



**Residential Planning Group
Final Report
May 2022**

Members:

Dawn Abt-Perkins
Jordan Ahlersmeyer-Huang
Andrea Conner
Linda Horwitz
Joe Kinsella
Sean Menke
Kristen Nolan
David Siebert
Lori Sundberg

INTRODUCTION

Lake Forest College has long been established as a residential, liberal arts college, and we impose a residency requirement (with appropriate exemptions offered) that upholds that ideal. This planning process, which brought together faculty and staff in various departments, affords us the opportunity to consider important questions about the nature of our residential campus and the ways we do – or don't – meet the needs of both our residential and commuting students. Our residential experience matters throughout the student's life cycle at the College:

- it shapes prospective student (and family) decisions about their college choice,
- the mission for the residential program supports the overall educational mission of the College,
- the community that's created on campus should create a sense of belonging that leads to student success and retention, and
- this student satisfaction may lead to increased alumni/donor engagement.

Currently, our residence halls are full to their capacity. The large first-year classes in 2021 and (projected for) 2022 will test our ability to accommodate all those that wish to live on campus, which is currently about 70% of the population. There are limited rental options available in the nearby community to absorb our growth; housing immediately surrounding campus is too expensive for students, but students do commute from home or choose more affordable options further from campus as a way to take control over their meal planning and potentially save money.

As the College enrollment grows, so does our commuting population, which has more than doubled in the past 13 years. As is often the case for residential liberal arts colleges in or adjacent to urban areas, we have a larger commuting population than many of our peers (approximately 30% of our student body). It is sometimes difficult for commuting students to integrate into the campus community, but in other ways we are fortunate for growth in the commuting population since the number of beds on campus remains relatively unchanged for the past ten years. A larger student body – both commuting and residential – creates pressure for campus parking, which is already full.

Residential liberal arts colleges in rural areas or smaller cities often have a 90-98% residency rate, but to achieve that we would need to build new residence halls or expand the current buildings, since our buildings are currently at capacity. New builds or expansions are difficult to imagine due to the expense, and we are already facing the financial burden of deferred maintenance in our current

residence halls. While some crucial health and safety renovation projects are slated for the summer of 2022, the condition of our buildings vary widely, with some buildings as old as 1908 and others having only minor renovations since being built in the 1960s. The last major investment in residence halls was the 2012 construction of Moore Hall. Some of the facility maintenance, and our need for more parking, will need to be addressed before a more complete planning process can be endeavored.

As briefly mentioned above: when we discuss the residential experience on our campus, we mean to include both the facilities, programs, staff, and systems that support our residential students living on campus, but also the impact of our vibrant residential community on our non-residential (i.e. commuting or living locally) population. We are keen to understand the ways that the residential experience shapes all students, and how it contributes to the lively nature of our campus community.

For students living on campus, there is an unmet demand for singles and private bathrooms. These desires for privacy can feel at odds with our priorities around building community, which is more important than ever as we emerge from a pandemic that has necessarily kept people apart. There has been turnover in the office of Residence Life that has led to periods of being short-staffed, and we need to improve that picture so the team can focus on community building in the student experience. Finally, we heard that many students stretch to afford room and board, and there is some student demand for less expensive meal plans. And yet, the College doesn't bring in enough money via room and board to break even and address the annual and long term repairs that are needed.

All of these factors and more have led the Residential Planning group to offer three key recommendations.

I. MASTER PLAN

As noted above, there are serious considerations regarding the condition of existing residence halls due to age, the capacity of those buildings compared to demand, and the configuration of the student desired offerings (communal rooms, kitchens, washrooms, and availability of singles). At the same time, we note that these residence halls are fully in use, including during the summer, so that there is no down time for refreshing or repairs. In addition, there is a serious shortage of parking on campus, which impacts faculty, staff, commuters,

residential students, and guests at College events. Addressing any of these issues will be expensive and there is a significant need to prioritize.

