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Dear RHS Stakeholder:

Much work has been accomplished since the Michigan State University Board of Trustees approved the Division of Housing & Food Services' new strategic direction. Many of the milestones put in place in 2008 have been accomplished. For example, we have:

- Renamed the Division of Housing and Food Services as Residential and Hospitality Services;
- Realigned the Division into cohesive functional areas;
- Played an integral role in establishing Neighborhoods at MSU;
- Developed and opened five Neighborhood Engagement Centers across campus;
- Consolidated Campus Living Services and the Department of Residence Life to form Residence Education and Housing Services, reinvigorating a focus on co-curricular education;
- Created Neighborhood Dining Centers with a focus on culinary excellence. This has resulted in national recognition, but more importantly, enthusiastic response from students, guests and the campus community.

Now, it is time for the Division to revisit the Strategic Plan to:

- Validate original planning assumptions;
- Make necessary adjustments in response to changing environmental factors;
- Plan for the future, ensuring the long-term fiscal sustainability of the organization in support of the University's mission.

Residential and Hospitality Services (RHS) always has strived to transform students’ lives through intentional co-curricular programs and activities offered in inclusive and diverse communities, and by using physical structures to maximize learning opportunities. This generation of students will need a different set of skills to participate in and contribute to a global society.

Welcome to RHS 2.0! The Division will work closely with our academic partners to give students the confidence to innovate, to equip them with the ability to lead small groups and flat organizations and to work effectively and live with diverse groups of people. We want our students to become lifelong learners and to master information technology. We will look at action-based learning (undergraduate research, Study Abroad, entrepreneurial activities, performance and design activities) to augment our learning outcomes. This will result in a graduate who is prepared to assume a leadership role in our world-grant society.

We have accomplished much during the last five years but we need to continue to innovate, remain true to our values and mission, and continue to improve. We must support the University’s goals of retention, persistence and graduation. These are our challenges for the next 10 years and the focus of the 2013–2023 update to our planning process.

Vennie Gore
Vice President for Auxiliary Enterprises
The 2008 Strategic Plan noted that the process was as important as the plan. At this five-year mark, the realization is that the process is more important than the plan.
BOLDNESS BY DESIGN
Strategic Positioning of Michigan State University

GOAL
expand horizons of possibility for humanity through pursuit of:
knowledge
discovery
engagement
opportunities to apply knowledge to improve the world

MISSION
advance knowledge transform lives

STRATEGIC COMMITMENT
recognized worldwide as leading land-grant research university in U.S.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVES
enhance the student experience
enrich community, economic, and family life
expand international reach
increase research opportunities
strengthen stewardship

Beaumont Tower
In October 2008, the Division of Housing and Food Services embarked on a journey to enhance its rich history, began in 1946, and prepare for the challenges of a new millennium for a diverse set of buildings and units. By renaming itself Residential and Hospitality Services, the Division signaled a culture of change, breaking down silos and creating opportunities for the future.

The timing is significant, as recent history recalls that the global economy began a decline in December 2007. The resulting global recession precipitated the European sovereign debt crisis and the slowing of U.S. and Chinese growth. Against this backdrop, Michigan State University pushed forward with focused, strategic changes to “Delivering Outstanding Spartan Experiences” and chart a future on solid ground.

Daniel Pink, the author of Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us, reminds us that it takes small steps to reach goals. Small steps prepare us to navigate our aspirations and to handle deviations and detours. Nimbleness prepares us to stay the course during moments of crisis and moments of calm. RHS has taken steps both big and small to navigate change.

One result is the creation of focused neighborhoods, which have revitalized buildings and created opportunities for student success. The division has proven that positive outcomes in support of the University’s mission can be achieved when a group of individuals rally around a shared vision and work together to move things forward. While the past few years have seen progressive cultural and organizational shifts, the division’s heart remains the same – the continued support of the University’s mission.

A good strategic planning process evaluates the current condition, its historic context and visualizes an ideal future. It analyzes gaps between the current reality and the ideal state and devises specific actions to close that gap, including the identification of resources required to execute the action plan. The RHS Strategic Plan of 2008 evaluated a mountain of data and developed both a 10-year plan and a supporting document that projected to 2032. The 2008 Strategic Plan noted that the process was as important as the plan. In 2012, the five-year mark, RHS continued the conversation ignited in 2008 with noticeable differences. In 2012, the realization is that the process is more important than the plan. The atmosphere has changed. This is evidenced by the excitement of all divisions at what has been accomplished and what is left to achieve. Today, there is a shared vision for what will help ensure student success.

2012 marks the sesquicentennial of the Morrill Act, signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862. The purpose of the land-grant colleges was:

without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactic, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life

Michigan State University, founded in 1855, was designated as a Land Grant University on March 18, 1863. MSU was known as the “pioneer Land Grant University” with its own state grants of land and became the model institution for the federal Morrill Act of 1862. Michigan State University holds the distinction of being the first land grant university in the United States.

“Do not go where the path may lead, go instead where there is no path and leave a trail.”
— Ralph Waldo Emerson
The 2008 Strategic Plan outlined a phasing plan, which prioritized physical projects to be implemented by the division. The effort has been intensive in physical construction, program development and internal reorganization. This timeline indicates the work that has been accomplished. Additionally a few projects are underway and slated to be completed over the next few years:

- Renovation of Armstrong Hall 2013
- Renovation of Bryan Hall 2013
- Renovation of Shaw Hall’s Dining Center 2013
- Renovation of Butterfield Hall 2015

In the 2008 plan, the South neighborhood was positioned for a strategic restructuring and renovation to the food offerings. It was noted that meaningful improvements in both the physical appearance, as well as operational efficiencies, could be achieved through the renovation of the Holden Dining Hall, closing the existing dining venues in Wilson and opening a neighborhood coffee shop. RHS ultimately determined that Case Dining Hall should be renovated, and the other projects in the South Neighborhood were deferred.
2010
- South Engagement Center (Holden)
- East Neighborhood Engagement Center (Hubbard)
- Position Management
- Combo Exchange program begins
- Merger of Campus Living Services & Residence Life Department
- MSU Fall 1st Time Freshman: 7,375

2011
- Cherry Lane Apartments demolished
- Faculty Bricks demolished
- Case Dining Hall Renovation & Expansion
- Enterprise Business Systems
- Renovated Emmons Hall opens
- Brody Square Dining & Engagement Center
- Starbucks opens at Wells Hall
- MSU Fall 1st Time Freshman: 7,827

2012
- North Neighborhood Engagement Center (Union)
- Union Renovations Phase 1
- Kellogg Big Ten Rooms and Main Corridor Renovations
- Rather Residence Hall Renovations
- Bailey Residence Hall Renovations
- River Trail Engagement Center (McDonel)
- MSU Fall 1st Time Freshman: 8,154
Red Cedar River during the winter

Bridge over the Red Cedar River
The team determined that the original four Strategic Goals of 2008 continue to be what drives thinking. In 2012, a fifth goal provides additional focus.

**1 Define and enhance the student experience by promoting learning and development through interaction.**

**2 Create vibrancy and renewal that compels higher levels of satisfaction and achievement.**

**3 Celebrate student life by providing diverse spaces for a globally minded, 24/7 student that is uniquely MSU.**

**4 Initiate a transformative, world-class model of the residential experience with accessibility, sustainability and stewardship principles.**

**5 Maintain fiscal responsibility to provide long-term financial viability and sustainability.**

**PRINCIPLES + CORE EXPECTATIONS**

The Overarching Principles developed during the 2008 strategic planning process remain pertinent today and for the future.

- The strategic planning process is as important, if not more important, than the planning document. The planning process is not fixed but should modify and morph as input and data are interjected into the discussion.
- The strategic master plan will seek input from a broad spectrum of individuals.
- The team will use all avenues available to communicate the vision, the plan, and the process to stakeholders, obtaining consensus and avoiding implementation roadblocks.
- The plan will align with the goals of Michigan State University’s strategic position: Boldness by Design.
- The plan will integrate with the campus master plan.
- The plan will support the Division’s overall mission first and the individual units second.
- The planning effort will support the Division’s values of Purpose Practice & People.
- The planning effort will be one of collaboration among all parties.
- The plan will seek to find the optimal balance between the elements of system size, competition for students, and fiscal stability.
- Ultimately, the plan will synthesize a shared vision for RHS the next 10 years. (Updated from 2008)
- The strategic plan will be uniquely Michigan State.
In 2008, several themes emerged through focus group discussion. In 2012, the themes were re-validated through another series of focus group discussions. Discussions identified opportunities to advance the themes as the Strategic Planning moves forward.
**CUSTOMER**

2008: The challenge is to provide what feels like personalized service to such a large number of customers with very diverse needs.

2012: Staff work days need to align with student lifestyle – focus on service.

**OPPORTUNITIES:**
- Customize Neighborhood Engagement Center programs to location and population (Example: tutoring for freshmen halls/neighborhoods, but something different for upperclassmen/neighborhoods halls.)
- Create more of a 24/7 presence.
- Develop plans to reduce red tape, so that when Post-Gens arrive, you have already learned to respond simply and honestly. Words to live by: transparency, accessibility.
- Some residence halls are not successful. Why? Identify those with a low return and consider new markets for unsuccessful halls.
- Develop a strong ‘service mentality’ among staff.

**CELEBRATING THE PEOPLE**

2008: They are the legacy. Market the “faces” of MSU; the longevity of staff creates a tradition for the Division to which students connect.

2012: This did not appear to be part of the current conversation. In 2008 the division was just engaging in a new vision to come together, there had been a lot of internal work developing division unity. The conversation has moved away from the H&FS individual and is now more focused on collaborative units within RHS. Although the staff is becoming change weary.

**OPPORTUNITIES:**
- People are still the engine behind what drives RHS and makes the Spartan Experience uniquely MSU. Bring the individual stories, successes, and people connections to the students each and every day.

