Residential Master Plan
Update
MEMORANDUM

TO:     Dr. Barbara Jones, Assistant Chancellor for Student Affairs
        Dr. Steve Summers, Deputy Assistant Chancellor for Student Affairs

FROM:  Jeff C. Janz, Executive Director, Office of Residence Life

DATE:  April 12, 2005

RE:     Comprehensive Residential Master Plan Action Response Update

This document serves as an update to and replacement of the memo dated October 27, 2003 in which our action recommendations to the comprehensive residential master plan were delineated. This updated memo is intended to:

A. Offer a summary of the efforts of the consultant’s commissioned in 2001 to provide the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater with a comprehensive Residential Master Plan.
B. Describe information and data obtained since the submission of recommendations in 2003.
C. Document our revised master plan action response recommendations.

Executive Summary of Recommended Action Responses

Summary of new information related to the master plan:

1. Since receiving the 2002 consultant’s report, the cost of steel and other construction expenses have increased at a rate well above the expected inflation rate.
2. With the use of an RFP to hire a design-build developer, UW-Platteville is constructing a new suite-style residential facility at a per bed cost far below the estimate to renovate Sayles Hall into suites.
3. A residential Learning Community has been successfully implemented and several more are being planned for the coming academic year. Locations for increasing numbers of Learning Communities and other special living options will be harder to identify without increasing the volume of elevator accessible residence halls.
4. The design and construction of the new College of Business and Economics building has been approved by the Building Commission at a site in the drumlin south of Salisbury Hall.

Based on the results of the assessment conducted, along with this new information, we recommend that UW-Whitewater embark on implementing a 14-16 year residential master plan with these components:

1. To facilitate more accessible residential space for Learning Communities quickly, install retrofit elevators in two residence halls as soon as possible.
2. Take Sayles Hall off line. Raze Sayles and replace it with an elevator-accessible air conditioned 226-bed suite-style residence hall.

3. After Sayles, take White off line. Raze White and replace it with an elevator-accessible air conditioned 226-bed suite-style residence hall utilizing an architectural design complimentary to the first construction. The construction of these two halls will provide the same number of suite-style beds, yet be more cost effective than the previous plan to retrofit Sayles and White Halls and construct one new suite-style hall.

4. As the older Baker, Salisbury, Sayles and White Halls are razed, the two new residence halls will compliment the more modern architectural presentation in the central corridor of campus framed by the Welcome Center to the north, the newly renovated Upham Hall to the east and the new CBE building to the south. For this reason, we recommend that a campus-based planning team convenes to discuss architectural designs with an eye toward a synergistic and complimentary presentation in this section of campus.

5. Once the new facilities are ready for occupancy, take another residence hall off line. Complete the deferred maintenance as recommended in the FacMan report and construct a retrofit elevator if one does not already exist. Continue this sequence each year until all residence halls have been remodeled. In the case of three low rise halls and Wells Hall, reconfigure designated floor rooms into additional bathroom facilities. While remodeling, space promoting student socialization will be optimized.

6. After all residential remodeling and construction is completed, total capacity will have been reduced by over 100 beds, and over 450 beds will be suite-style.

7. A room rate increase of 7-9% annually along with a premium increase when remodeled facilities come back on line is recommended.

8. We recommend a steady growth of the Learning Communities throughout the residential facilities. By 2007, we further recommend establishing academic special interest residential college designations in specified residence halls. Examples of possible designations include business, art and education. We will also expand various academic collaborations, staffing enhancements and facilities upgrades.

9. Ongoing assessment and demand analysis will be required in order to stay in alignment with current and future student needs.

**Changes in Cost of New Construction**

While the cost of construction (particularly steel cost) has accelerated since receiving the master planning consultant’s original recommendations, several actual UW System projects have gone through bid or RFP procedures with notable results. In 2003-04, the UW-LaCrosse 356-bed suite-style project came in at $62,640 per bed. LaCrosse took part in the traditional state construction bidding procedure. In the fall of 2004, UW-Platteville broke with tradition and utilized an RFP process to hire a developer to design/build a 380-bed suite-style facility. This project came in at $46,447 per bed.
In order to achieve the addition of 452 suite-style beds at UW-Whitewater, we originally proposed retrofitting Sayles and White Halls to suites (approx. 100 beds each) and then constructing a new 252-bed facility. The originally proposed cost per bed (2002 current value) for the Sayles/White retrofit projects was $47,596. The consultants were limit by DOA procedures in their analysis. So, we recently hired the Uihlein architectural firm to offer a more detailed assessment of the cost to retrofit vs. the cost to build new. Their revised estimate to retrofit Sayles and White Halls from a double-loaded corridor design to a suite-style configuration was $69,701. The new construction protocol utilized by Platteville, therefore, resulted in a more cost effective method of adding suites to the campus housing inventory.