The last time the College did a Master Plan for facilities and grounds was in 2001. At that time, the report noted a variety of needs around campus, some of which have since been addressed. It is time to begin a new master plan for facilities that will address competing needs for resources.

Priority Recommendation: Develop a Facility Master Plan that will outline the needed renovations to the residence halls and address the parking situation.

Key Questions:

1. What is the state of deferred maintenance in our existing residence halls?

There are ten residence halls that vary in age from 1908 to 2012. There is not a single report or assessment that covers the condition of all buildings. During FY22, an engineering firm was consulted to evaluate the condition of the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) systems in five buildings. Additionally, the ventilation and air conditioning systems were evaluated in Nollen and Deerpath, due to ongoing concerns about humidity. These reports are available in the Business Office. These reports do not address the envelope of the buildings, which would include roofs, windows, walls and foundations. In short, **we do not have a complete picture of deferred maintenance in the residence halls.**

Plans are made to address, in the summer of 2022, the most significant areas of risk: the plumbing and heating systems in Harlan and Blackstone, and the aging boiler that heats Gregory, McClure and Roberts. The next priorities will be the dedicated outdoor air system (DOAS) unit and the roof for Deerpath, and then the humidity challenges in Nollen. We note that Lois is of the same age as Harlan and Blackstone, with similar galvanized steel piping and similar vulnerability. The "Quads" (Gregory, Roberts, and McClure) were built in the 1960s and have infrastructure issues that reflect being 60 years old.

Recommendation: The College should do a complete Facilities Assessment of the residence halls to determine what the deferred maintenance issues are.

2. Should we add new residence halls or tear down existing halls?

The question pertains to two further underlying issues:

a. Are the existing residence halls past their useful life and economically not worth keeping?

Without a complete facility assessment, this question cannot be completely answered. However, it is noted that some of the oldest residence halls were determined to be worth renovating this summer. The question of “useful life” seems to be more about whether the configuration of the building (quads, doubles, singles, air conditioning) makes the buildings undesirable by students in the long run. The buildings will require renewal, and that cost will increase as it is delayed, but the existing buildings are filling a market demand for housing that is not currently available elsewhere.

Recommendation: As above, the College should do a complete Facilities Assessment of the residence halls to determine what the deferred maintenance issues are.

b. Does a future strategy for housing indicate an increase or decrease in demand compared to the existing capacity?

Admissions spoke to the current importance of being able to offer housing on campus: unless the student is local, there is an expectation that housing will be provided. Many local students also want the experience of living on campus, and about half of transfer students are looking for housing. Last summer there was a waiting list for housing, which created anxiety for some First Years and caused some Transfer students to go elsewhere.

Yet, we noted that our commuter population has grown as a percent of the overall student body. Local students are most likely to commute for financial reasons, many indicating that they are saving money by living at home. Many of us were surprised to learn that the College has about 500 commuting students this year, in comparison to 265 in Fall 2004. Thankfully, our overall increase in enrollment has been accommodated by this shift in housing demand, because residential housing would not be available for additional students.

We note again that the current capacity is in demand at an enrollment of 1650. Some of this demand can be considered artificial, since the College has adopted a mandatory residency policy for students in the first three years (subject to certain exclusions). However, in the senior year there is no exaggerated flight to live off campus. A contributing factor is

the residential community around the College; a limited number of apartments and rental houses may be available but they require a car to commute to campus and the rentals that are closest to campus are not as affordable as those farther away.

If enrollment should drop as the demographic cliff puts pressure on yield, we could see the need to shutter a residence hall. If enrollment should increase, we could evaluate the possibility of contracting with apartment complexes in North Chicago or Highwood. Increasing the density within the existing halls is not a good option given the pressure for more communal spaces and more private space (see below).

Recommendation: For now, develop flexible contingency plans for a decrease or increase in enrollment that does not involve tearing down or building a new residence hall.

3. Do the existing buildings meet the needs of current students and provide the type of accommodation that competitors provide?