**TECHNOLOGY AS A STRATEGY**

2008: Technology should be viewed not just as a service but a strategy.

2012: Essential Resource; pervasive across all conversations. • Technology should not be just a service but a strategy – still.

**OPPORTUNITIES:**
- Capitalize on communication tools (social media, Spartan Connect, other?) so that student, faculty, and staff know about the services already in place.
- Use social media to change student patterns.
- Benchmark peers and develop a campus-wide technology vision/master plan that is nimble, flexible, responsive. At a minimum, this must include WIFI throughout campus. Leap ahead!
- Create a virtual identity for RHS; create an online identity for Neighborhood Centers/Resources.
- Bring technology resources to the neighborhood for student interaction. Is there a place for an innovation incubator?
- Embrace technology as a way to provide solutions. For example, technology could drive food ordering/to go/delivery. Technology solutions for simple interactive communications.
- Technology should not be departmentalized/compartmentalized.
- Used data to assist in evidence based discussion making.
COMMUNICATE
2008: Promoting the “new MSU.” Define the Scales of the Community: Create a hierarchy that is intentional: my hall, my building, my neighborhood, my campus. Learn from the Living/Learning Successes: Identify the benefits of the intimate community scale within the context of the larger scale of the University.

2012: Defining community scale has taken center stage with the creation of the Neighborhood Engagement Centers. Identify and communicate the value of this concept to the students and the broader MSU family, market, and brand that value.

OPPORTUNITIES:
- Communicate MSU Value: What distinguishes us?
- Make Neighborhood Engagement Centers part of the MSU Brand.
- Promote Neighborhood Engagement Centers to parents and alumni.
- Make sure Neighborhood Engagement Centers are part of admissions tours and with the depth needed.
- Make identity of neighborhoods part of the design process: dining halls, public spaces, Neighborhood Engagement Centers, graphics, etc.
- Communications should reinforce that Neighborhood Centers are for everyone, both residents and off-campus students.

LEARNING FROM THE LIVING / LEARNING SUCCESSES
2008: Identify the benefits of an intimate community scale within the context of the larger scale of the university.

2012: Connecting and developing relationships with students through the neighborhood engagement centers has been a definitive success in creating the intimate scale desired in 2008.

OPPORTUNITIES:
- Continue to fine tune each Engagement Center’s programs and services to better align with the unique populations of each neighborhood. Needs will shift, so flexibility is paramount.
- Track success of RISE’s move to the newly renovated Bailey Hall and its greenhouse addition. Are there similar opportunities in other halls and neighborhoods?
- Capitalize on the Neighborhood Engagement Center’s ability to mimic the Residential College experience and to champion student success; create opportunities for learning everywhere.

DEFINE THE SPARTAN FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE
2008: What is it? What should it be? How can it be enhanced? Is there a sophomore experience?
2012: Spartan Experience – beyond just the first year.

OPPORTUNITIES:
- Redefine residential life mission: all inclusive from freshman to graduate student?
- Tap into the needs of the non-residential student.
- Continue to evaluate and family housing opportunities to support goal of becoming a Top 10 research school.
- Make “Uniquely MSU” an adaptable, flexible, nimble Spartan Experience.
- Place the right students in the right locations. Evaluate the current room assignment process and how it supports strong student neighborhoods/communities.
- Evaluate why some residence halls are not successful. Identify those with a low return and consider new markets for unsuccessful halls.
- Capitalize upon positive perceptions about recent renovations. Nice living arrangements equate to student ownership.
- Use the residence life system to identify and connect students.
- Apply Residence Education and Housing Services’ mission equally to all populations.
- Elevate the living experience for upperclassmen and graduate students.
- Increase number of kitchens in residence halls to encourage international students to stay in the system; this is a cultural need, not just a desire.
- Provide additional kitchen space for upperclassmen use as an amenity.
- Ensure security of residents when non-residential populations engage in neighborhoods.
- Continue to recognize and analyze the local housing market. How can MSU distinguish itself to keep students on campus?
DINING
2008: Invest in creating a better customer experience without compromising efficiency. Should MSU have integrated dining? Move towards greater flexibility in formats and facilities. The direction of housing will have a key influence on dining. 

2012: Dining has been a catalyst for developing neighborhoods, but it can be a catalyst for connections to broader communities – international students; faculty; MSU; E. Lansing.

OPPORTUNITIES: 
- Use the success of the dining momentum to continue to shape the future.
- Identify the “face” of dining. Check the NACAS survey and compare MSU to peers. How many put their chefs out in front of the students for credibility?
- Early, clear, concise communication to students, staff, and faculty about dining plan options = increased customers.
- Evaluate current food trucks as a nimble way to bridge between dining locations and in places where there is no dining location.
- Engage the international community in discussion about international food. Use this as an opportunity to create “global” events in support of “World Grant” Institution.
- Educate student dining staff about food preparation and ingredients. This would be of particular service to students on special diets and international students.
- Offer more healthy food choices, all day, all locations.
- Open more places for quick meals/coffee. Convenience is key; supports commuter student.
- Use technology to drive food ordering/to-go/delivery.
- Mobile food: align product with need. Immediate impact, minimal start-up expense.
- Challenge the staff to Culinary Excellence.
- Evaluate sustainable food practices, composting, education, and food sourcing.
- Lead the emerging community of college sustainable food programs – engage in the broader conversation and determine MSU’s place in this trend.

UNION VS. STUDENT CENTER
2008: Define this facility’s aspiration and function. Is it time to redefine its role on campus? 

2012: How will an engagement center make an impact?

OPPORTUNITIES: 
- Build a story; gain momentum, and enhance traditions heading toward the 90th anniversary of the union in 2015.
- Create a vision, implementation and funding strategies.

KELLOGG HOTEL & CONFERENCE CENTER
2008: Recognize its roles as an academic resource and auxiliary service. How does its mission align with that of H&FS? 

2012: Not a stated theme.

OPPORTUNITIES: 
- Investigate creative academic partnerships looking to the future of culinary and hospitality education. Might the Kellogg Center enjoy a new purpose as the home of new academic programs in Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality?
- How does the Kellogg Center support student success – how is it a part of the Spartan Experience?

ATHLETICS/ENTERTAINMENT
2008: Partnering with more campus groups is needed. How will H&FS change to integrate this group? 

2012: Where should the conversation go?

OPPORTUNITIES: 
- Challenge golf, tennis, the Breslin center to engage students in their mission. How can they support student success? Think outside of today’s current reality to a different future.

FINANCIAL
2008: Not a stated theme. 

2012: Financial approach, while part of the original strategic plan, was not a heavily discussed issue in the initial conversations. The plan did not begin to delve into the financial ramifications until later in the process. The economic change as well as the high level of physical changes made within RHS has integrated this topic into most current conversations. It is the execution part of the equation, which will need to be pushed, pulled and tested in order to find the right answer.

OPPORTUNITIES: 
- Revenue Stream: Diminishing state support means looking for ways to make up the difference.
- How will the division face challenges from a new generation of students that don’t want to take on a lot of debt and those who question the need for a four-year degree (i.e. community college option or online options.)
- Don’t ignore outliers such as the “UnCollege” movement. Is it ridiculous and unsustainable or real?
- Fear will restrict innovative thinking and not allow new opportunities to create outside-the-box financial partnerships.
- Find innovative ways to deal with energy consumption at both the divisional and institutional levels to achieve a reasonable payoff to investment.
- Apartments: What is the right balance between supporting the Spartan Experience for all students and the cash flow from a failing resource?
- Investigate public/private partnerships to accomplish housing goals.
RHS will support the University Neighborhood Model.

RHS will seek to advance knowledge and transform lives through intentional measures and programs to ensure maximum alignment of academics and student services.

MSU will be a residential campus, with the University committed to maintaining a residential campus inventory of approximately 14,500 beds.¹

The MSU residency requirement will remain in effect for freshman, assuming a stable enrollment of 7,100 freshman for the next 10 years.²

Utility cost increases are not expected to exceed 8.5%.

Annual rate increases are not to exceed 3.95%.

Renovations will be paid with the appropriate balance of JIT maintenance funds and debt service, keeping Divisional reserve funds at $12M or higher.

The financial plan will be based on operational gains. Sound, innovative thinking will be used to explore financial methods to provide funding for necessary, major renovations and new construction. These might include a rate structure shift between renovated and un-renovated housing room rates and a one-time renovation fee for new students.

The strategic plan continues to provide an emphasis on process and implementation strategies, while not providing a specific road map. The intent of this document is to provide guidelines and tools for the prioritization of the advancements to the Division of Residential and Hospitality Services as it strives to create a world-class Spartan Experience that results in student success in the global community.

¹ This is the minimum number of required beds to maintain a balanced budget. Occupancy up to 17,710 is achievable, with a flexible number of designated singles.

² In 2012, the freshman class topped 8,000; in 2013 it is estimated at 7,500; in 2014 at 7,300. leveling off to 7,100 for the remaining years.
VISION FOR THE SPARTAN EXPERIENCE

Defining the Spartan Experience for a student’s entire MSU career.
A new Spartan Experience will require a comprehensive approach that best aligns academics, student development, and the residential experience.”

— Vennie Gore
“They say it takes a village to raise a child,” said MSU President Lou Anna K. Simon. “It takes Team MSU to make anyone coming here as a student to leave as the citizen scholar they envision society needing for a brighter future. That village is Team MSU and is represented by the neighborhoods.”

The Division of Residential and Hospitality Services operates and maintains a diverse portfolio of facilities occupying more than 6 million square feet in more than 166 buildings. This represents 30 percent of the 556 buildings on campus and 26 percent of the more than 22 million square feet of space on the campus. The MSU Union is the oldest facility in the division having been built in 1925. The newest freestanding construction, University Village, opened in 2007. RHS has a long tradition of maintaining existing buildings instead of rebuilding. This has continued over the last five years, with an aggressive program of re-energizing campus communities. This environmentally sustainable approach is to be commended and has been balanced with additions such as Brody Square when appropriate. RHS supports the institution’s mission as a residential campus by housing 32 percent of its enrollment, higher than the 24 percent median offered by its peer group.

