

**Facilities Planning – February 2006**  
**Review of Accomplishments, Priorities, and Assumptions to Date**  
**(Edited March 2008)**

As stated in President Sullivan's 05-06 Goals and Objectives, it is our intention to perform a comprehensive review and update of our Campus Master Plan. As noted in the February pre-Board memorandum from Board Chair Larry Winston and President Sullivan, we are not going to define that process of facilities planning until we have assessed our financial strategies. Our decisions regarding financial strategy will drive our facilities planning process. This document provides the background information or starting point for the ultimate planning process when chosen.

**The Master Plan – Defined**

Our master plan is a continuum of decision making communicated and recorded in a series of documents. While we recognize a previous campus master plan carried out in 1986, the basis of our present thinking begins with the Campus Master Plan of 1997 performed under the auspices of the campus Buildings and Grounds Committee with the professional input of Art Lidsky of Dober, Lidsky, Craig and Associates. This document and a series of documents listed in chronological order on the St. Lawrence University website (<http://www.stlawu.edu/initiatives/masterplan.html>) represent our campus master planning continuum. With the approval of the campus Buildings and Grounds Committee, this document will become part of the Master Plan.

Since 1997, it has been generally understood that the Buildings and Grounds Committee is the keeper, defender, and amender of the master plan with the ultimate approval by resolution of the Architecture and Physical Plant Committee and Board of Trustees.

**Prioritization Criteria**

The 1997 plan specifically defined the following criteria for prioritizing its long list of Wants and Needs.

- Relevance to Mission
- Penetration (numbers affected)
- Importance to Enrollment Management
- Program Enhancement

Enrollment Management was particularly important to the University at the time. Looking back, we were, in fact, at a low point of "demand" for the University with a student body of 1800 and the highest discount rates experienced.

In 2003, with "The Capital Prioritization Process – September 2003", the criteria was reviewed and amended as follows:

- Relevance to Mission
- Program Enhancement (adding value to the student experience)
- Importance to Enrollment Management

- Financial Return on Investment (energy savings/productivity)
- Overall Cost Feasibility (total \$, future operation costs, cash generation)
- Sustainability (ecological, programmatic, operational)

The last (and additional) three criteria are obvious responses to the tightening financial capacities of the University and the need to generate cash as well as improved program.

### **Priorities**

The 1997 plan listed the following priorities, virtually all of which have been addressed.

#### Highest

- New Student Center, Bookstore, and renovation of Dana Dining Hall
- Recreation and athletic improvements, including renovation of Augsburg/Leithead, expanded Fitness Center, and a new playing field and track, and,
- Renovations to Owen D. Young Library, including the associated relocation of the remaining sciences collection to the Launderers Center

#### High

- Increase in the number of computer classroom/lab spaces,
- Additional space provided for the arts at Griffiths Arts Center,
- Science facility improvements and expansion, and,
- Provision of space resources for the Outdoor Program

In “The Capital Prioritization Process – September 2003,” the priorities were distinctly viewed in the context of the limited capital environment. The document, a product of the combined Buildings and Grounds Committee and Priorities and Planning Committee, prioritizes as follows (paraphrased):

1. Stay the course with the Sciences – Phase I project despite the likelihood that the Science Resource Plan would not be 100% complete at the time of commitment. The document urges a critical look at reducing the project from \$36 million to \$34 million if possible. *(Ultimately, the project could not be reduced in the face of rising costs, and moved forward at \$36.9 million.)*
2. Prioritize a continuation of \$6 million as the Annual Capital Allocation over new facilities. *(In response to cashflow, we have had to lower this number to \$4 million last year and in all likelihood this year, 06-07.)*
3. Continue to solicit gift giving toward the Arts, moving forward when possible. *(With an allocation from our borrowing capacity of \$1 million and gifts of \$200,000, we completed Phase I. With further gifts of \$2.5 million, we are ready to begin Phase II at this amount.)*

## Accomplishments Through 2007

Our accomplishments have tracked well with our identified priorities from 1997. To be sure, we underestimated the level of need in a few areas, most particularly the Sciences and the Arts. The following list of accomplishments takes us through the planned completion of projects now in construction and expected to be completed by the end of 2007.