**Background**

Beginning in 1989, the UW-Whitewater residence life staff began an extensive refurbishing effort which culminated in 1998 with completion of the final residence hall bed space and the majority of common area refurbishing on campus. This effort was taking place concurrently with basic preventative maintenance activities. However, many variables combined to prompt residence life and student affairs administrators to seek assistance in developing an overall on campus housing plan for the future.

As the buildings reach forty or more years of age, many systems and features require upgrade or replacement. From a design stand point, the “double loaded corridor” architecture limits the majority of residents to a small double room with large shared bathroom facilities on each floor. Increasing numbers of students prefer other options. Additionally, programmatic efforts to collaborate with academic affairs increase the likelihood of student success. Some programmed activity such as this has taken place, but a more deliberate effort is called for. Finally, as state/UW System officials consider the removal of the sophomore residency requirement, we must be proactive in our planning and analysis in preparation for such an eventuality.

With these variables in mind, UW-Whitewater issued a request for proposals (RFP) for a “comprehensive master plan for student housing” in the fall of 2001. The consulting partnership team of Einhorn, Yaffee, Prescott (EYP) and Anderson Strickler (AS) was awarded the contract and began work in the winter of 2001-02. Their analysis was quite substantial and included efforts detailed below.

**Market Analysis**

The consultants began with a market analysis which included site visit focus groups with parents of prospective students, prospective students, ten variations of student groups and staff members, individual meetings and interviews with staff members and other stakeholders, an extensive web-based survey issued to all full time UW-Whitewater students, an off campus market analysis, and a review of the markets at several competing colleges and universities.
The most significant market analysis information was culled from the extensive student survey they conducted. This survey provided housing satisfaction information comparing off campus to on campus students, identified primary factors impacting student's decisions to live on or off campus, and it established a demand analysis for a new variety of residential unit types (such as suites, semi suites, and apartments).

Facilities Analysis

Their review also included a facilities analysis which took the form of campus tours, an assessment of historical renovation projects, TMA (our computerized maintenance management system) data, and a review of the results from the previously conducted "FACMAN" building condition analysis. This FACMAN analysis, conducted in 2001, was a state requirement for future project approvals. Based on this review it was clear that many systems and features will require upgrading in the next 10-15 years. However, the basic building construction and design is sound and will last many years to come. Systems to remodel or replace include the original heating systems, cooling systems (or lack thereof), overall ventilation systems (residence halls were constructed without ductwork or sophisticated ventilation), various plumbing fixtures and water systems, electrical systems, lighting, fire alarm systems, fire protection systems (stairwell doors, high rise sprinklers), windows, roofs, and telecommunication systems. The consultant's estimate of net financial cost for a typical low rise residence hall upgrade exceeds $2,000,000 and approximately $10,000,000 for Wells Hall.

Financial Analysis

The consultants also reviewed past and present financial data including budgets and assignment figures. They demonstrated that new construction square footage would cost less than reconfiguration of existing square footage. In presenting several scenarios for future renovations, they clearly saw the need for a consistent increase in room rates over the next 10 to 15 years. It was their perspective that based on a competitive market analysis, UW-Whitewater room rates are low and have room to grow. Additionally, reason dictates that many colleague institutions will be requiring dramatic increases in room rates as the year's progress. The majority of on campus residential inventory nationwide was constructed as a result of the baby boom of World War II. These buildings require a good deal of work, which necessitates an expanded financial base.

Program Analysis

Dr. Jeanne Steffes, commissioned by Anderson Strickler, provided an audit of the programs and services offered by residence life for student residents. She conducted her own interviews and focus groups to derive her findings and recommendations. In the program analysis (referred to by the consultants as the Residence Life Assessment), Dr. Steffes made several recommendations, primarily in the area of academic initiatives. She acknowledged a dichotomous relationship between residence life and the rest of the campus population. On the one hand, the sheer scope and size of the organization occasionally makes it function as an "individual silo". On the other hand, residence life
administrators are very open to collaboration with many groups and organizations on campus and provide a very important function for the Division of Student Affairs and the campus as a whole. Dr. Steffes suggested adding an Associate Director level position for Academic Initiatives. She also advocated the creation of a living/learning program founded on collaboration with faculty and staff. She specifically recommended the renovation of the first floor of Wells Hall to establish an academic help and career success center.