We approached this in two ways. We spoke with students and with the Residence Life staff to understand the needs within the buildings, and we spoke with Admissions staff to get their feedback about what families have said regarding competitor offerings.

Students are asking for singles. This is sometimes expressed through a disability accommodation request. It is also clear through the room selection process that singles are in high demand. The room configuration most in demand is the single in Nollen, which shares a washroom with only two other students. The four-person “quad” rooms in McClure, Roberts and Gregory are the least popular; these are two rooms (that require the “back” room’s residents to walk through the “front” room) with a private bathroom for four people. Community washrooms used by more than six people are not desired.

Community kitchens are very popular. Students will travel to the halls that have kitchen access: Moore, McClure and Cleveland-Young. Middle campus has no kitchen at all. The type and availability of communal gathering spaces varies. While the Mohr Student Center is popular for early evening gatherings, students prefer to congregate in spaces within the halls to continue socializing. The temporary tent on South Campus, set up for outside classes during the pandemic, was also mentioned as a popular gathering space.

Admissions staff spoke about the impact of our housing stock on their work. Although it is not the most important consideration, the quality of the housing sometimes becomes the tipping factor at the end in getting student to commit to a deposit. Admissions indicated that a “sense of community” and evidence of customer service are more important considerations. However, they also thought it not unreasonable to conclude that fewer overnight visits during the pandemic might have had a favorable impact on enrollment. Parents are more likely than students to comment on the quality of the spaces, including being surprised about community washrooms. Admissions is careful about which housing spaces are shown to applicants, but overnight visits are dependent upon the students who offer to host.

We understand that this is not an amenity race and we are not desperately far behind our competitors, but some upgrading would be an advantage so that furniture, furnishings, and communal spaces would look (and be) inviting. Admissions concluded that money put into the existing halls, as opposed to constructing brand new facilities, would be preferred.

Recommendation: In a master planning exercise, develop plans to upgrade the existing residence halls to provide more singles, fewer students per washroom, more communal kitchen space, and more community space that meets the specific interests of students.

4. How should we address parking problems?

With the increase in enrollment and, proportionately, the larger increase in commuters, the demand for parking has become a significant problem. Spaces are often not available on Middle Campus in the middle of the day, leaving commuter students and faculty circling for spots. Faculty and staff who arrive early are assured of spots but dare not leave for lunch. There are frequently spots open at Glen Rowan, but these spots are either not top of mind or are considered too far for walking purposes.

On South Campus, events in the Sports and Recreation Center or the Ice Rink will often necessitate Parking Restriction emails from Public Safety. This February, parking restrictions were in effect for three weekends. Students were required to move their cars so that spaces could be made available for guests, which unintentionally sends a message to students about how the College is prioritizing space. (See attached illustration email.)

Several times in the past few years, an attempt has been made via working groups to locate spaces for additional parking. Each spot has drawbacks due to existing usage. The easiest spots to add would be on South Campus and would impinge on faculty and staff housing or on athletic fields. Other parking could be located at Glen Rowan or in the vacant lot at the corner of College and Sheridan; these locations would potentially clash with the City. We note that the City has already specified that the additional asphaltting behind North Hall was done without an analysis of adequate permeable surfaces.

Recommendation: The parking situation is serious enough that the College must address it fairly quickly, knowing that any available space will have other claims, and the decision of location will not be easy.

In addition to parking availability, there are issues with adequate asphalt repair and striping due to budget pressures. The students pay \$170,000 in parking permits annually, but that full amount is not returned into the maintenance of the lots. Currently, we do not require faculty and staff to pay for parking permits.

Recommendation: Funds should be set aside on a regular basis to provide safe parking lots.

II. BUILDING COMMUNITY

The committee engaged in robust discussion about the commitments we must make – as a residential college – to a vibrant on-campus community. We believe that the nature of our college requires us to invest in the educational, social, and personal development of our students outside of the classroom, with a focus on the dynamics of a residential community. We noted that this is important even for our commuting students, who have chosen a residential liberal arts college when they have many other options in the Chicago-land area.

