

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well  
**University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well**

---

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

---

2-8-2012

## Planning minutes 02/08/2012

Planning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan>

---

### Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 02/08/2012" (2012). *Planning Committee*. 12.  
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/12>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Planning Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

**Planning Committee**  
**February 8, 2012**

**Present:** Jim Barbour, Julie Eckerle, Ken Hodgson, Arne Kildegaard, Margaret Kuchenreuther, Josh Preston, James Rook,

**Guests:** Henry Fulda, Director of Residential Life

Margaret distributed a document Arne Kildegaard composed. It is entitled *suggested language for inquiry to campus community about target enrollment constraints*. This could be sent to all employees via email. By doing this way anyone who has a thought or consideration might offer that thought as feed back. There is the possibility of getting feedback of all kinds, good and bad. The consensus of the committee is to send the message with a few minor tweaking by Arne first. (Below is the verbage sent out to campus via email.)

*“The Planning Committee has been charged this year with developing an optimal target for student enrollment. We have organized our work by trying first to identify facilities constraints, since we believe those are the most difficult (costly and time consuming) to change. The Office of the Registrar and the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Facilities have helped us to grapple with the issue of classroom space generally. The Office of Residential Life has informed our discussion about dormitory space and off-campus housing.*

*What we can't accurately anticipate, without your help, are all of the bottlenecks that enrollment expansion might cause in specific-purpose facilities. For example: lab space is obviously finite, and in some cases already at capacity. Likewise, language labs, computing classrooms, and perhaps a long list of other things. We seek your input on dedicated-use facilities about which you have specific information. As an intellectual exercise, you might contemplate what sorts of facilities bottlenecks would occur with enrollment increases anywhere from 0-15%.*

*Of course there is a strong sentiment on the Planning Committee that we should not dilute the quality of our programs, which means we would need to ramp up faculty and staff in an appropriate way, proportionate to increased enrollment. This also creates facilities demand. We will seek input directly from the division chairs about the feasibility of finding office space for additional faculty, but we would also like some input (however speculative) from other service providers on campus, anticipating the bottlenecks in staffing and, consequently, facilities that would arise as a consequence of increased enrollment.*

*Please direct your responses to me by March 1st at the latest. Include in the subject heading the following: FACILITIES CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS.*

*Thank you for your help.”*

**Attachment 2**

All \$ in thousands (\$1 = \$1,000)

2012		Total	State Contribution	U of M Contribution
<b>2012 State Capital Request: Unprioritized</b>				
Location	Project	Total	State Contribution	U of M Contribution
Systemwide	HEAPR	90,000	90,000	0
Twin Cities	Combined Heat & Power Plant	81,000	54,000	27,000
ROC&FS	Itasca Facilities Improvements	6,090	4,060	2,030
Twin Cities	Eddy Hall Rehabilitation & Space Optimization Projects	21,000	14,000	7,000
Duluth	American Indian Learning Resource Center (AILRC)	11,025	7,350	3,675
<b>Total</b>		<b>209,115</b>	<b>169,410</b>	<b>39,705</b>
<b>University Funded Projects (FY2013)</b>				
Location	Project	Total	State Contribution	U of M Contribution
Twin Cities	Containerized Data Center	12,000		12,000
Twin Cities	Baseball Stadium Replacement	7,500		7,500
Morris	Student Residence Hall	6,900		6,900
Twin Cities	Mechanical Engineering Engine Lab Relocation	5,000		5,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>31,400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31,400</b>
<b>Minnesota Biomedical Sciences Research Facilities Authority</b>				
Location	Project	Total	State Contribution	U of M Contribution
Twin Cities	Project #4	50,000	37,500	12,500
<b>2013</b>				
<b>2013 State Capital Request</b>				
Location	Project	Total	State Contribution	U of M Contribution
Systemwide	HEAPR	35,000	35,000	0
<b>University Funded Projects (FY2014)</b>				
Location	Project	Total	Other Contribution	U of M Contribution
Twin Cities	Decommission/Demolition of Obsolete Buildings	3,000		3,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,000</b>		<b>3,000</b>

Jane Kill had asked questions regarding the 6 year capital plan which was handed out (shown above) and the date of library commons area as stated 2018. This is something Lowell will address when he has time to meet with us. Margaret explained the Finance Committee meets at the same time/same day as this committee. Lowell will be able to meet with us when the budget materials have been submitted and approved.

Margaret explained she issued an invitation to Bryan Herrmann, Admissions Office Associate Director, to come and talk to us on Feb 22 about enrollment.