Overall, housing facilities have been well-maintained. They are clean and exhibit less wear and tear to the casual observer than most facilities of a similar age on other campuses. Beyond the initial first impression, however, many of these buildings have significant basic issues that will impact project costs including, but not limited to, the following:

- Life-safety upgrades, including the addition of sprinkler systems and upgrades to the fire alarm systems.
- Hidden renovation conditions, such as asbestos abatement.
- Accessibility code compliance – both public access to and within the facilities, as well as accessible accommodations for disabled students.
- Code compliance – architectural, electrical, mechanical.
- Outdated and inefficient mechanical systems, which increase operational costs and do not promote energy conservation.
- Aged piping.
- Lack of technology infrastructure.

As MSU advances plans to update living accommodations, it must look at these changes through the lens of the “Spartan Experience.”

\(^1\) 2011 Total Enrollment 47,954 (36,675 Undergrad, 11,279 Graduate) 15,151 housed on Campus.
THE SPARTAN EXPERIENCE

Research has shown that students are more successful when they live on campus. Students who have more opportunities to interact with other students, faculty and staff persist to graduation and are more fully developed adults. Research also indicates that the first year is critical for creating a successful foundation for undergraduates.¹

The neighborhoods north of the Red Cedar River include the residence halls of West Circle and Mason-Abbot and Snyder-Phillips. These are primarily historic, loaded with character and reside on the east and west edges of the original academic core. The halls house between 200 and 400 students in relatively small communities of traditional rooms. While the character of this group of residence halls is similar, they are not close to each other. The new engagement center for the North Neighborhood is located in the Union, which is adjacent to West Circle but more distant from this cluster of halls than other centers, for example, the center serving McDonel. It will be important to verify which engagement centers are used by the residents of Mason-Abbott and Snyder-Phillips, and if they avail themselves of center services given the distance.

The Brody Neighborhood, while on the north side of campus, is its own community with a central building, Brody Hall, housing the engagement center and a new large dining hall. The six residence halls surrounding Brody Square have seen an ongoing revitalization through major renovation. New entrances and community space, as well as renovation to the residence floor communities, has changed perceptions of the neighborhood, with a shift in student population from 80 percent freshmen pre-renovation to 50 percent freshman post-renovation. The Brody neighborhood characteristics—adjacent parking and proximity to downtown E. Lansing—are appealing to upperclassmen. Included in the Brody Neighborhood are the University Village Apartments, just south of Brody and separated by the Red Cedar River. This group of apartment-style residence halls house upperclassmen students. As RHS focuses on the whole Spartan Experience, it will be important not to marginalize this group; they need to be included in all conversations and in all methods of tracking student populations. Ease of access to the Brody Engagement Center is important. Methods that will bring this group of students from relative isolation to being part of the community will be key to students’ success, not just maintaining successful occupancy rates. Currently these apartments are segregated in the RHS systems; they should be considered residence halls first, apartments second, for a holistic approach to the Spartan Experience.

¹ “Estimating the effects of dormitory living on student performance,” February 9, 2010
Pedro de Araujo, Colorado College, James Murray, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse
The neighborhoods south of the Red Cedar River are comprised of three individual neighborhoods, River Trail, East and South; they form the edges of the south academic zone. Each of these neighborhoods has an engagement center at its heart. Residence halls typically are communities of 1,000-plus students in double semi-suite rooms. The buildings are large, mid-to high-rise structures. South and East neighborhoods are home to the highly successful living-learning programs James Madison (Case) and Lyman Briggs (Holmes). Ongoing renovations to dining halls and public spaces have improved retention in some of the residence halls. Residential floors remain in need of renovations and, in the case, of Akers, reconfiguration.

The neighborhood concept creates a sense of place and belonging at a reasonable student scale. In the planning process, neighborhood characteristics were envisioned as:

» Dynamic Dining – gateway and focal point for social interaction
» Campus Connections
» Intentional critical mass
» Core – magnet that pulls populations through the neighborhood
» Identifiable entry
» Quality finishes
» Diversity – students from different backgrounds with different academic interests
» On-site resources to promote healthy living
» On-site resources to support academic success
» Expanded opportunities for student leadership
» First-year experience
» Residential colleges
» Living-learning communities
» Community hierarchy – floor to floor; building; neighborhood
Completing Spartan Experience = Holistic Community Engagement

» Distinguishable by variety, vibrancy and value

» Responsive to the developmental stages and needs of students
  • Cognitive
  • Physical
  • Emotional
  • Social
  • Vocational

» Characterized by a unity of services and opportunities
  • “One Stop Shopping” in the neighborhood
The most significant innovation accompanying this new thinking was the creation of Neighborhood Engagement Centers as the nucleus of each neighborhood. These centers, paired with new vibrant dining facilities, have become the heart and heartbeat of the neighborhoods.

This new vision for student success better connects where students live and learn. It is an intentional alignment between Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Residential and Hospitality Services. Furthermore, this vision represents a cultural shift for RHS.

Each engagement center director is associated with one of the Four Pillars – Academic, Intercultural, Health & Wellness, plus Residential Life. The director works closely with his or her pillar to understand the vision and then open an active dialogue with the other directors. The intent is for people to think differently about the pillar they are associated with, or the unit they are working in, and to think differently about programs, not just report out on them.

Through the Engagement Centers, students can connect with faculty, support staff, other students and resources that can help them be successful. The Centers bring resources closer to the students, where they live, and puts these in the context of their greatest needs. This collective engagement seeks to provide the necessary services to enable students to persist and graduate from MSU.

The Neighborhood Engagement Centers have assembled important resources – from academic and social to health – in a location central to each neighborhood to focus on student success in a broader living-learning environment. They are staffed by a core team of professionals from across campus, whose task it is to look at all elements of the living-learning experience and determine where, when, and to what extent they can best assist in delivering the kinds of support that students need to be successful at MSU.

For example, the Engagement Centers feature a Math Learning Center, which attracts students for math tutoring and test preparation sessions. The Math Learning Center is a partnership between the Engagement Center and the Department of Mathematics.

The Engagement Centers also provide a branch of the Writing Center, which offers students one-on-one help; and a student health services clinic that provides primary care, health education and preventive medicine. There are also Sparty’s Cafés that include a coffee shop, convenience store and grill. The Engagement Centers, with lots of natural light and vibrancy, create interior spatial connections to exterior activity.

While the Neighborhood Engagement Centers and renovated dining facilities are a powerful first step to enhance the Spartan Experience for upperclassmen and to engage off-campus populations, more needs to be done. Key characteristics define each neighborhood. Aligning neighborhood attributes with appropriate student assignments is essential to enriching the Spartan Experience for all.
Deeper understanding of campus demographics provides a powerful tool to complete the vision for a reinvigorated housing system. RHS began this process with the Brody neighborhood following the 2008 Strategic Plan, and it is an excellent example of how this concept of matching population to neighborhood can work.

Brody is located on the edge of campus, adjacent to downtown and furthest from the academic core. Brody has parking adjacent to the buildings. These are attributes that would support an upperclassmen community, which might have students with off-campus jobs. Prior to the 2008 plan, Brody was occupied primarily by freshmen. Shifts have begun to take place, with a 30 percent reduction of freshman in the neighborhood. This shift should continue, and similar analysis should begin for the other neighborhoods.

This 2013 Strategic Plan update provides a deep analysis of campus demographics to allow this redistribution to continue. However, one significant hurdle remains. The current system of room assignments is random and counter-productive to creating intentional, successful student communities. It works like this: If a student is not in a living-learning or other special program, or is not an athlete, he or she is “auto-assigned” to a residence hall by computer, according to the Housing Assignment Office. Placement occurs by alphabetical order of building name. For example, a student who applies first will be placed in Akers, which has a more negative reputation on campus. The student who procrastinates until the last minute earns a place in Wonders, whose retention rate is significantly higher. There is no attempt to assign students more intentionally to create a desirable community mix supporting a specific freshman, sophomore or international student experience. The room assignment discussion is a philosophical one, but rethinking it could result in a true transformation of the system that would support a successful Spartan Experience.
Looking at data from different perspectives helps visualize and identify where needs are greatest. For example, this graph plots residence halls into quartiles. The horizontal X-axis is the residence hall retention rate for 2012; higher return rates push the building to the right. Retention shows a student preference for a particular building or neighborhood. The Y-axis positions each building vertically based on its level of improvements, including renovation, partial renovation and infrastructure improvement such as life safety and accessibility. Higher positions show a greater amount of renovation and/or building improvements.