Recent student surveys indicate that students don't necessarily feel a strong sense of community in the residence halls. In 2019, only 28.5% of respondents to the All-Campus Student Survey agreed or strongly agreed that "there is a strong sense of community in my residence hall." In the 2022 version of the survey, this percentage of respondents that agreed or strongly agreed with that statement fell further to 20.91%, which is perhaps partially attributable to the safety precautions that prohibited gathering and connecting in person during the

pandemic. We find these survey outcomes dramatic and in need of immediate attention.

This focus on building community can seem at odds with the student population that is craving privacy in single rooms and aren't necessarily engaging in communal spaces. However, discussions need to continue about the kind of college that we want to be. As educators inside and outside of the classroom, we can prioritize what we know is good, healthy, and helpful for our students' development. And, we know that creating a sense of belonging on campus will help students persist through the typical obstacles that they will face as emerging adults in college. A fantastic residential experience would cement affinity for the college and likely increase alumni engagement and donation.

Priority Recommendation: Rally the relevant campus departments around building community in the coming year(s), especially as we seek to revivify the campus after a pandemic kept us apart.

Key Questions:

1. How can staffing in Residence Life be maximized to improve community?

The office of Residence Life has been affected by turnover that is not uncommon for departments such as these, especially once the pandemic began and Residence Life responsibilities changed dramatically. Like many institutions, we are also affected by The Great Resignation. In the last four years (2018-2022) the department was led by four different Directors; the longest-tenured Residence Director stayed for 2.5 years and others were promoted to leadership positions, but some RDs stayed for fewer than 12 months. In those years, the department had only brief spans of time where it was fully staffed, which increases burnout among the remaining staff as they take on more responsibilities (especially when the role includes a 24/7 on-call rotation).

Staff turnover affects many elements of the important work of building community in the residence halls. Ongoing relationships with students can falter, time is lost to hiring and onboarding processes, institutional and departmental memories suffer, collaborations around campus are difficult to keep consistent, and forward progress is difficult. The committee notes, however, that many individual Residence Life staff have been wonderful contributors to our community and have created meaningful relationships with students and colleagues. It's just that the cumulative effect of turnover has a ripple effect.

At this writing, the College is seeking our next Director of Residence Life, who will be charged with leading efforts to invest in the staff's professional development, create a programmatic curriculum for the residence halls, refresh the Resident Assistant (RA) program, join campus efforts to reinvigorate campus community, and move the needle on student impressions of the community in the residence halls. Both returning and new RD staff will experience an optimistic reset of the department this summer.

Resident Assistants (RAs) are critically important in setting the stage for healthy communities. At this writing, the College is also responding to student requests to increase wages – including from the RA population – and a task force convened to address these concerns. More discussion of the RA program can be found below.

Recommendation: Analyze the fiscal resources that are necessary to secure the right people – and give them the resources that they need – to build community.

2. What will it take to build community in our residential program?

It's clear that collective attention from staff in Residence Life, Student Affairs, and campus partners must be focused on how to increase the student sense of community and belonging for both our residential and commuting students. We discussed several ideas – all of which require time and financial resources – but are worth exploring further by the relevant staff in coming months and years.

As examples only:

- The College could consider repurposing a centrally-located house (7 Campus Circle?) as a middle-campus kitchen and gathering space for commuters. Committee members noted other liberal arts colleges have student kitchens or themed houses (cookie house!) that are institutional points of pride.
- We could offer meditation and prayer space in the residence halls or in the student center. These practices are sometimes individual, but are often communal activities too.
- We noted the need for a creative program to 're-socialize' students this fall, with a focus on fun, energetic connections with others that enhance the student experience.

Committee members were concerned that these efforts might be complicated by a generation of students who – due to the COVID-19 pandemic – have been socialized differently than their forebears. In Fall

2022 and beyond, our students may need more thorough information about campus programs and traditions, and how to plan events and engage with peers.