Margaret introduced Henry Fulda and explained why it is necessary to hear what ramifications an increase of students could have on Residential Life. Henry began with both good and bad news with the thought of additional 300-400 students.

Bad news always seems the best place to begin. UMM definitely does NOT have the facilities/space to take care of that number of students (increase of 300-400 students.) Henry handed out an *Occupancy Report* (found at end of minutes.) This is the housing summary from Fall Semester 2011. It clearly indicates UMM is at 100 percent capacity. Residential Life currently has ideal bed space for 824 students and RDs/CAs. Fall 2011 students used 822 of the 824. The apartments currently house 3 students per unit. If they housed 4 it would be very tight/crowded and not a good thing.

After being decommissioned as a res hall, Blakely was re-opened to accommodate 78 students. This was possible only after new fire protection etc. had been installed. However, even this has stipulations that students can only be housed for 7-9 years. After that it Blakely will no longer be available for housing purposes.

When the GPLLC is opened it will house 72 students and when Blakely goes off line the 78 students housed there will add another small decrease in housing.

If future trends remain the same as the prior 6 years and ORL places 92-95% incoming freshman staying on campus, there will be no room. The process of having to use Prairie Inn or Super 8 to house extra upper classmen would need to be implemented. This was done in the 90's. It is necessary to have freshman stay on campus.

If UMM increases to 2,000-2,150 student enrollment, the facilities are not in place to house this number. A deal would have to be made to house upperclassmen at the Prairie Inn or Super 8 for fall semester. The trend indicates after fall semester between 50-75 students leave for spring semester thus making room on campus for students being house off campus fall semester. (Students leave for various reasons, ie. student teaching, study abroad, students transferring to other places, students who decide college is not for them.) This practice is something Crookston, Duluth and the Twin Cities have been doing for years.

It must be remembered, freshmen need to be housed on campus. There are many reasons for this. It helps freshmen prepare for what is to come, it helps them developmentally, and the majority of freshman is just not ready for off campus life. The rules and regulations that are a necessary part of life are learned quickly with on campus living. It is easier for upper classmen who have had the freshman year on campus to adjust.

There is another philosophical approach for on campus housing. If a student asks for on campus housing they will be housed, your contract will be accepted. The problem with this is do we ever say... "no, this is what we have, first come first serve?" Or do we have a pretty good idea what the size of the incoming

class is going to be and hold that room amount open for freshman? And if there are requests from returning students to stay on campus, is it our job to make sure they are able to stay on campus.

There are many reasons why freshmen need to be housed on campus. The reasons may be as simple as time management to as complex as relationships and all that entails. If the University would take a stand that all incoming freshman (new students) will be housed on campus that would solve part of the problem.

If there is an increase of student for the upcoming year ( as we had this year) we may have to implement the living off campus for 10-20 students.

In the past 6 years we have kept 42-45% of returning student on campus. These are returning students not freshman. A question asked, Is there a trailing off such as of the returning percentage are 60% sophomores, 40 percent juniors and 20 percent seniors? This data has not been tracked, but it is a pretty good guess this is the case. When students previously were housed off campus, all extra spaces on campus were utilized first, i.e. study halls/rooms, lounges.

The question was asked of Henry if there are some of the same reasoning for upper classmen to stay on campus. Some reasons upper classmen stay on campus include convenience, budgetary reasons, leadership reasons (student CAs, RDs, etc.)

The question was asked if Blakely Hall could be used as a swing space, if dorm space was needed. The explanation of how Blakely was brought up to code with sprinklers and water for fire safety etc. However, this was a “quick fix” and Blakely will only be on line for 7-9 years. We need to remember Lowell referred to Blakely as a “mall building” not a residential life building.

Back in the 90s there were 38 students housed at the Prairie Inn. But at that time there were more students housed per apartments and dorms. There were 4 students in apartments and all study lounges and other lounges were used to house students.

So you believe that once a student has become a sophomore there are less reasons for students needing to stay on campus? Are there pedagogical reasons to stay on campus? However, the students that usually move off campus after the first year are the students who want to get on with their lives. They wish to have more say over their lives, i.e. fix their own meals, comings and goings, etc. There are all kinds of studies that indicate students that stay on campus have higher gpa etc. but these studies seem to have no sway over other students. Henry believes that it is more often the convenience verses the need to be on your own. It may also be a budget issue.

Jane Kill asked the question if Blakely Hall could be used as a “swing space;” a place for students who are at the end of their scholastic career and faculty space? Henry reiterated the fact that this space can only be used for housing in the timeline given and who has ownership of building at that time.