- Academic
  - ODY Library Renovation \$ 5.0 million
  - Significant Computer Classroom Additions
  - Wachtmeister Field Station \$ 1.5 million
  - Sarah Johnson Redlich '82 Hall of Science \$36.9 million
  - Arts Phase I \$ 1.3 million
  - Arts Phase II \$ 2.5 million
  - Total \$47.2 million
  
- Athletics
  - Appleton Arena \$ 5.0 million
  - Softball Field \$ .4 million
  - North Country Field (artificial turf) \$ 1.8 million
  - Weeks Field \$ .8 million
  - Merrick-Pinkard Outdoor Track \$ .8 million
  - Leckonby Stadium \$ 1.2 million
  - Augsbury Phase I Renovation \$ 1.3 million
  - Creasy Way (Leigh Street) Athletic Fields \$ 2.2 million
  - Newell Field House – Stafford Fitness Center \$12.9 million
  - Robie Squash Center \$ 2.0 million
  - Tom Fay Baseball Field \$ .6 million
  - Sandy MacAllaster Soccer Field \$ .6 million
  - Boathouse \$ .3 million
  - Total \$29.9 million
  
- Student Life - Student Support
  - Student Center \$15.0 million
  - Steiner Student Residences - Townhouses \$ 6.0 million
  - Residential Refurbishment \$ 6.0 million
  - Dana Dining Hall Renovation \$ 5.0 million
  - Brewer Bookstore Renovation \$ 2.8 million
  - Diana B. Torrey '82 Health and Counseling Ctr. \$ 2.2 million
  - Noble Student Center Renovation \$ .4 million
  - Total \$37.4 million
  
- Other Capital
  - MacAllaster House \$ 1.0 million
  - Security Access and Campus Lighting \$ 1.0 million

- University Inn Renovation	\$ 1.6 million
- Warehouse	\$ .4 million
- Facilities Recapitalization (10 years) approx:	\$19.0 million
- Library Book Acquisitions (10 years) approx:	\$12.0 million
- Information Technology (10 years) approx:	<u>\$12.0 million</u>
Total	\$47.0 million

Total all Groups	\$161.5 million
Other Capital Over Ten Years (equip replacement, etc)	<u>16.5 million</u>
Ten Years of Capital Expenditure est. through 2007	\$178.0 million

### **Campus-Wide Design Issues**

Along with the obvious facilities needs, the 1997 plan identified campus wide design issues that we have attempted to improve upon as we have invested directly in buildings. Design issues identified in 1997 are listed below with current commentary in italics.

- University does not have a natural entrance. (*The logical entrance, Romoda Drive, off Main Street enters the less attractive side of campus. We want the original arrival point, Park Street, to look and feel like our main entrance to campus – see next comment.*)
- Park Street simply “drives by.” (*Much has been done to mitigate this concern and create an “entrance to campus” feel to Park Street. The elimination of Leigh Street and creation of Creasy Way has connected the athletic facilities to the campus. Millennium Way, stretching from the Student Center to Brewer Bookstore, connects the campus to the west of Park Street. The additional activity of the bookstore, the added athletic facilities, the Teaching and Learning Center, and, soon to be, the Health and Counseling Center, have and will incorporate Park Street as part of campus. Campus lighting has been placed on Park Street to make it feel like part of the campus. The campus lighting, many crosswalks, and stoplight have also been added for safety.*)
- Two campuses, the original St. Lawrence and the old Canton ATI. (*The site of the student center and the site of the new science building, combined with the demolition of the old bookstore and present health center will eliminate any sense of two campuses.*)
- “Semi-walking” walking campus. (*We have a great deal of asphalt roadway yet to be replaced by “walkways” with ADA, emergency, and maintenance vehicle accessibility as needed. This can only come about as funding allows.*)
- May have too much space between buildings - suggest future expansion within the present boundaries. (*The placement of the new science building addressed the “best practice” concept of infilling rather than expanding boundaries. On the other hand,*

*we chose to expand the boundary with the Townhouses, for a variety of competing considerations.)*

- Important positive feature, the historic landscape. *(This area, defined as the corner of Park and University, south to Sykes, then back north to include Hepburn, Carnegie, Gunnison Chapel, Richardson, and Atwood, along with its trees and green space is seen as our treasure.)*

### **Return on Investment**

This topic could, of course, require a paper in itself. I offer the following three points, merely as a starting point for that discussion.