We also noted the need for better gathering space for commuters. The existing commuter lounge in the lower level of Deerpath is large, with comfortable seating and modest appointments, but it is not centrally located. Perhaps commuting students could be assigned to join certain residential communities to broaden their social connections and access to spaces on campus.

Both the Residence Directors (RDs) and the Resident Assistants (RAs) are asked to spend a notable amount of their time and energy on building community on the floor and across the residence hall. This can feel at odds, on occasion, with the accountability measures that the RDs and RAs must take to ensure the community's standards are upheld. Some committee members felt that confronting policy violations makes it difficult for RAs to be seen as builders of community; other committee members felt that holding the community accountable is good for the overall health of the community itself.

Currently the operational budget for programming in the residence halls is too low at approximately \$10,000 annually. This amounts to \$2,500 per RD, or \$250 per RA, or \$8 per resident each year. Of course, other campus entities like the Gates Center, Intercultural Relations, Student Government, and student clubs contribute to campus community through their own programming budgets.

Recommendation: Empower Residence Life and other campus departments to experiment with low-budget projects that may develop into community-building traditions.

Recommendation: Assess the space in Mohr Student Center for a commuter lounge and prayer/meditation space.

3. What kind of spaces create community?

Over time, small residential lounges originally planned for TVs or studying were reclaimed for bedroom space. This leaves only the larger, public "entryway lounges" for communal space in most buildings. Some of these are in good to excellent shape (Moore, Nollen, Deerpath) but others are unattractive with mismatched and uncomfortable furniture. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, few buildings have kitchens, which further limits student interaction and connection. We found it noteworthy that students

mentioned the outdoor tents and picnic tables as gathering places that are addressing that need, at least partially.

Recommendation: Include residence hall furniture replacement in residence hall master planning. Capitalize on any donor interest or surpluses to make modest improvements to shared residential spaces whenever possible.

Recommendation: Create more communal spaces by converting some bedrooms to shared lounge or cooking space, despite a marginal revenue loss.

III. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Housing is an auxiliary business and is expected to “pay its own way”. Yet we also know that a residential program is not easily separated from the educational experience at a college like Lake Forest. We looked at the financial outcomes from room and board and discovered two very important points. First, the fees that students pay for room and board barely cover the costs of providing these services when we take into account the additional need-based aid that is awarded. Second, some significant number of our students still have difficulty affording room and board despite the additional aid, because even with institutional grants of \$35,000 and full federal and state support, their financial aid package falls short of need by about \$7,500. We also heard concerns that the existing meal plan does not provide food during breaks, and that some students cannot afford to get food off campus during those times.

Priority Recommendation: Review and solidify a financial plan for housing and food that balances student financial need and possible food insecurity with the realistic need for College revenue.

Key Questions:

1. Does the residential program make money?

Room and Board charges are \$11,500 in FY22 for the least expensive room type. Total revenue as shown on the financial statements is \$14 million. In contrast, the net tuition revenue was only \$27 million, making it appear that the College is very dependent upon room and board revenue. This is because almost all of the Lake Forest scholarships and need-based grants have been applied against tuition and fees.

The College contracts out for the dining plan and pays Parkhurst for the meals. Financial Aid packages about \$4,000 of additional College grant aid for students living on campus who have unmet need. The average across all residential students in FY19 (pre-pandemic) was \$2,846 in additional aid per resident. Starting with \$14 million billed for room and board, subtracting Parkhurst fees, and subtracting the additional grants, the remaining revenue was \$4.3 million or about \$3,900 per residential student. Against that revenue is allocated direct repairs, custodial, facilities management, utilities, interest paid on debt for past renovations, and the residence life staff and programming. The net revenue remaining was only \$507,000, which is not enough to pay for needed annual refurbishment, let alone major capital repairs to roofs, HVAC, or electrical systems.

Since we established earlier that many of our applicants are looking for a residential campus, the residential program is not a stand-alone offering that can be evaluated on profitability. However, we have also established a clearer understanding of the costs of the program through this analysis.