**Results and Review by the Consultants**

Based on the various analyses conducted, EYP and AS believed that by reconfiguring a percentage of the residence hall architectural inventory, on campus residence halls would experience a "capture rate" of 472 students. The "capture rate" is defined as full time off campus respondents from the survey who would be interested now in a reconfigured style residence hall room. This capture rate must be factored mathematically against the likely loss of on campus students if the sophomore residency requirement is eliminated (we instructed the consultants to operate under the assumption that the sophomore residency requirement will be removed). Their estimates based on the survey they conducted indicate that as many as 769 sophomores could leave on campus housing. The consultants were quick to point out however that the current off campus housing capacity will not accommodate as many as 769 new customers. At the time of their analysis, only about approximately 100 off new campus housing units were in the pipeline for construction. It is uncertain if the off campus housing market will actually absorb this number of students. It is also uncertain if the parents of the 769 sophomore students would concur with the response provided by the students themselves. The net effect is a reduced total capacity needed on campus (a reduction by at least 100 beds). Recently, a draft report of a Residential Program Review was completed by the UW System Office of Operations Review and Audit. This report does not specifically recommend the removal of the sophomore residency requirement. Rather, the report documents several reasons for the requirement and recommends several alternatives including a) imposing the freshman-sophomore residency requirement at all UW institutions, b) modifying the requirement to be for freshmen only, and c) leaving it up to institutional discretion.

**Development of Scenarios**

The consultant team concluded their analysis by considering several renovation and upgrade scenarios. The first one would address deferred maintenance issues over a 14 year period identified by the FACMAN analysis only. The second scenario suggests those renovations plus reconfiguration of rooms to suites in Sayles and White Halls, as well as improving bath and common areas in Lee, Knilans, and Wells Halls. This would also be conducted over a 14 year period. A third scenario would involve the same reconfigurations but also the construction of a new suite style facility to be built next to Carlson Hall in the central part of campus. With a more aggressive room rate increase and a more active renovation plan, this plan would be completed in approximately nine years. In all cases, the renovation scenarios each require that a building be taken off line
and stay out of service beyond the summer months. In other words, significant capacity (and thus financial) loss would be realized.

**Residence Life Administration’s Response to the Consultants Findings**

Residence life administrators find great value in the data gathered by the consulting firms and appreciate their analysis and recommendations. The following items represent the action responses and recommendations by the residence life administrative staff:

1. **Survey data and reliability** - The consultant sent an extensive web-based survey to all full-time students (approx. 8,500). With 1,138 responses, the survey achieved an overall confidence interval of 2.7% at a 95% confidence level. An incentive for participation was included to help reduce any bias factor. The consultants compared the demographics of survey respondents to the overall student population and found no meaningful differences. This further verified the lack of meaningful bias. As final decisions are being crystallized, brief update surveys may be warranted to verify that the data remains reliable to new classes of students. Further, student perception and opinion may or may not manifest in decisions (moving off campus, staying on campus, etc.). Parental influence is another significant factor. We recommend that survey be sent to the parents of second year students to determine if their views will impact the demand rate.

2. **Demand analysis** - The consultant’s analysis helped determine what demand will exist if we introduce new housing configurations. They used the “capture rates” (previously discussed) multiplied by demand results (generalized to the whole population). They divide the results in half to come up with the potential demand. They acknowledged that dividing results in half is a “rule of thumb” method used on most campuses with reasonably accurate results. We believe that this demand number must be used conservatively. However, given the current data provided by the market analysis, and assuming that other information supports this data, we concur that a reduction in capacity by at least 100 beds is a reasonable future forecast. This forecast spans 14 to 16 years and can be adjusted regularly as demands shift through the years and new information comes available.

3. **Financial situation facing the state and campus** - A decision involving major renovation, reconfiguration, and for that matter new construction will required an increase in room rate structure. This must be factored against sensitivity to keep the total cost to the students low when tuition and fees are on the rise. We must also be aware that changing and uncertain financial circumstances at the campus and state levels may force a delay with what might otherwise be perceived as the most appropriate residential master plan projects in the years ahead.

4. **Increasing upper-class students in the mix** – Retention rates of first year student returning the second year has been steadily improving over the past three years
(73% in 1999-2000; 74.2% in 2000-01; 77.1% in 2001-02)\(^1\) As the University anticipates a reduction in first year students and improved retention rates of upper-class students (including sophomores), a shift in the mix of student housing configurations is warranted. A reasonable balance of housing more conducive for upper-class students must be added to the housing inventory. A suite style residential inventory is appropriate for this purpose. Several other campuses in the UW system are proceeding in this same direction including Eau Claire, Stout, Platteville, LaCrosse and River Falls\(^2\). Therefore, we recommend a plan that will add 452 suite-style beds to the campus, or 12.1% of the housing inventory.

