications for universities. The benefits to society include increased understanding of a new type of retirement option for senior adults.

e. Duration/Time: Research will be conducted during Spring/Summer 2002.

f. Statement of Confidentiality: University and participant names will be changed to protect confidentiality.

g. Right to Ask Questions: Participants have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. All questions should be directed to Bonnie Snyder, 864-653-4771, kerrigansnyder@mindspring.com.

h. Compensation. None.

i. Voluntary Participation: Participation is voluntary. Subjects can withdraw from the study at any time by notifying the principal investigator. Subjects can decline to answer specific questions.

j. Confidentiality of audiotapes: Audio tapes will be kept in the possession of the principal researcher and will be destroyed by the year 2005. Dissertation committee members may have access to the tapes.
You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records.

_______________________________  __________________
Participant Signature             Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

_______________________________  __________________
Investigator Signature            Date
Appendix C: Interview Protocol

Time of Interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
Position of interviewee:

(Briefly describe the project). The purpose of this project is to learn about retirement communities that are linked to universities. I am particularly interested in the ways in which the retirement community is officially connected to the university, and the ways in which this connection will advance the institution’s mission.

Questions:
Why did (Your Institution) Decide to Develop a University-Linked Retirement Community?

When and how did the idea for the URLC originate?

How long has this idea been in the works? What hurdles did this project have to overcome?

What were the benefits expected from establishing this URLC? Have these benefits materialized?

What problems were anticipated? Did these materialize?

What type of background research did you have to do for this project? Who was involved?

How is this project financed?

Was it necessary to engage in consensus building in support of this project?

What is the business arrangement?

What departments/areas of the university are affected by/involved with this community?

What organizational links are there between the community and the academic side of the university? Other areas of the university?

How does this community support and enhance institutional mission?

Any other individuals/departments I should contact that I haven't identified?

Anything I forgot to ask that you'd like to add?
VITA

Bonnie Kerrigan Snyder

Education


Virginia Polytechnic and State University, Blacksburg, VA. M.A.Ed. in Counselor Education and Student Personnel Services, 1990.


Experience

Assistant Professor of Education. Southern Wesleyan University, Central, SC. 2002-present.


Special Skills: Certified as a public school teacher (NJ, PA, VA) in Elementary Education, Secondary English, and as a Secondary Guidance Counselor.