Recommendation: Provide more transparency in financial aid packaging, so that the net revenue for room and board is apparent.

2. How can the College afford to update the residence halls?

According to a report commissioned by the College to review Facilities Management, a rule of thumb for annual spending on capital renewal would be 1.5% of the current replacement value. Using their number of \$350 per GSF on 310,000 GSF, the replacement value of the residence halls would be \$108.5 million; the annual capital renewal goal would be \$1.6 million. The current capital renewal budget has been \$400,000 - \$600,000 for the *campus*, and not all for residence halls. Given the analysis in Question 1 above, the capital renewal budget is unlikely to come from student revenue.

The College will be incurring debt this summer to accomplish major renovations in Harlan and Blackstone. The buildings will get all new plumbing, heating and ventilation systems.

Per current plans, the next residence halls to be given a major renovation would be the "quads" of Gregory, Roberts, and McClure. The committee discussed the popularity of the Nollen renovation which transformed the original building (which was of the same design as Gregory, Roberts and McClure) to a much more popular configuration that enclosed the center

between the wings and removed the external “motel” entrances. Multiple room types and air conditioning were also added, and the gross square footage went from 28,000 to 39,000, and the number of available beds went from 120 to 154. The estimated cost, based on figures above, to replace the three existing quads would be \$10 million each. The cost to “Nollenize” one of the quads would be \$13.7 million. Both numbers may be low based on Chicago-area prices.

If the College were to expand substantially beyond the current enrollment, and applicants required on campus housing, then increasing the number of beds by renovating the quads might be considered important. Rough calculation shows that \$13 million debt at 5% interest rate over 30 years would increase the annual debt service by \$850,000 per year. 34 additional residents (154-120) would bring in only \$132,600 in annual housing revenue, but also additional net tuition revenue. Given the decline in the number of college-going students starting in 2026, this might not be the right time to consider expansion. But, our trend of full-to-bursting residence halls do require some creative solutions if our enrollment stays healthy in the meantime.

Recommendation: Prepare a long-range financial plan to fund residence hall renovations.

3. Can students afford our room and board?

Room and board fees are part of the total cost of attendance (COA), and students' financial aid packages are based on COA. The College is extremely generous with institutional grants but is not in a financial position to cover full need. Many of the neediest local students are choosing to live at home and commute. They will save \$7,500 (the balance of what they would have paid living on campus with additional aid). Against this, the commuter will need to incur transportation and food costs.

The students who have chosen to live on campus *and* have a zero expected family contribution (EFC) will need to find additional loans or work to pay for the outstanding \$7,500. In the entering First Year class of Fall 2022, the commuter population is 48% Pell recipients, compared to 28% of the resident population. This indicates a skewing of our population in housing choice by family resources.

Some students have petitioned to waive the Board Plan to save money. Currently the College requires students to remain on the Board Plan unless a medical exemption is given. This is primarily because of the lack of cooking facilities in the residence halls. We also note that keeping more

students on the meal plan makes the plan more affordable on average, and mitigates any food insecurity during the academic year.

Off-campus apartments are spread around the surrounding areas of Highland Park, Highwood, Vernon Hills, North Chicago, Lake Bluff, and Waukegan. They are not clustered to create community and the town of Lake Forest has few housing opportunities. Apartment rent for 2 bedrooms and 1 bath ranges from \$1,350 in Vernon Hills to \$2,200 at Arrive (billed as luxury) in Highwood. At \$1,800 per month, *double occupancy* bedrooms, the 12-month cost unfurnished would be \$5,400 for the year plus utilities and wifi, making the cost similar to the College's lowest cost of \$5,540 for two semesters. At least one group of students has found a 4 bedroom (4 person) house for \$2,650/month, or \$7,950 per person for the year, which is similar to the College's price for air-conditioned suites.

Students who cannot go home over breaks face additional costs for housing (between semesters) and food (not currently provided during Thanksgiving, winter and spring breaks).