5. **Plan for deferred maintenance and modifications** - The age and current condition of the residence hall inventory at UW-Whitewater prompt action and planning financially and programatically. Regardless of any other plan, we must take aggressive steps to address deferred maintenance and planned modifications needed in the various buildings systems in all halls. This must be done on a schedule spanning the next 10-15 years. In most cases, this process will require taking one residence hall off line for the start of the academic year (and thus, for the entire year). While buildings are offline, we recommend reconfiguring select facilities to increase suite style offerings and modifying/adding bathroom accommodations. Sequencing of this work will be based on the demand for service and programmed usage for the residence halls.

6. **Marketing Value** – UW-Whitewater can be very proud of and place great market value on the high quality condition of its residence halls. No other UW-System residence life operation has successfully refurbished all its facilities as extensively as Whitewater. We believe it is important to maintain this market advantage. Therefore, we must not only schedule deferred maintenance projects but we would be well served to add suite style accommodations to Whitewater’s housing inventory much like several UW-System institutions.

7. **New construction** – We recommend that construction of two new suite style residence halls with a total capacity of 452 beds be given a high priority. This will meet the demand for suite-style housing suggested in the market analysis.

8. **Increasing Room Rates** - It is recommended that an accelerated rate increase schedule be approved in order to accomplish the necessary deferred maintenance, renovations and new construction recommended herein. UW-Whitewater currently charges the lowest room rates in the UW System\(^3\). The 2005-06

\(^1\) Source – University Fact Book
\(^2\) As an example, Eau Claire provides 324 beds of 3,754 in a suite style arrangement, or 8.6%. River Falls has started construction of a 240 bed suite style residence hall, which will result in 10% of their housing inventory suite style architecture. Stout is implementing their master plan know, which includes new construction. With a first new hall in 2003 and a second in 2007, Stout will have 18% suite style housing.
\(^3\) Source – UW System Auxiliary Operations 2004-05 Academic Year Residence Halls and Meal Plan Rates Table C-5
proposed UW System Room Rate chart is attached. Many, if not most of our sister institutions will be facing similar upgrade decisions and some have in fact begun accelerating their room rate increases. We suggest an annual room rate increase of 7-9%, along with a premium increase when upgraded facilities are brought back on line.

9. **Student socialization space** - Market and satisfaction indicators demonstrate that students require (or at least desire) more space, more private bathroom facilities, and other amenities. In addition, national research shows that student socialization in residential facilities is the number one factor impacting the student’s overall residence hall satisfaction. Therefore, space promoting socialization will be included in upgraded or newly constructed facilities.

10. **Learning Communities** - We recommend establishing a variety of Learning Communities similar in concept to the pilot ‘Live and Learn’ program offered during the 2004-05 academic year. A list of foundational principles to help guide the Learning Community effort is attached in Appendix E. We further recommend establishing building-based ‘residential college’ facilities beginning in 2007 with more to follow in future years. Examples of themes for these facilities include College of Business and Economics, Art and Education. This will provide an excellent academic resource for students and will be well timed with the opening of the new Business building.

11. **Academic Collaboration** – We must determine, in concert with other campus officials, if residence life is the appropriate place for a variety of new academic collaborations. It is not our intention to duplicate efforts, but rather to offer satellite locations for academic services as a convenience to student residents. Examples include career advising, academic advising, library research assistance, writing/reading labs, and tutorial programs. Residence life administrators concur with the concepts presented by Dr. Jeanne Steffes to review and implement new academic efforts including an enhanced academic staffing presence, a facility for academic assistance, and new academic programming offerings. A position devoted to coordinating academic efforts in residence has been developed and will be filled by the end of the spring semester, 2005.

12. **Advisory Board** – We recommend establishing a Residential Long Range Master Planning Advisory Board comprised of appropriate students and staff. This board will help provide direction for the implementation phase of the master planning process. The advisory board charge is attached in Appendix F.

---

4 From the 2004 ACUHO-I/EBI Resident Study – For the past five years, this satisfaction study shows that of fourteen factors, the factor “Interaction with Others in the Residence Hall” is the strongest predictor of overall residential satisfaction both at UW-Whitewater and nationwide.
## Appendix A