First, return on investment in the non-profit sector is a combination of financial return (cash) and “outcomes” return, or improvement in our teaching and learning, and, ultimately, our graduates as they take up their roles in society. While we expect that “outcomes return” will also improve “cash,” it is probably a very long-term process and possibly never complete. The support for that statement comes in the recognition that we choose, to a certain extent, how to utilize our newly gained “enrollment demand” among the classic admissions tradeoffs, net tuition revenues, academic quality improvements, and multi-cultural and socio-economic diversity. Nonetheless, the financial portion of the return is significant. From our financial statements, our total operating revenues have increased from \$58.2 million in fiscal 97-98 to \$88.7 million in fiscal 04-05 through a combination of increasing enrollment back to optimum size, improving the discount rate and significant improvement in gifts. All these improvements, I would identify as increased financial return on our investment.

Second, our “investment” has not been solely in the high visibility facilities, but we have purposely chosen to use those financial returns identified above to “invest” significantly in people and programs. Using the same financial statements as the example, expenditure on program (here defined as Instruction, Academic Support, and Student Services) increased from \$29 million in fiscal 97-98 to \$52 million in fiscal 04-05. This near doubling of expenditure on people and program might be seen as the immediate conversion of financial cash return into “outcomes return” as was defined above. I note parenthetically that, as exemplified by this brief discussion, it is a challenge to think of investments in the non-profit sector within the traditional corporate return on investment approach, yet, despite the complexities, a valuable endeavor.

Third, in return on investment analysis, it is always convenient to assume the starting point to be the baseline from which we measure our improved return. This is almost never true and is certainly not true here at St. Lawrence. If we accept that we were on a downward trend with respect to enrollment demand in 1997, most assuredly, a “do nothing scenario” with respect to investment in facilities would not have yielded a flat or breakeven baseline, but a continued downward trend and likely an accelerating downward trend in the face of the improvements being made by our overlap schools. The real measure of return on investment is in comparison to some downward trending baseline, not a flat baseline, yielding, of course, a greater sense of return on investment.

As stated at the beginning of this section the intention here is to simply introduce food for thought for a greater discussion, which, despite its complexities, is an important discussion to take on.

### **Closing Comments**

While not intending to presume the direction we will take based on our review of financial strategies, it is fair to say we still have a great deal of identified need in front of us as noted below.

• Sciences Phase II through IV	\$ 23.1 million
• Arts Future Phases (estimated)	\$ 14.0 million
• Utilities Infrastructure Issues	\$ 4.0 million
• Annual Capital (estimated need)	
– Library Acquisitions	\$ 1.2 million
– Information Technology	\$ 1.2 million
– Residential Refurbishment	\$ 1.0 million
– Facilities Recapitalization	\$ 1.6 million
– Other Capital Replacement	<u>\$ 1.0 million</u>
Total Annual Capital Need	\$ 6.0 million

Much of our facilities planning will involve prioritizing within these projects already on the table and wrestling with the logistics of construction, timing, and minimal interference with University program. In addition, more of our planning will need to center on the three added prioritization criteria from the planning that took place in 2003.

- Financial Return on Investment (energy savings/productivity)
- Overall Cost Feasibility (total \$, future operation costs, cash generation)
- Sustainability (ecological, programmatic, operational)

These three criteria speak directly to the need to balance *Outcomes* return on investment with *Financial* return on investment. How do we compare and choose between the measurable return of cash from an energy saving project, for example, versus a less tangible outcomes return? How do we find the appropriate balance for the University at this particular time?

Finally, more than ever before, our planning effort should be guided by a sense of sustainability, which was, in fact, intended to be in response to the environment, the programs we choose to embark upon, and our abilities to operate the campus within the financial limitations of our revenue generating capabilities.

TFC/ac