Fall 2012 Residence Hall Conditions Student Preference
Note: Armstrong and Bryan were offline for renovation.
### Residence Hall Building Upgrades Score – Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Complete Renovation</th>
<th>Partial Renovation</th>
<th>Renovation Year</th>
<th>Sprinkled</th>
<th>Access all levels</th>
<th>Card Access 2009-10</th>
<th>Interior Green Phones</th>
<th>Retr. commission</th>
<th>Building Upgrades Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>86,039</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>86,867</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>89,513</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Akers</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>330,930</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>70,463</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Landon</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>71,107</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Yateley Gilchrist</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>116,067</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Trail</td>
<td>Van Hoosen</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>24,677</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Wonders</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>294,253</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>344,976</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Trail</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>225,107</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Trail</td>
<td>McDonal</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>302,791</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>294,156</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mason Abbot</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>165,233</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>302,585</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Trail</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>248,060</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>260,874</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>130,197</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Holden</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>320,455</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>University Village</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>193,779</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Emmons</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>85,770</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>82,306</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Rather</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>85,756</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>203,798</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Snyder Phillips</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>240,980</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residence Hall Retention Rate – Fall 2012

#### Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Armstrong</th>
<th>Bryan</th>
<th>Akers</th>
<th>Hubbard</th>
<th>Wilson</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Rather</th>
<th>YateleyGilchrist</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
<th>Butterfield</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Holden</th>
<th>Wonders</th>
<th>Mason Abbot</th>
<th>Bailey</th>
<th>SnyderPhillips</th>
<th>Landon</th>
<th>Owen Graduate</th>
<th>Shaw</th>
<th>Emmons</th>
<th>Mayo</th>
<th>Williams</th>
<th>VanHoosen</th>
<th>University Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Armstrong</th>
<th>Bryan</th>
<th>Akers</th>
<th>Hubbard</th>
<th>Wilson</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Rather</th>
<th>YateleyGilchrist</th>
<th>Holmes</th>
<th>Butterfield</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Holden</th>
<th>Wonders</th>
<th>Mason Abbot</th>
<th>Bailey</th>
<th>SnyderPhillips</th>
<th>Landon</th>
<th>Owen Graduate</th>
<th>Shaw</th>
<th>Emmons</th>
<th>Mayo</th>
<th>Williams</th>
<th>VanHoosen</th>
<th>University Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expanded Spartan Experience

Once decisions are made with regard to neighborhood alignments and intentional distribution of students, then informal decisions can be made about residence hall renovations. For example, upperclassmen might prefer a more “collegiate” living experience. Career counseling and placement might be desirable Neighborhood Center service for upperclassmen, rather than tutoring.

International students are another growing MSU population with unique considerations. REHS is taking positive steps to assist these students.

Winter break housing was introduced in the 2010-2011 academic year to provide a year-round alternative for any residential student who may need it.

» MSU Hostel was introduced in August 2012 to provide temporary housing for students between Aug. 1 and when halls open for fall.

» Signage in the residence halls is being updated to be written in five languages.

» A more diverse Resident Assistant pool is being recruited.

» REHS will travel to Beijing in March, 2013, and again in June, to participate in pre-departure meetings with new international students. These meetings are in partnership with the Office of International Student Services (OISS) and are being coordinated by MSU’s Beijing office.

What else can be done? How might international students be integrated into the housing system in a way that would ensure academic success? Feedback from recent focus groups revealed, for example, that some international students are assigned to residence halls in isolation. Consider a student with few English skills living in a hall where only English is spoken. If this same student was placed with a few others who spoke his or her language, this community within community would become a safe haven, where the students could relax and speak their native language while they learn more English and become more comfortable in America. Dining options also should be refined. Focus group feedback revealed that international students often don’t understand how a dish is prepared or its ingredients, hence they are reluctant to eat it. They do not consider dining hall Chinese fare or sushi adequate alternatives.

We are just beginning to understand the potential of the neighborhood reorganization and Neighborhood Engagement Centers. To maximize this potential, Neighborhood Center staffs need to share observations with each other to encourage creative thinking on ways to make them even better and more relevant to the Spartan Experience.

Challenges as the engagement centers move forward:

» **Communication**: Find effective methods to communicate services to students. Resident Advisors share information with their respective student communities, but the centers are for all Spartans. Social media, such as Facebook and Twitter, should be exploited for student communication.

» **Intellectual Rights**: Monitor the politics of the engagement centers to ensure that they belong to everyone.

» **Alignment**: Make services available when students need them, even if they are outside typical staff hours.

» **Student Satisfaction**: Understand if there are areas of improvement, such as sound control, that could be revised to improve space usage.

Metrics are an effective way to measure continued success:

» Track who is using each center. Do the students live in the neighborhood, a different neighborhood or off campus?

» Track students’ use of services.

» Develop a simple system to visually assess center usage at different times of day and different periods in the academic year. Observe where people sit, how they engage, what they do, how they use the space.

» Relate student access to the engagement centers to long-term success. Are those who use the centers more likely to graduate?

» Use the metrics to determine what services are not being tapped by students and then assess why. Right time? Correct location? Right service? Share these observations with neighborhood staff for creative thinking on potential improvements.
“Neighborhoods are making this very large university smaller,” said Vennie Gore, Vice President for Auxiliary Enterprises. “We’re taking the many resources of MSU a step further by bringing them to students where they live, and engaging with those students to help them navigate their time on campus.”
Anticipating the next generation of MSU students will pose its own challenges and opportunities, requiring new thinking and nimbleness. While the Millennial Generation (born 1980–2000) are continuing to arrive on campus, we must also look ahead to the children born after 2000 and how their characteristics will impact the way RHS meets the needs of these future Spartans. Generational research has begun to identify and to characterize the qualities and traits we can expect to see.

Michael Wood of TRU, a global leader in youth research and insights, presented focused research on the core group of 12-15-year-olds to RHS in the spring of 2012. This core group is labeled “POSTGENs” – they are post-911, post-Columbine, post-first African American president, and they post everything about their daily lives online. These major events affect their attitudes and thought processes.

POSTGENS:
1. Desire simplicity and honesty.
2. Demand authenticity.
3. Need a purpose.
4. Emphasize family and community (non-traditional family makeup).
5. Possess practical optimism.

World events between 2001 and 2011 have affected youth attitudes. Success equated to money is on the rise, and they enjoy being with family. Faith and an emphasis on clothing/style have fallen in importance. The most significant shift relates to their views on debt.

Debt Doubt:
1. Use of a debit card is prominent, but not credit cards – POSTGEN’s do not want to overextend themselves.
2. They are concerned and aware of the relationship between money and value.
3. Credit card debt is on the decline in the 18-29 age group.
4. Issues related to student loans, which increased from 46 percent to 51 percent between 2008 and 2011, are having an impact on how young people think of the college experience. Teens and 20’s are questioning the need for a college education, since their college-educated older siblings are not able to find jobs.

Young people perceive three institutions that have failed their parents through the recession:
3. Stock Market: Retirement funds have lost significant value.

As a result, this view has influenced their personal opinions of their relative personal values.

The emerging POSTGEN is mature and they should not be underestimated. The POSTGEN seeks individuality, and he or she is willing to align with people and experiences that are different from their own. They have very different expectations. Research suggests that they look for easy solutions to be delivered quickly. Perhaps this relates to the fact that they have grown up with technology.

Michigan State’s mission includes preparing students to contribute fully to society as globally-engaged citizen leaders. How can the University simplify processes for this next group of students? How can we best equip them with problem-solving skills?

Whether Millennials or POSTGENS, Michigan State should be focused on a residence life program to support persistence, retention and graduation. By definition this will require the deliberate focus on a complete Spartan Experience.
Neighborhood alignment that supports development of intentional communities for all Spartan populations.
Since 2008, Spartan housing represents one of the areas of the Division of Residential and Hospitality Services that has experienced the most organizational change. Previously the Department of Residence Life reported to the Vice President for Student Affairs. This department handled staffing and programming within the residence halls, while University Housing, a unit of the Division of Housing and Food Services, handled the physical buildings and program spaces. In 2008 it was evident to the planning team that a non-collaborative culture had existed for some time, and it was a key issue holding back development of a stronger Spartan Experience.

Since 2008, the two disparate departments came together to form the Campus Living Services and Residence Life (CLSRL) unit as part of the sweeping changes in transforming the redefined Division of Residential and Hospitality Services. CLSRL included functions formerly under University Housing, with the exception of Dining Services, and rejoins the functions of facilities, maintenance, construction, interior design, capital project management and environmental stewardship.\(^1\)

The stated Goal for Campus Living Services in June 2009 was:

To provide a robust residential experience supporting programs and activities that promote growth and development of students; to provide safe, clean and well-maintained facilities for students; to promote sustainable practices; to utilize technology to enhance student experiences; to promote responsible behavior and citizenship; to promote fiscal responsibility; and to develop and facilitate a community that supports the academic mission of the university.

In January of 2012 Kathy M. Collins, Ph.D. came to Michigan State as the Director of the newly formed CLSRL. Her impact was evident to the strategic planning team in that the current conversation was elevated and challenged. Her continued alignment of housing with the overall goals of the institution and of RHS has been further defined with a recent revision to the unit's name to Residence Education and Housing Services. In October 2012 REHS adopted a new mission statement:

We are dedicated to creating a safe, sustainable and inclusive residential environment that enhances the MSU experience and inspires our community to: Live. Learn. Lead. Impact the World.

Residence Education and Housing Services has aligned previously independent functions allowing for a shared and supported vision, where projects can be prioritized, not just based on maintenance need, but on what will enhance the student experience and support student success.

**NEIGHBORHOOD ALIGNMENT**

The realignment of the division also has supported the creation of the defined neighborhoods and their core – the engagement centers. In the 2008 plan, neighborhoods were delineated based on physical attributes and features that provide natural boundaries. This was the identified ideal configuration. The current neighborhood arrangement was modified to accommodate administrative and financial realities.

The new neighborhood alignment continues to support development of intentional communities with supporting functions and programs for the specific student population.

Prior to the strategic plan, the population distribution had freshman as the predominant resident of the Brody, East and South Neighborhoods, with the North Neighborhoods of West Circle and Red Cedar being split 50/50. The remainder of the population, from sophomores to graduate students, was dispersed throughout the system. The 2008 plan recommended a shift in that distribution to more closely align resident populations with the attributes of particular neighborhoods. By autumn 2012, the shift was becoming clear, the neighborhoods were becoming focused, and engagement centers came on line. For example, the Brody neighborhood freshman population dropped from a high of 85 percent in 2007 to 57 percent in 2012. The number of sophomores has risen from 12 percent in 2007 to 32 percent in 2012. This supports the idea that the Brody neighborhood is more suitable for upperclassmen students, and it indicates an increase in upperclassmen retention. The 2012 numbers reflect one residence hall off line and another occupied but not yet renovated. The junior population has risen 5 percent from 2007, up to almost 8 percent of the total. While the increase is solid, the neighborhood has not fully transitioned to an upperclassmen experience.