### Preliminary Residence Hall

#### Double Room Rate Comparison

##### 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>$3,286</td>
<td>$3,440</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parkside</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>$2,670</td>
<td>$2,988</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oshkosh</td>
<td>$2,528</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stout</td>
<td>$2,464</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>La Crosse</td>
<td>$2,530</td>
<td>$2,720</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stevens Point</td>
<td>$2,535</td>
<td>$2,573</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$2,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>$2,495</td>
<td>$2,620</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>$2,503</td>
<td>$2,553</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>River Falls</td>
<td>$2,394</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eau Claire</td>
<td>$2,480</td>
<td>$2,540</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Platteville</td>
<td>$2,336</td>
<td>$2,448</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Whitewater</td>
<td>$2,332</td>
<td>$2,440</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oshkosh</td>
<td>$2,528</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stout</td>
<td>$2,464</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>La Crosse</td>
<td>$2,530</td>
<td>$2,720</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stevens Point</td>
<td>$2,535</td>
<td>$2,573</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$2,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eau Claire</td>
<td>$2,480</td>
<td>$2,540</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Whitewater</td>
<td>$2,332</td>
<td>$2,440</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Building Construction/Renovation Activities
In the UW System as of 10/03

The information detailed below suggests that nine of the other twelve 4-year institutions in the UW System have built new residence halls in recent years, are in construction now, or are looking into the possibly in the foreseeable future. In particular, Eau Claire, Parkside, Green Bay and Milwaukee have recently completed new residence construction, River Falls is currently in construction, and La Crosse and Stout are taking part in the active approval stages.

UW-Eau Claire

- Opened a new apartment style residence hall in fall of 2000.
- 81 four-bedroom apartment: 324 beds representing 8.6% of the total 3,754 spaces on campus.
- Began increasing room rates several years prior to construction of the new residence hall.
- Spread the cost of the new building over a 20 year bond as well as charging the residents of the new hall a higher premium room rate helped finance the building project.
- Rationale for new construction was a shortage of bed space for many years.
- Hired a master planning consultant in the mid 90’s.
- September, 1997 – RFP issued for designs/building bids.
- Construction began in October, 1998; construction was completed in January, 2000.
- Actual cost of building construction – $11,023,158.
- Total square feet – 131,553.
- Construction cost per square – $83.79.
- Construction cost per bed – $34,022.
- All costs including furnishing – $13,271,570.
- 81 apartments – amenities
  - furnished, air conditioned;
  - single rooms, living room, fully equipped kitchen;
  - divided bathroom with shower, linen closet, dual sinks and vanity;
  - entry closet and walk-in storage;
  - bedrooms/living room, voice, video and data ports with fast internet access;
  - campus cable TV and local phone service.

UW-Green Bay

- Currently in the third year of a three year/three building construction phase.
- First building opened – August of 2002, second in August of 2003, and the third is scheduled to be completed in August of 2004.
- All facilities are apartment style residence halls; include 31 apartment style suites providing housing for 122 students each (30 – 4-person suites and 1 – 2-person suite).
- Each suite approximately 1200 square feet, fully furnished; include living room, full kitchen, dining/study area, 4 private bedrooms, toilet room, shower room, double vanity area, storage room.
- Total cost for three building project – $11,662,466, or $3,887,489 per building. This includes the contractor fee, construction materials, filing fees, architectural plans, etc.
- Constructed with foundation agreement – 501 C(3)
- Construction cost per square foot – $73.38.
- Project cost per square foot – $80.99.
- Cost per bed – $28,869.
- These costs include furniture which is $9,780 per apartment unit.
Prior to construction, room rates increased approximately 3% annually. During three year construction phase room rates were increased to 7% annually. Upon completion, rate increased are projected at approximately 4% annually.

- Three story, wood frame/brick construction – similar to residential homes. Although constructed as a "30 year" building, they anticipate life expectancy to double this.
- The three new facilities added 366 beds, bringing on campus housing to 2,000 beds.

**UW-LaCrosse**

- They have selected an architect for a new 350-bed suite style residence hall.
- Estimate cost to be $22.3 million.
- Cost per bed - $62,640
- Plan to raze a 200 bed residence hall to create the building site, resulting in a net gain of 150 beds.
- Anticipates room rate increase of approx. 10% for next several years (as they have done for the past two years). Estimated construction time is 14 months.
- The master plan calls for demolition of two additional 200-bed residence halls in order to construct more new buildings.
- Rationale -- desire a new architectural design for upper-class students who wish to remain on campus.

**UW-Madison**

- Working on a substantial master plan.
- Considering razing some buildings and constructing new primarily for freshmen accommodations.
- Considering individual temperature control and air conditioned units in their older buildings.
- Consideration is being given to tear down Ogg Hall, building new facilities with the resulting additional capacity of 700-800 beds.
- Much of this will involve private/public partnerships.
- A second phase will include renovation of older buildings.

**UW-Oshkosh**

- Proceeding with a major renovation project in Taylor Hall at a cost of approximately $12,000,000, or $20,000 per bed.
- Students were transferred to Gruenhagen Conference Center during the renovation construction.
- Plan to vacate Taylor Hall in May of 2004 and reopen in July 2005.