Recommendation: Provide meals during winter and spring breaks and include them in the meal plan.

4. How does differential pricing impact equity on campus?

Currently rooms are priced higher for air conditioning, singles, and spaces in newer residence halls. The two-semester cost (for housing only) for FY22 ranges from \$5,540 to \$8,738. Some students are mindful of cost and choose accommodations that are within budget, although not their preference. Some students pay no attention to cost and select nicer residence halls that lead them to incur financial hardship; the most frequent financial appeal according to the Financial Aid office is from students who have chosen to live in more expensive rooms.

In our discussions, we were not agreed on the question of College approach: should all rooms be priced the same and the best rooms given to students with more seniority, or should pricing reflect amenities and lower pricing be made available to students with fewer financial resources? We have shown that even at the lowest prices, some students are finding room and board to be not affordable.

Recommendation: Develop a mission for the residence life program that weighs the affordability and equity issues.

5. What is the financial role of summer programs that utilize the residence halls?

The College has a strong summer rental program, which brings in week-long camps and conferences to live in the residence halls. These renters will also usually purchase meals from the College's meal plan provider, Parkhurst. The summer meal plan revenue helps offset the cost of the academic year meal plan.

In the summer of 2019 (the last full pre-pandemic summer), the College netted \$270,000 from these rentals. The College also contracted for \$45,000 of additional custodial help to get the halls ready before and after rentals, making net revenue \$225,000. In the summer of 2021, with students present on campus in the spring but few rentals in the summer, the College incurred no additional summer custodial charges. We are not able to identify or analyze specific costs for repairs due to summer wear and tear since the College work-order system does not collect this information.

The College also rents residence hall space to students in the summer. Some of these students are attending summer school or researching with faculty, some are working on campus or at internships, and a small number are given permission because they lack other suitable options. Summer rent from students was \$158,000 for the fiscal year FY19 (June, July of 2018 and May of 2019). Students are given air-conditioned halls, with Moore Hall being most often used. Since Moore Hall is always full (because other air-conditioned halls are reserved for rental, and because the College does not mix outside renters with students), there is no time to do preventative maintenance repairs. Other halls have periods of weeks open during the summer but the rentals are heavily loaded in July and end by July 31. About 50 students who are remaining on campus throughout the summer transition to their actual fall rooms five days later; 42 RAs and 100 football players return to campus within 7 days of rentals leaving.

CONCLUSION

The Residential Planning group feels it likely that we generated more questions than we answered. To be sure, the questions we have identified are complicated, have expensive ramifications, and are deeply intersecting with the work of our academic, enrollment, partnership, and diversity/equity/inclusion counterparts in the planning process. We could not,

alone, make a prediction about whether the students of our near-term future will want to live on campus at greater or lesser rates, just as we could not, alone, identify how to prioritize the millions of dollars of deferred maintenance in the residence halls.

As you have read, this report outlines three priority recommendations for the coming years:

1) Develop a Facility Master Plan that will outline the needed renovations to the residence halls and address the parking situation.

- In the near-term, a facilities assessment could be requested by an external party that would help ready us for campus master planning process. Furthermore, the campus parking shortage may need a remedy before the master planning process can be completed, and flexible solutions for additional residential beds may be needed if enrollment continues to grow.

2) Rally the relevant campus departments around building community in the coming year(s), especially as we seek to revivify the campus after a pandemic kept us apart.

- In the near-term, Student Affairs plans to devote significant energy in Fall 2022 towards efforts to reengage our student body. Additionally, more data could be gathered about the unique needs of our commuting students.

3) Review and solidify a financial plan for housing and food that balances student financial need and possible food insecurity with the realistic need for College revenue.

- In the near-term, a decision must be made about the differential pricing for campus housing and the financial aid protocols for room and board.

The members of the Residential Planning group look forward to further campus deliberations about the preservation and advancement of the residential nature of our liberal arts college in years to come.