\(^1\) June 23, 2009 Name Changes Memo
Residence Hall Demographics

NOTE: Diameter of circle relates to size of Residence Hall population.
An analysis of the rate at which students returned to their residence hall of origin from 2007 to 2012 shows the impact of recent renovations. Retention rates for Emmons have climbed from 14.5 percent in 2007 to 73 percent in 2012, a 57.5 percent increase. At the same time, Akers, which remains un-renovated and a problematic configuration, has fallen from a retention rate of 28.9 percent in 2007 to the lowest in the system at 14 percent in 2012. Hubbard, a building not well-defined for freshman occupancy due to its vertical organization and location at the edge of campus, has a retention rate of 18 percent, just above Akers and a drop from the 2007 retention rate of 40.4 percent. It is important to understand the ebb and flow of student populations and to understand what drives them to leave their building, the neighborhood or the system. The stated minimum number of occupants in the system for financial viability is 14,500, but if occupancy could reach 15,500 or higher, it would represent revenue available for the continued renovation of the system. Most importantly, retaining students on campus beyond their freshman year will aid in student persistence to graduation.
Current Building Conditions - Fall 2012
Neighborhoods Distribution
Brody
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North
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Cyan sphere indicates full accessibility
White top indicates building is fully sprinklered
Blue sphere indicates partial accessibility
Red & white top indicates building is partially sprinklered
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### Residence Hall rankings based on Building Conditions, Living Learning and Food options – Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Engagement Center</th>
<th>Residential Dining</th>
<th>Sparty's</th>
<th>Late Night</th>
<th>Retail Dining</th>
<th>Degree Granting</th>
<th>Residential Community</th>
<th>Special Interest Groups</th>
<th>Complete Renovation</th>
<th>Partial Renovation</th>
<th>Renovation Year</th>
<th>Sprinkled</th>
<th>Access all levels</th>
<th>Card Access</th>
<th>Interior Green</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Rtn commision</th>
<th>Conditions Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>University Village</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>103,779</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Ermichia</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>86,801</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>86,039</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>86,985</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>86,511</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>82,306</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody</td>
<td>Rumor</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>85,764</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Avers</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>130,930</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>102,098</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>344,976</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>35,923</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Stimpie</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>79,802</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mason Abbot</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>166,233</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>53,761</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Landon</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>71,107</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Yakeley-Keen</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>116,067</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Snyder-Phillips</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>240,980</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>Van Hoosen</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>24,977</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>Shale</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>229,107</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>McDonnell</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>352,791</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>248,063</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Wonder</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>294,253</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Winton</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>294,253</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>280,874</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Holian</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>320,455</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Icetarian Village</td>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Conditions as of Fall Term 2012 Academic Year

Tracking population shifts with exit surveys and mapping those migrations would help identify strengths and weaknesses within the system. Drivers might include, cost, location, unit configuration, renovation (new space), roommate, and neighborhood dynamics. This would be valuable information to confirm intentional shifts as the system moves forward.

While Brody is an example of the full renovation of a neighborhood, other renovation approaches have focused on public space, where the greatest number of students will be impacted positively by renovations. Specifically, the renovation of dining halls, Sparty’s, and the creation of engagement centers has improved the nature of those selected neighborhoods. However, retention rates within those neighborhoods do not provide evidence of that success. For example, Case had a retention rate of 36 percent in 2007, but realized a 9 percent drop to a 27 percent retention rate in 2012, after a full renovation and addition of the dining hall and construction of a new Sparty’s store in 2011. At the same time, a rise in the number of juniors and seniors in Case, of 68 percent and 77 percent respectively, could be due to those same renovations. Since Case houses the James Madison Living-Learning program, a closer look at correlations between that program’s enrollment and the retention would be beneficial.

MSU residence halls comprise almost 4.5 million gross square feet. The oldest residence hall is Mayo Hall built in 1930 and fully renovated in 2008. There are 26 residence halls, 20 of which are over 50 years old. Of the total, 22 percent of the residence hall gross square feet has been renovated or is slated to be renovated by 2014. Approximately 3 million square feet remain for renovation, after accounting for partial renovations of public space and dining halls. In today’s dollars, the remaining renovation work represents a capital investment of approximately $774 million. For example a typical housing project, from programming through occupancy, takes approximately 2.5 years to complete. Over 10 years, that represents four residence hall renovations. A complete renovation of the four remaining buildings in the North Neighborhood (West Circle) is estimated at $78 million (2012 Figures) for 1,200+ beds. Akers has slightly more square footage and currently houses approximately the same number of students in quad rooms, so renovation costs would be similar. The reduction of construction from four phases (four buildings) in West Circle to two phases (Akers east and west), or even one phase would realize savings. With limited capital to renovate over the next 10 years, project prioritization is critical.
SOPHOMORE MANDATE

Requiring sophomores to live on campus recently has been making news. The Huntington News (9/30/2010) reported that Northeastern’s sophomores would be required to live on campus, beginning with the class of 2016. “When students live together, especially younger students, they get more engaged; they get acclimated to the university community more quickly than others,” said Ed Klotzbier, vice president and dean for student affairs.

The Ohio State University announced in August that sophomores would be required to live on campus beginning in fall 2015. “This is not about housing, it’s about providing the best quality education to students by taking a bold step that no one else is making,” OSU President E. Gordon Gee told The Columbus Dispatch.

Universities have evaluated the sophomore experience and student success and understand the correlation between the two. Clemson University noted a GPA difference between on Campus and Off Campus as 3.2 and 2.95 respectively in the 2008-2009 academic year.¹

Some universities already require sophomores to live on campus, including Seattle University, Georgetown University, Catholic University, Duke (six semesters on campus), Colgate University, Syracuse University, and others.

Michigan State University Housing Policy

Freshmen and Sophomores (0-55 credits), including transfer students, must live in on-campus housing. The housing requirement currently is waived for sophomores. Students are exempt from this policy if they are:

1. Married
2. 20 years or older by the first day of fall classes.
3. A U.S. armed services veteran with at least one year of active service.
4. Living with parents or legal guardians.
5. Taking six or fewer credits during the semester in question.

The current capacity of the residence hall system, with the exclusion of Spartan Village, is 17,710 beds, including the 410 staff beds. Freshman enrollment for 2012 was approximately 8,000. The administration has set the incoming freshman class at 7,500 for 2013, 7,300 for 2014, and then holding at 7,100 through 2020. Assuming 10 percent attrition, the sophomore class can be assumed at 6,300 students. Comparing fall 2012 bed counts with a projected version for 2015 with a sophomore mandate the residence hall system can accommodate the influx of sophomores with an adjustment to the total number of designated singles available out of the total system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2015 Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current System Capacity</td>
<td>17,710</td>
<td>17,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclassmen + Grads</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>2,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Singles</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bed Demand</td>
<td>16,597</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Residence Hall Occupancy if Sophomore mandate were enacted in 2015.

¹ Clemson Sophomore Experience Pamphlet
TRENDS
As the conversation regarding a sophomore housing requirement escalates across many campuses, a second conversation is also under way—whether or not to integrate or separate the freshman and sophomore classes. Freshmen who live on campus experience personal growth and development, including the art of compromise as they share rooms and community bathrooms. After freshman year, students expect increased levels of privacy and independence, advancing from a traditional double room to a double semi-suite with a shared bath, then moving to a single room with a private bath and apartment-style units. East Carolina University and Ohio University each are exploring the concept of mixing unit styles within a floor community to blend freshman and sophomore classes. This can be intentional with new construction. However, as MSU has a significant proportion of double semi—suites in its residence halls, this could be challenging. Creating an intentional mix of freshmen and sophomores in neighborhoods, or in residence halls within neighborhoods, deserves conversation. One possibility is to achieve a mix of classes through program and support rather than room type. The theory is that sophomores will help freshmen make the transition from home and high school to becoming independent and responsible adults.

APARTMENTS
Michigan State University has a particular way of accounting for apartments within RHS that is counter to reinforcing the Spartan Experience. For example, when evaluating occupancy demographics and retention figures, University Village apartments, opened in 2007, was excluded from the residence hall picture. Because Spartan Village is categorized as apartments, it was deemed the community should be separated. University Village is first and foremost a residence hall, whose units happen to be in apartment style. By location, University Village is somewhat isolated from the campus core, but it is still central to the Spartan Experience for the 304 students who live there. VanHoosen, also apartments, is listed as a residence hall within the River Trail neighborhood. University Village, part of the Brody Neighborhood, is not listed as such on the LiveOn website.

Spartan Village, built in the 1950’s, has been reduced from its original capacity because of age. Spartan Village also is categorized as apartments and excluded from many reports. Spartan Village houses students and thus is part of the residence hall system. It should be included and represented in all conversations related to improving the Spartan Experience.

Michigan State’s market share of apartment-style student housing is diminutive in the grand scheme of apartment housing in East Lansing. The local competition continues to vie for the 45,000 students who attend MSU, specifically the 60 percent or more who do not live on campus. Outside of University Village and Van Hoosen, MSU is at a crossroads for developing a strategy for apartment-style housing. Previously the Cherry Lane and Faculty Bricks apartments were demolished in 2011 after realizing their life expectancy. Parts of Spartan Village also have been demolished, reducing the number of apartment-style units offered on campus. Private development continues to drive the local market, with developer investment in new off-campus housing geared to attract students. New construction drives the market to reduce rental rates for older apartment stock, creating stiffer competition for those who want to live on campus in apartment-style housing—principally international graduate students and students with families.

Is providing apartment-style on-campus housing mission critical for MSU? Can RHS create a viable proforma for new construction on campus to house graduate students whose financial means are limited? Is there an academic partnership that might support creating affordable on-campus housing to draw the best and brightest graduate students to MSU as a research institution?