**UW-Milwaukee**

- Completed construction of a second high rise residence hall in 2002.
- Demand for housing continues to increase and consideration has been given to leasing space and purchasing facilities from nearby hospital sites.

**UW-Parkside**

- Completed most recent construction of a new residence hall approx. four years ago.
- 364 beds out of 765 are apartment style dwellings.
- 53 apartments with 6 or 7 person construction (4-bedroom, 2-bath).
UW-Platteville

- Received Building Commission approval for construction of a 380-bed suite style residence hall.
- Conducted an RFP to hire a developer for the design-build project
- Anticipated cost of construction - $17.65 million
- Cost per bed - $46,447

UW-River Falls

- Currently constructing a 240-bed, 60-suite residence hall; 4-single rooms per suite.
- Anticipate opening of the new building in fall of 2005.
- Length of construction time – approximately 18 months.
- Projected cost – $11.5 million.
- Suites include 4-bedrooms, bath, living area, and kitchenette.
- Building was designed with a capability to add twice the bed capacity in the future.
- Anticipated cost per bed – $47,916.
- Expected room rate impact – 8 to 10% increase over 10 or more years.
- Three years prior, a residential student room rate increase of $50 per year was approved to be used for building furnishings.
- Rationale for construction was experience of some overcrowding in recent years.
- Selected suite style to be able to offer a different living style that would be more similar to what is offered in off campus market.

UW-Stevens Point

- Recently completed its 3-year upgrade to room furnishings.
- Bonding and current room rate structure precludes any plans for new construction.

UW-Stout

- Secured the help of a master planning consulting firm.
- Construction will soon begin on a 296-bed suite style residence hall.
- Estimated cost – $16.25 million, budget authority approved for $16,694,000 from the state.
- Construction expected to begin in March of 2004 and to be completed in July of 2005.
- Projected cost per bed – $54,900.
- Now looking at an 11.6% increase in 2005-6.
- Previous formula for calculating a single room rate was 68% of double room rate. Beginning in 2005-6 this will be reconfigured to take into account the suite style offering.
- Construction is intended to replace an old hall that is no longer cost effective to continue repairing.
- The research firm found that students wanted suites with kitchenettes, bathrooms with separate toilets/showers/sink areas, small living area and private bedrooms.
- Each floor will have a laundry room, full kitchen/lounge/TV area, and recycling room.
- It is anticipated to be a 5-story residence hall with 2 elevators.
- After completion, 18% of the total residence hall bed inventory will be suite style along with the first hall completion in 2005, a second hall is planned to be completed in 2007.

UW-Superior

- Considering a request from a private organization that would involve university management of an off campus housing facility.
- Consideration is also been given to building an apartment style facility.
Appendix C

Residential Academic Enhancements

Listed below are possible academic enrichment initiatives that are recommended for implementation at UW-Whitewater. Some have already been initiated. Theoretical bases for such academic inclusion in residential environments can be found in the literature including:

- Separation, transition, incorporation (Tinto, 1997)
- Construction of knowledge (Tinto, 1997)
- Academic and social integration (Tinto, 1993)
- Involvement impacts learning (Astin, 1996; Tinto, 1993)
- Academic skills and climate (Kuh, 1995; Kuh, Branch & Lund, 1994)
- Peer influence (Astin, 1984; Kuh, 1995; Tinto, 1994)

Academic Support in All Residence Halls

- Provide mini computer lab facility.
- Solicit involvement of faculty to serve as Faculty Partners; provide office space.
- Provide academic related speakers and programs.
- Host class sections in specified residence hall common area classrooms.
- Provide outreach academic services, such as advising, tutorial programs, career services, study skills, writing/reading labs, etc.
- Provide a centralized staffing module in Residence Life to include a key central staff member to oversee academic initiatives.
- Establish a living/learning program advisory group comprised of academic administrators, faculty, Student Affairs administrators, Residence Life staff, and students.
- Encourage high quality “passive” programs such as academic focus bulletin boards (on study tips, interaction with faculty, advising preparation, etc.), and postings.
- Encourage the Residence Hall Association (RHA) to embrace academic initiatives as part of their charge. One possibility would be to suggest they draft an “Academic Achievement Bill of Rights.”
- Take part in early warning efforts with Academic Affairs utilize early “D/F” notices in the fall semester to initiate conversations with students on personal issues, study skills, and other barriers to effectiveness.
- Nurture the RA’s as academic role models.
- Consider other healthy special living options such as outdoor recreation and sports, service learning, and wellness/nutrition.
- Continue to encourage Residence Life staff to teach the Freshman Seminar course, with many sections being held in residence hall facilities.
- Provide academic achievement rewards to floors based on GPA.
- Invite faculty members, deans of colleges, the chancellor and cabinet members to events honoring academic achievers.
- Create special efforts in appreciation to students who have received a 3.5 or above GPA including, but not limited to, certificates signed by the chancellor, assistant chancellor, executive director, develop a memento with appropriate logo and distribute to resident students who have received a 3.5 or above GPA, establish a recognition program honoring those students, etc.
- Nurture a large body of the faculty as strategic partners in establishing an enhanced UW-Whitewater residential academic success effort.
- Invite master advisors and peer mentors to make use of residential facilities when making connections with students.
- Request that Residence Life take part in new faculty orientation, extending a welcome and explain what resources are available from Residence Life to assist new faculty on campus.