Both Pine and Spooner have their definite niche in the student population.

Now the “good” news portion for ORL and residential facilities. If we have a continued increase of students for the next 4-6 years and all the numbers continue to indicate that justification, there may be financial support for a GPLLC II. At least there will be enough argument with corroboration to build. This is all in the planning stages at the moment. However the foot print is there and reasoning on how to extend this off of the GPLLC I. In 2013 the GLLPC will be addressed. There are concerns as there are only 78 beds for GPLLC I, GPLLC II will house more. There are currently 2 main concerns regarding this in the Twin Cities The first being if enrollment increases stops/or decreases and the second being the

apartments, Spooner, Pine, Gay and David Johnson Independence Hall are all older units and need anywhere between \$300k-\$500k in improvements. Will the operating costs support these costs?

However, if we need to put between 30-50 students each fall in rooms at the Prairie Inn that in itself will be making a large statement to the Twin Cities. Once again we need to remember that over 40% of returning students choose to stay on campus, which has held steady for over 6 years. The increase of students and retention of students is a domino effect.

The question was asked how long has it taken Henry/ORL to convince Central Administration we need more bed space? Answer, it took about 5 years. That is an important piece of information. If advocating begins now for another new unit, it may be 2017 before anything happens. This probably will not be the case however. Demographics have changed. Even though the claim that high school grads peaked 10 years ago, we are getting more international student recruits. The cost of a degree from Morris is less than other institutions. Graduates are leaving Morris with less debt, and quite a substantial up to \$7,000.

Will this effect the recruiting process? We need to remember that freshman will be housed on campus.

There has been little to no activity for off campus housing, at least in new construction.

Next meeting it is hoped to have Bryan Herrmann address the committee.

Next meeting is February 22, 2012

University of Minnesota Morris  
 Office of Residential Life Housing Report  
 10 Day Occupancy Report  
 Date: September 7, 2011

Updated 10/20/2011

Housing Summary	Blakely		Pine		Spooner		Mall Hall		Clayton A. Gay		David C. Johnson		Apartments		Campus	
	Total	Occupancy Rate	Total	Occupancy Rate	Total	Occupancy Rate	Total	Occupancy Rate	Total	Occupancy Rate	Total	Occupancy Rate	Total	Occupancy Rate	Total	Occupancy Rate
Capacity: Ideal Occupancy - Total Bed Spaces Including Staff	0	83	0	83	91	174	211	228	211	211	228	211	211	211	824	824
Total Residents -- Occupied Bed Spaces - In recommended spaces	0	83	0	83	89	172	211	228	211	211	228	211	211	211	822	822
Student residents	0	79	0	79	84	163	204	216	204	204	216	204	204	204	787	787
Student staff (Student Hall Directors, Community Advisors)	0	4	0	4	5	9	7	12	7	7	12	7	7	7	35	35
Vacant Bed Spaces -- In recommended spaces	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Base Occupancy Rate	0%	100%	0%	100%	98%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Crowded Capacity: Supplemental/Overflow Spaces to accommodate student demand**

Supplemental/Overflow Spaces (Show Rooms, Emergency Spaces, 4th Apartment Space, Community Lounges, All of Blakely Hall)	Blakely	Pine	Spooner	Mall Hall	Clayton A. Gay	David C. Johnson	Apartments	Campus
Total Occupied Supplemental/Overflow Spaces	72	2	2	76	4	5	68	153
Student Residents	68	1	0	73	4	1	38	116
Student staff (Student Hall Directors, Community Advisors)	4	0	0	69	4	1	38	112
Vacant Supplemental and Overflow Spaces	0	1	2	3	0	4	30	37

**Total Space Usage**

	Blakely	Pine	Spooner	Total	Clayton A. Gay	Independence	Apartments	Total
Total On-campus Space (Recommended plus Supplemental)	72	85	93	250	215	233	279	977
Total Occupied Spaces (Recommended plus Supplemental)	72	84	89	245	215	229	249	938
Student residents	68	80	84	232	208	217	242	899
Student staff (Student Hall Directors, Community Advisors)	4	4	5	13	7	12	7	39
Total Vacant Spaces (Recommended plus Supplemental)	0	1	4	5	0	4	30	39
Overall Occupancy Rate (total occupied/Recommended capacity)	7200%	101%	98%	144%	102%	100%	118%	114%

Notes:  
 1. Spaces held for emergency rooms: 1 in Clayton A. Gay, 1 in David C. Johnson Independence; not counted in capacity.