It was previously stated in the Cherry Lane Study: 2010 that 250 apartment-style units is a minimum commitment to support the institution’s mission. Options to meet this might include:

1. Build a new 250-unit apartment-style residence hall in a viable location north of the railroad tracks to replace Spartan Village.
2. Purchase an existing off-campus apartment complex and manage same for graduate student housing.
3. Develop a Private-Public Partnership to build private off-campus housing for graduate students.
4. Withdraw from apartment-style housing beyond University Village and Van Hoosen, allowing the private sector to satisfy the graduate student need.

This is a bigger conversation that is being explored at the highest levels of the administration both here at Michigan State and at other Land Grant institutions.
The Capital Gateway (proposed development)
City Center II (proposed development)
The Lodge Phase II (proposed development)
Waterbury Place
Crossing Place - 432 Beds
Sterling University Court - 516 Beds
Capstone Apartments - 654 Beds
The Landings at Chandler Crossings - 936 Beds
The Club at Chandler Crossings - 768 Beds
The Village at Chandler Crossings - 1068 Beds
The Lodges - 683 Beds
Pleasant View Apartments - 24 Apartments
Cedar Village Apartments - Approximately 200 Apartments
The Hamptons - Approximately 50 Apartments
The Oaks Apartments - 190 Beds
Student Union
1/2 Mile
Elementary School
Elementary School Slated for Closure 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Average GSF/Beds</th>
<th>Average Rent/Bed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom or Studio</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>$689.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>$657.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>$543.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedroom</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>$474.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West Circle, Students Studying

Holden Lecture Hall
SUMMER CONFERENCING
As renovation plans continue, a greater synergy between summer conference planning and RHS strategic planning staff could shift renovation requirements and / or construction phasing. Summer Conferencing has the ability to generate additional revenue, but it may drive other considerations such as bathroom configurations and air-conditioning. Building codes treat residence halls that house conference attendees differently than those that just house full time students. This can impact bathroom fixture quantities and egress requirements that will have a cost impact if not considered carefully. Amenity costs would have to be balanced against potential increase summer conference income and how that income feeds back into capital funds for renovation.

FACULTY ENGAGEMENT
“Build the Best Classroom and they will come”
RHS has the enviable position of having residence halls with significant classroom infrastructure included in original structures, and these spaces are of considerable size. Classrooms that draw faculty into residence halls increase opportunities for student faculty interaction outside of the classroom. Understanding what will lure faculty into residence halls is important. Is it a great coffee house where they can choose to engage with students? Decent office space and proximate parking? Classrooms with the latest technological teaching tools? Answers to these questions can guide renovations and the use of existing space. From a responsible, sustainable approach, refurbishing existing classrooms that would be used more frequently by academic departments would lessen the pressure for new construction. Residence halls are open 24/7; having evening classes consolidated in these locations would provide an opportunity for traditional academic buildings to set back energy systems at night.

Michigan State has a series of challenges to upgrade the Spartan Experience for all students. The encouraging news is that there are creative opportunities to make an impact on the institution’s reputation and student academic success.

A new technologically advance classroom is being built in existing classroom space in McDonel Hall. Tracking faculty engagement and response to this new classroom will be important to measure.
VISION FOR INTEGRATED DINING

Building on success.
STATUS OF THE VISION

STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITIES
The Vision for Integrated Dining as articulated in the 2008 10-year Strategic Plan identified three core strategic opportunities, upon which the overall plan was based:

» Create a truly integrated campus dining program, which provides both a seamless experience for the customer and leverages shared resources, such as leadership, human resources, administrative support, and facilities.

» Adjust the number, mix, and location of venues across campus (and across current organizational lines) to provide the optimal level of service to customers at the lowest cost.

» Implement an aggressive and sustained commitment to facility renewal that supports both the initial opportunities for realignment of the program, as well as maintaining a high level of customer satisfaction.

As part of this Strategic Plan update, RHS stakeholders confirmed that these goals are still relevant and should be carried forward into the next phase. For each of these, we have listed below the degree to which opportunities have been realized as well as future opportunities that may yet still be pursued:

Create a truly integrated campus dining program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New organizational structure implemented that brought the various campus dining services operations under one department has increased overall customer satisfaction (NACUFS) for four consecutive years.</td>
<td>Full integration still in process; operational practices and duplication of services left over from the previous “Residential”, “Retail” and “Sparty’s” silos still exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common currency created to give students on residential meal plans unprecedented access to “retail” operations outside the residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Combo-X-Change program is not a true retail model; program still favors and is oriented toward the residential student. Opportunity to grow program through development of new plans for non-residential students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective cross-utilization of resources and leveraging of staff, expertise, assets.</td>
<td>Not fully leveraging Sparty’s locations for late night, some duplication in neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in overall number of residential dining units and reinvestment in the program for new facilities, culinary development, additional locations.</td>
<td>West circle renovations about to occur and East neighborhood dining restructuring has yet to be planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant growth (double-digit growth for four consecutive years) in non-residential meal plan sales, while revenues from cash sales have grown as well.</td>
<td>Service to the greater non-residential population can be improved and business grown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent integration of Sparty’s into Engagement Centers.</td>
<td>Extend concept of integrated eat/study/hang spaces beyond the residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza shop in Case services both retail customers and those inside South Pointe dining hall. The Riverwalk Market is a “retail” operation run by the residential dining team.</td>
<td>Crossroads could be an opportunity to integrate retail further into the program by flipping more of the concepts to internal operation. Currently, only the Sparty’s is operated by CS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Neighborhood Dining Hall
Adjust the number, mix, and location of venues across campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of dining halls in several neighborhoods has reduced operating costs and aligned capacities with demand.</td>
<td>Continue to implement vision in West Circle and East Neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combo-X-Change has shifted some of the demand to retail units; helped justify closing of some dining halls, but put significant pressure and crowding in these units.</td>
<td>Evaluate, adjust capacities in retail units, especially in academic zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity of dining halls has driven counts, especially lunchtime, much higher than anticipated in several locations putting stress on these units.</td>
<td>Ongoing assessment and adjustment of capacities in neighborhoods; introduce alternative services such as take-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in cash sales at the same time, suggesting real growth is occurring, not just shifting of previously captured revenues.</td>
<td>Put dining venues, meal plans and promotions in place to increase capture of overall campus market; combination of driving new meal plan sales as well as continued increase in cash revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of meal plan has increased, improving value equation and satisfaction for students, faculty and staff. Net contribution has grown, but additional focus on more efficient operational models, deployment of nimble venue models and careful staffing, especially in larger units.</td>
<td>Leverage the capacity of larger dining platforms (AYCE) for high demand periods and the efficiency of smaller, more nimble store/café/quick service venues for lower demand periods such as breakfast and late-night within each zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While growth has been achieved across campus, it is constrained by capacities, both in residential neighborhoods where consolidation has occurred, and in academic zones where footprints for dining are limited.</td>
<td>Broaden portfolio to include “restaurant” concepts that offer more choice than convenience platforms (Sparty’s) but are not as large as the neighborhood dining halls. These are a gap in the portfolio and the addition of these could increase capture of off-campus customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant growth in meal plan sales, while revenues from cash sales have grown, as well.</td>
<td>Service to the greater non-residential population can be improved and business grown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent integration of Sparty’s into Engagement Centers.</td>
<td>Extend concept of integrated eat/study/hang spaces beyond the residential neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implement an aggressive and sustained commitment to facility renewal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of dining renewal in several neighborhoods, including the Gallery, Brody, Southpointe, and Shaw.</td>
<td>West Circle renovation about to occur; East Neighborhood changes not yet planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of Owen from grad student dining to Riverwalk Marketplace.</td>
<td>Only full-menu “retail” option on campus; look for other locations where this concept may fill out the overall portfolio and improve options for customers seeking alternatives to an AYCE meal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring, rebranding and updating of Sparty’s in several locations, especially in connection with Engagement Centers. Portfolio now organized into three formats: Express, Refresh and Café.</td>
<td>Assess all Sparty’s locations for ongoing improvements and to confirm they are in the right place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Dining Options

- Retail Dining
- Dining Centers
- Sparty's Refresh
- Sparty's Café
- Sparty's Express
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following 10 guiding principles were adopted as an extension of the vision for Integrated Dining. An assessment of progress made toward successfully integrating/implementing these into the program is provided below:

1. Recognize All Students as the Primary Market

**INTENT**: This acknowledges that dining’s role encompasses not just residential students, and that resources and offerings should be oriented to meet the needs of all students. It also suggests that, while faculty and staff needs are important, dining’s higher priority is serving students.

**UPDATE**: The improvements made to the dining program have had a significant impact on student life at MSU, with the most noticeable emphasis on residential students. While many off-campus students, faculty and staff enjoy the new dining facilities and offerings developed within the residential neighborhoods, improvements should continue until dining in all neighborhoods have been improved. The next challenge is to better serve the needs of the many off-campus students that do not regularly use one of the new dining centers.

2. Ensure Dining is Open and Attractive to All

**INTENT**: Decisions about menu development, meal-plan structure, hours of service, and facility design all should be made with this in mind. The approach will accommodate the greater diversity of the campus community through open, accessible dining options.

**UPDATE**: The broad interest in and use of new venues such as the Gallery, Brody and Riverwalk Market, are testimony to the successful transformation of these facilities from inward-focused residential dining halls to community dining centers. Meanwhile, the Sparty’s rebranding has raised the quality of convenience options for residential and off-campus students throughout campus. The next wave of priorities should be focused on identifying specific and unique needs of off-campus students so that offerings, services and programs can be fine-tuned to better serve them. These will most likely include a realignment of dining offerings in the academic zones to improve speed, capacity, freshness, and convenience for the daytime customer.

3. Adopt Common Currency

**INTENT**: Meal plans, debit cards and other forms of payment should be universally accepted by all dining venues on campus so the customer experience is seamless.