A Living/Learning Community Concept
Many campuses have engaged in the establishment of residential living/learning community, frequently connected directly with a particular academic emphasis, major, or college. A pilot program at UW-Whitewater could be a College of Business & Economics Living/Learning Community.

Sample Goals of the Living Learning Community (from Syracuse University, 2000)

1. Build partnerships among faculty, staff, and students to increase interaction, involvement, and learning inside and outside of the classroom.
2. Connect the curricular and co-curricular experiences of students to create a seamless learning experience.
3. Facilitate the college transitions by fostering smaller communities of students, faculty, and staff.
4. Promote opportunities for individual students to make more meaningful connections with members of the UW-Whitewater university community.
5. Support students’ successful completion of their academic programs.
6. Contribute to the continuous enrichment of the intellectual climate of the university.
7. Foster students’ active commitment to the UW-Whitewater community as students and alumni.

Suggested Components of a Living/Learning Community

- Provide block scheduling for students in particular course areas.
- Offer Freshman Interest Groups (FIGS) for students.
- Encourage service learning opportunities.
- Provide specialized software in the residence hall computer lab.
- Provide specialized tutorial programs for particular majors.
- Encourage academic student organizations to meet and organize in the residence hall.
- Coordinate specialized class projects among residents in the residence hall.
- Host various forums with the dean, chancellor, provost, and others.
- Administer specialized quiet and study hours for the benefit of all residents.
- Create and schedule topical guest speaker panels and lectures.
- Provide an extensive academic resource center in a common area.
- Provide special RA training and recruitment, encouraging a particular academic background for the staff.
- Organize study groups in residence halls.
- Post list of students taking similar courses from various sections.
- Set up academic health and career success center collaborating with several academic support offices on campus.
- Establish a special relationship with the library resource professionals.
## Appendix D
Residential Fall Opening Occupancy/Singles

### Residence Life
10\textsuperscript{th} Day of Classes Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th># of residents</th>
<th># of singles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>3556</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>3694</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>3826</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>3775</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>3766</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>3778</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>3772</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>3783</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Comprehensive Long Range Master Plan
Foundational Principles

1) Function within the Residence Life mission.

2) Serve the needs of the primary stakeholders (today and in the future).

3) Reflect the needs and interests of students.

4) Serve as good stewards of Residence Life physical assets.

5) Uphold fiduciary responsibilities by making reasonable financial plans and decisions, keeping student costs in balance with services provided.

6) Support the university’s academic mission by facilitating student academic success.

7) Be prepared to respond to changes (anticipated or not) in the external environment.

8) Serve as good partners and good neighbors with the university and community.
Appendix F
Residential Long Range Master Planning
Advisory Board

Charge:

The Residential Master Planning Advisory Board will provide direction and advice to the residence life administration with regard to implementation of the comprehensive long range residential master plan. The advisory board will assist with planning facilities, programmatic and fiscal arrangements based on the master planning consultant’s report, ongoing assessment data, and other relevant information. The board will serve to identify issues relevant to the master plan and bring them to the attention of the residence life administration. Any proposed changes to the approved master plan will be forwarded to the Student Affairs office for approval.

Composition:

- Residence Hall Association (2 students)
- Whitewater Student Government (1 student)
- Resident Assistant (1 student)
- Representative from University Center/Dining (1 staff)
- Residential Education Live-in staff (2 staff)
- Building Superintendent (1 staff)
- Coordinator of Residential Services and Assignments (1 staff)
- Associate Director – ex officio
- Assistant Director – ex-officio
- Executive Director - chair
Comprehensive Residential
Long Range Master Plan
Foundational Principles

1) Function within the Residence Life mission.
2) Serve the needs of the primary stakeholders (today and in the future).
3) Reflect the needs and interests of students.
4) Serve as good stewards of Residence Life physical assets.
5) Uphold fiduciary responsibilities by making reasonable financial plans and
decisions, keeping student costs in balance with services provided.
6) Support the university’s academic mission by facilitating student academic
success.
7) Be prepared to respond to changes (anticipated or not) in the external
environment.
8) Serve as good partners and good neighbors with the university and community.
Comprehensive Residential Long Range Master Plan
University of Wisconsin - Whitewater

What is a comprehensive master plan?
This is a thorough look at all the variables involved in planning for the future of on campus living at UW-Whitewater; 20 years ahead and beyond.

Why conduct a comprehensive master plan?
➢ The current residence halls are forty years old;
➢ The cost of attending college is increasing;
➢ Student needs/demands are changing;
➢ Unique living options on campus establish a market advantage for some campuses;
➢ Research shows the value of on campus residence toward student success;
➢ The residency requirement is under review;
➢ Academic collaborations are increasing.

What factors must be included in developing a comprehensive master plan?
➢ Varying student housing; developmental and academic needs;
➢ Long term strategy has been to keep rates low;
➢ The potential negative statement to students/parents when rates are too low (what does it say about quality);
➢ Some student are willing to pay more for better quality;
➢ Demand for unique room configurations;
➢ Importance of balancing reasonable cost, service variety and service quality;
➢ Desire for more privacy, more space, and more private bathrooms;
➢ Condition of physical facilities;
➢ Cost of various renovation and upgrade options;
➢ Programmatic opportunities;
➢ Room rate structure for students;
➢ Use of facilities during summer to offset student academic year costs.

What is involved in the master planning and capital planning process?
➢ Historical perspective:
  o Began refurbishing in 1989 – phase 1 completed in 1998
  o From 1998 to present – phase 2 of upgrades continue
  o 2000 – prepared RFP for Master Planning consultation
  o Engaged RHA and other groups each year of the process
  o Began Master Planning analysis in 2001; concluded in 2003
➢ Intensive market analysis:
  o Off campus housing market
  o Residence life offerings at other institutions
  o Student/parent focus groups
  o Extensive student survey (1,138 responses)
Facilities analysis
- Building tours
- Review of ‘FacMan’ data analysis
- TMA data analysis

Financial analysis
- Budget review
- Comparison to industry standards

Program analysis
- Interviews with students, staff, faculty regarding current academic initiatives
- Current program analysis
- Comparison to industry standards

What did we discover in our review?
- Research demonstrates the value of on campus living in terms of student success (retention and persistence to graduation).
- Students desire privacy.
- Facilities require substantial utilities upgrades / window replacements, some roof replacements, some door replacements.
- If sophomore requirement were eliminated, current/future housing demand will go down (by as many as 769).
- If residence hall architectural inventory were re-configured to include a suite style, as many as 472 students would either stay on or move back on campus. (capture rate)
- A strong Living-Learning effort will help retention efforts.
- UW-Whitewater currently has the lowest double room rate in the system; majority of other campuses have or are constructing new housing and rates are going up at an aggressive rate.
- Our room rate structure can be increased more than in the past while remaining reasonable and competitive.
- Percentage of upper-class students at UW-W is increasing.
- Suite style facilities are now or will be available at Eau Claire, Stout, La Crosse, River Falls, Milwaukee, Green Bay, Parkside, Madison, Platteville

What is our current comprehensive master plan and what’s been done already?
- Take one building off line each year to upgrade major utilities, bathroom upgrades, facilities and furniture as needed (beginning in 2006).
- With the first and second buildings, Sayles and White, also modify architecture to a suite style, add central air, and add an elevator in Sayles.
- With the next two-three low rise halls and Wells, take rooms off line on each wing and add more bathroom space.
- In year two of the plan, construct a new suite style residence hall to offset the loss of space from “decompression” in renovations.
- Continue with all remaining buildings until complete.
UW System and state procedures require nearly four years of advanced planning. We have submitted the papers for the Sayles, White and new building projects.

With the assumption that this plan is followed, a recommendation was approved by the chancellor to change from a sophomore residency requirement to a sophomore residency recommendation beginning in fall of 2008.

Develop a variety of special Living-Learning communities, special living options and academic service offerings.

A vacated position was updated to include academic and leadership initiatives - search is under way.

Living-Learning Community pilots under way in Lee. Plans for more in 2005-06 well under way.

Increase room rates steadily over a long term period 7-8% annually. Add a premium rate when suite style halls are brought on line.

What are some recent developments since completion of the plan?

Dramatic increase in construction costs.

We paid $377,130 for our share of the financial aid cash giveback in May.

Concern for the increasing tuition and fees for students.

Reluctance of Building Commission to approve excessive residence hall designs, with differential room rate structures.