**UPDATE**: This has been accomplished successfully as part of the integration of dining and the introduction of the Combo-X-Change program. CXC has provided resident students on mandatory meal plans significantly higher access to all dining venues around campus through a patterned exchange concept. Satisfaction is high among meal plan holders, and the added volume has been a boost to many of the retail locations that were previously struggling to sustain themselves. However, the shift in activity created by the CXC program is greater than anticipated and is expected to continue. While the migration of resident diners from dining centers to retail has provided capacity for non-resident customers, it is causing overcrowding in the most popular Sparty’s locations. This could limit growth opportunity for new customers, especially non-residents without meal plans. Therefore, the overall meal plan model and, in particular, the way in which portability is achieved, should be studied carefully over the next few years with the goal of balancing the flexibility offered by CXC with the need to provide sufficient capacity in retail-style units to accommodate non-resident customers. Market research suggests that a growth opportunity is available in the area of voluntary meal plan sales. Off-campus students indicated they like the changes that have occurred in dining and would be willing to purchase a meal plan if more suitable plan types were available. But, capacity for added customers must be managed, both through adjustments to the meal plan model and overall dining capacities.
4. Retain Dining Halls in Each Neighborhood Complemented with Appropriate Retail Options

**INTENT:** The “all-you-care-to-eat” (AYCE) dining hall will continue to play a pivotal role in fostering community within each neighborhood, while serving large numbers of people in a cost-effective manner. However, the new “neighborhood” vision involves replacing some of the current dining hall capacity with a mix of complementary, retail-oriented dining options. This combination will serve to enrich the student experience, while meeting evolving and diverse needs more effectively.

**UPDATE:** This vision of balanced, complementary offerings has been realized brilliantly in some neighborhoods, such as Brody (Brody Square complemented by Sparty’s Café at Brody) and the integration of food into the Hubbard Engagement Center. The implementation of this concept is less evident in the development of South neighborhood, where Wilson Hall, originally slated to be converted to a restaurant concept, remains a dining hall format. This is due in part to budget and concern about having insufficient capacity in Case and Holden to eliminate Wilson as an AYCE option. This may have also been the case in Shaw, where it was envisioned during the 2008 planning that an expansion of this facility would include a robust retail dining offering that would serve both residents and the many non-resident students that pass by Shaw every day. Looking forward, the consultants suggest that recommitting to the concept of creating a balanced set of offerings in each neighborhood is important. A refinement of the original vision may be in order so that subsequent projects in East and secondary updates in other neighborhoods will contribute to a vibrant portfolio of venues, which are an important link to creating a dining program for all students.

5. Develop According to Projected Market Demand

**INTENT:** Use traffic data and projections to guide the number, mix, and size of venues in each neighborhood, so as to provide optimal service at minimal cost.

**UPDATE:** Demand-based sizing metrics were employed for the planning of early projects, which were then updated to factor in the significant increase in non-resident traffic drawn to new dining units. While the concept of consolidation of units still makes sense from an overall planning perspective, sizing of future projects should take into consideration the potential for high levels of capture. Assume high participation and visitor rates to ensure facilities are not undersized.

6. Remain Fiscally Responsible

**INTENT:** Dining is and will continue to be a self-funded auxiliary. Therefore, the development of new venues and changes to ongoing practices or polices must not compromise the program’s ability to operate in a self-sustaining manner.

**UPDATE:** Culinary Services’ financial performance has exceeded projections, both in terms of revenue growth and net revenue return. However, the annual rate increases originally proposed as part of the 2008 plan and approved by the Board have been reduced, placing additional pressure on RHS to self-fund projected debt payments. If the planned investment in renewal that has been so transformational is to continue, new forms of revenue must be identified.

7. Realize “It’s All About the Experience”

**INTENT:** Students, in fact all customers, look to campus dining for more than just “food as fuel.” While the food has to be good, satisfaction and loyalty are also driven by ease of access, excellent customer service, and a comfortable, updated atmosphere. For MSU, investment in the facility contributes significantly to creating the experience.

**UPDATE:** A core strategy that characterized the 2008 Strategic Plan was the term “Lead with Dining” – the idea that the impact of change could be felt more rapidly by the broadest audience by focusing on dining projects first. This strategy proved successful, and was embodied in the opening of four completely renovated large-scale dining facilities that set the tone for transformation of campus life at MSU. While more dramatic new facilities are in the wings, the execution of the vision, “It’s all about the experience,” should go deeper into the fabric of Culinary Services to pursue innovation and operational excellence in culinary, service, staff development and communications.

8. Ensure Ongoing Renewal

**INTENT:** It is not enough to fund major facility and programmatic change. To sustain customer satisfaction and market share, a commitment must be made to regular, ongoing updating of menus, programs, and facilities.
UPDATE: Culinary Services is still in the initial phase of development and renewal. As part of the financial planning, it will be important to factor in sufficient R & R funding above and beyond the commitment to covering debt service on the major projects. Brand and concept life-cycles are getting shorter, meaning customers’ expectation for refreshing of menus and facilities requires that funding be earmarked for regular updates in order for the dining program to remain relevant and valued.

9. Adopt Transparent/Seamless Service

INTENT: Regardless of the service provider, the customer should experience the same commitment to excellence throughout all dining venues on campus.

UPDATE: With regard to creating the seamless experience, Culinary Services has made tremendous progress in four (short!) years, but as an integrated department, there is still work to be done. Looking forward, CS has started down the path of franchise partnerships, which introduces new challenges as each brand brings with it new standards for product mix, pricing, merchandising, training and marketing. Of course, CS also manages a set of branded operations through tenant agreements, which offer the draw of nationally recognized products, but limit the degree of control and flexibility management has to create a seamless service experience that is unique to MSU. The use of branded / franchised concepts should be approached carefully to ensure that the benefits they may offer in perceived value and customer traffic do not conflict with organizational culture or constrain the program’s ability to adjust to your customer’s changing needs.

10. Adopt Sustainable Practices

INTENT: These shall be integrated into all facets of the program, including purchasing, operations, design and construction, and facility management.

UPDATE: RHS and especially Culinary Services are recognized leaders within the University for developing, adopting and integrating sustainable practices into everyday operations.
The 2013 strategic planning process resulted in the identification of following four strategies for taking Culinary Services to the next level.

1. **Build Revenue**
   The first step is to learn more about customers who are not dining with Culinary Services regularly (primarily off-campus students):
   - Lifestyles, schedules
   - Preferences dining habits, spending habits
   - Translate to what, where and when do they want it

   Then pursue opportunities based on these findings:
   - Increase sales of off-campus (voluntary) meal plans
     - Assuming research confirms off-campus students are more interested in retail
     - Develop more flexible plans
     - CXC are limited to fixed combinations and not always a good value in retail
     - Lower buy-in/smaller meal plan
     - Mix of Access and Flex Dollars
     - Broader appeal, less impact on neighborhood dining centers
   - Grow retail (cash) sales
     - Provide sufficient capacity to support this
   - Develop special meal plans for returning residents
   - Increase participation in grad student meal plans

2. **Optimize the Retail Portfolio**
   During the development of the 2008 plan, the Sparty’s stores were characterized as “too Spartan” and that they lacked any brand identity. We are pleased to report that the rebranding of Sparty’s into three categories – Express, Refresh and Café – is exceptionally well done and represents a significant turnaround of this segment of the Culinary Services program. Volume has increased significantly, in great measure due to the CXC program, but variety, merchandising, promotion, customer service and satisfaction have all increased concurrently. Looking forward, we believe the Sparty’s brand can continue to grow on campus and be an important component of a coordinated strategy to build overall capture and especially non-residential student business.

   Key strategies for this growth should include:
   - Continued efforts to improve customer service, especially speed, in the high volume locations that rely on quick throughput during bursts of peak demand (class change times in academic buildings)
   - Marketing and communication of a strong price/value proposition – especially relative to off-campus competition
   - Continuous evaluation and alignment of locations with traffic and siting metrics. A key part of the Sparty’s brand value is location and convenience, but this should not translate to a requirement to be in every building. Some locations simply do not generate enough volume to be self-sustaining and draw valuable staff and management resources that could be applied to improved service where it is most needed. One metric for quickly assessing viability is Average Transactions per Day. Below is a categorization of the Sparty’s locations by level of volume:

   **HIGH VOLUME** | **MODERATE VOLUME** | **LOW VOLUME**
   --- | --- | ---
   Hubbard (2232) | Bio Med (993) | Shaw Ramp (374)
   Holden (2019) | MSU Law (958) | Clinical Center (323)
   Case (1897) | McDonel (748) | Vet Clinic (235)
   Cyber Café (1745) | Wonders (677) | Admin (195)
   Wilson (1514) | Engineering (589) |  
   Brody (1489) | Erikson (597) |  
   Holmes (1188) | Com Arts (505) |  
   Snyder-Phillips (1145) | Crossroads (473) |  

   **Notes:** With the exception of the Cyber Café, all of the high-volume sites are within residential neighborhoods and experience peak demand in the evenings.

   Moderate-volume locations are mostly within large academic buildings with strong traffic throughout the day, and experience drop-offs in demand in the late afternoon and evening.

   All of the low-volume locations, with the exception of Shaw Ramp, are in remote locations within less active buildings and close in the early afternoon. Shaw Ramp is a very small location with limited offerings that is only accessed by bus riders.
KEY OPPORTUNITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Current Mid-Day Retail Dining Activity (transaction counts, 11 a.m. – 4 p.m.)
Several of the high and moderate volume locations are experiencing difficulty keeping up with the new volume levels associated with the CXC program, to the point that it could adversely impact service, efficiency and customer satisfaction. Locations noted by management most in need of expansion include:

» Cyber Café
» Snyder-Phillips
» Bio Med
» Com Arts

A balanced perspective of this portfolio would suggest that the low-volume locations are candidates for closure, as they draw staffing and management resources that could be applied towards other venues.

It is recommended that the four low-volume locations should be studied more closely to determine whether volumes can be increased significantly through marketing and management. If not, they should be closed or replaced with extended vending options.

### DEMAND ANALYSIS BY CAMPUS ZONE: CURRENT CONFIGURATION / DINNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Zones</th>
<th>BRODY</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>RIVER TRAIL</th>
<th>NORTH ACADEMIC</th>
<th>SOUTH ACADEMIC</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>16,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Meal Counts</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>4,442</td>
<td>7,565</td>
<td>23,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio: Transactions to Residents</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dining Halls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Total</th>
<th>66.7%</th>
<th>83.3%</th>
<th>42.5%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>55.7%</th>
<th>56.2%</th>
<th>53.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customers Served</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>12,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sparty’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Total</th>
<th>28.4%</th>
<th>16.7%</th>
<th>25.2%</th>
<th>56.7%</th>
<th>36.3%</th>
<th>44.3%</th>
<th>43.8%</th>
<th>36.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customers Served</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>3,314</td>
<td>8,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Retail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Total</th>
<th>4.9%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>32.3%</th>
<th>43.3%</th>
<th>63.7%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>9.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customers Served</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
● Significant demand for more full-menu options in central academic core, but class time business only – little on nights and weekends.
● Expand capacity and replace some tenants with self-operated franchises and/or self-branded concepts.
● Estimate right mix of branded and self-branded in larger facility could generate $2.5+ million, or over $200K in combination of rent and net revenues

» MSU Bakers working on higher brand awareness
» Potential grocery store outlet

4. Further Integration of Technology
Technology will be key to increasing market capture while controlling labor costs:
» Mobile apps to capture more discretionary spending
» Twitter feeds to what’s open now map; drive traffic to sites
» On-line order / payment
» Order fulfillment at convenient locations
» Service points coupled with student-union like environments
VISION FOR AUXILIARIES AND ADDITIONAL FACILITIES

Market realities and opportunities.
The 2012 Strategic Plan for the Division of Housing & Food Services includes updated analyses and recommendations for the Jack Breslin Student Events Center, the Tennis Center, Forest Akers Golf, the MSU Union and the Kellogg Conference Center and Hotel. While much focus has centered around the residential Spartan Experience, modest progress has been made with the auxiliaries.

STATUS OF THE VISION
The Vision for Auxiliaries articulated in the 2008 Strategic Plan called for greater integration of these facilities and their programs into the overall mission of RHS to enhance student life, and to make appropriate capital investments to maintain the facilities and improve service to the MSU community. A review of the vision and proposals provided in 2008 for each facility reveal very little progress has been made towards realizing these goals over the past four years:

BRESLIN CENTER
Goals from the 2008 plan
» The addition of a new main entry lobby on the center’s west side to create a stronger identity for this facility as both an athletic and events venue.
» Creation of a large lobby/gathering space with new ticket offices, retail space, restrooms and storage.
» Updating of finishes, bathrooms, the concourse area and lighting, as well as full replacement of the roof to make the facility more competitive with other event venues in the area.

2012 Update
» On the positive side, the Spartan Hospitality Group has been leveraging its resources to bring Breslin to a break-even operation, including shifting responsibility for booking the Center to the Conference Services and Sales team.
» However, only the addition of the marques on the West side of the building has been completed thus far. All other physical improvements identified in the 2008 plan have not been made, and a funding source has not been identified to make these changes.

BRESLIN CENTER ISSUES AND PRIORITIES
Issues
» The Breslin Center’s greatest challenge is that there is insufficient funding to make the necessary repairs and improvements.
» As the Breslin is used for athletics, student events and academic purposes, SHG feels the University needs to provide funding through the General Fund or a student fee to support this facility, rather than have RHS assume funding.
» The facility is 25 years old. Basic needs are to update finishes, bathrooms, seats, lighting platforms, concourse and roof.
» Athletics is the primary tenant, and the sales team is somewhat constrained by the preferential priority athletics has over the scheduling of events.
» It is a General Fund building; RHS does not receive support from the GF to operate.
» When the debt is satisfied within a few years, RHS proposes to maintain the fee and use this to fund basic upgrades. Even if this were to occur, it may not be enough to complete all the identified restoration and project upgrades.
» Opportunities for revenue enhancements exist that could help service new debt, including:
  » Providing greater latitude and control to the sales team to maximize booking the facility to outside groups.
  » Adding alcohol service at events.
  » Capturing more of the parking revenue; currently, the Breslin Center only receives approximately 20 percent of gross parking revenues generated during non-athletic events.
  » Improved support of on-site catering (better equipment) could lead to higher catering revenues.

Priorities
1. Basic facility renewal and upgrades, including roof replacement, concourse upgrades with new finishes, LCD screens and family restrooms.
2. New exterior entrance / lobby addition to include ticket booth space, additional office space, retail and storage space.
3. Luxury suites renovation.
Forest Akers Golf Course
MSU TENNIS CENTER
Goals from the 2008 plan
» To elevate the Tennis Center to be the premier tennis facility in the area.
» Addition of a north entrance / lobby to better connect the facility to the adjacent Spartan Village neighborhood.
» Expansion of the facility with 8 – 16 outdoor courts, additional coaches offices, additional lockers and more storage space.
» Replacement of existing radiant heat systems.

2012 Update
» No major facility updates or additions have been made.
» A site study has been commissioned for the outdoor tennis court expansion.

MSU TENNIS CENTER ISSUES AND PRIORITIES
» Some basic replacements to structure and infrastructure are required, including; the radiant heat systems, roof, upgraded mechanical systems and replacement of water heaters.
» The MSU Tennis Center would have a wider appeal and greater capacity during seasonal months if new outdoor courts were to be added. The target number is 12 to 16 new courts based on current demand.
» A longer-term goal is to expand the MSU Tennis Center to include:
  » Two additional coaching offices.
  » Additional storage space for equipment and retail supplies.
  » Improved locker rooms, currently shared by the tennis teams and the public.

FOREST AKERS GOLF COURSE
Goals from the 2008 plan
» Expand existing banquet room area.
» Enhance food service offerings and expand seating area.

2012 Update
» Expansion of the banquet space requires partnership with the University Club and the Henry Center; an agreement on this project has not yet been reached, so the project has not moved forward.
» A comprehensive Course Master Plan was completed in 2010 that identifies and prioritizes needed improvements to the course and structures for both golf courses.

FOREST AKERS GOLF COURSE ISSUES AND PRIORITIES
» The new Golf Course Master Plan, completed in 2010, identified several key projects:
  » Improvements to East and West courses and practice center.
  » The addition of women’s restrooms on the East course.
  » Replacement of the 50 – 60 year old irrigation system.
  » New East Course Club House
  » Possible partnership with Michigan Golf Hall of Fame.
  » Not fully funded, but moving ahead with East course improvements in 2012

Strategic Plan priorities
» East Club House , first.
» West banquet addition, after.
MSU, we love thy shadows
When twilight silence falls,
Flushing deep and softly paling
O’er ivy covered halls;
Beneath the pines we’ll gather
To give our faith so true,
Sing our love for Alma Mater
And thy praises, MSU.

When from these scenes we wander
And twilight shadows fade,
Our memory still will linger
Where light and shadows played;
In the evening oft we’ll gather
And pledge our faith anew,
Sing our love for Alma Mater
And thy praises, MSU.
MSU UNION

In 2008, the recommended approach was for a conservative renovation of the MSU Union, concentrating on the ground and first floors. Also recommended:

» Right-sizing food venues, considering the adjacent residential neighborhoods and the potential to capture more of the off-campus market
» Improving building access
» Providing space for additional program/student services “draws”

Since the strategic plan, the SmithGroup has been engaged in providing design direction for the MSU Union. A 2010 MSU Union Master Plan by the Smith Group noted “one goal of the Student Union is to become an on-campus home for off-campus students. By renovating the Union with this group in mind, creating a daytime “home away from home,” the building can once again become vibrant and a necessary component of the campus.” The creation of an engagement center to serve the North Neighborhood and off-campus students, reinforces this approach. The renovation of the MSU Union is proceeding with first floor renovations – one of five phases of renovation over the next eight years.

The focus has been on improving the building and its physical environment without integrating an improvement or rebirth of the institution.

In 1925, teams of students, faculty, alumni and college supporters joined together and cooperatively dug the foundation for the Michigan State University Union – a memorial to American Soldiers who died in service to their country. It was a stirring moment for the campus community. As the Union approaches its second century, how might we recapture that spirit, pride, community and ownership to reinvent this venue for future generations?

The MSU Union is not alone in its quest to find a refreshed identity and purpose in the new millennium. A search of peer institutions reveals a range of strategies, successes and struggles. Many struggle with the need for a large renovation, funding sources that are limited or nonexistent and a university culture that has lost interest in its union. However, an emerging theme among these institutions is the renewed interest in restoring traditions and history that were cornerstones of the original unions.

Over the past 10 years, MSU has expended a lot of energy to re-envision the union. A series of master plans from 2001 to 2010 were well-intentioned, but missed any focus on funding, implementation strategies (not just phasing) and student engagement. No clear vision was articulated.

The MSU Union still has a prominent role to play as the guardian of campus tradition, but the building does not aspire to that role. The next step must be a strategy to pull the institution back into the heart of campus life. Three things are needed:

» A true vision for the MSU Union.
» A vigorous, innovative plan to generate funding solutions for those renovations.
» Student support for the MSU Union.
In 2001, the Strategic Plan for a New Student Activities Center abandoned the Union, envisioned a new 200,000-square-foot structure that would “contribute to the enrichment of University life and out-of-classroom educational experiences through a variety of facilities for social/entertainment events, in addition to providing services and conveniences designed to meet the needs of a diverse student population.” The facility was to provide larger social/entertainment facilities, bookstore, convenience store, food venues and meeting/office space for student organizations – not unlike the list of spaces currently provided in the Union.

In 2003, the stated mission of the MSU Union was “to provide a variety of services, activity programming, educational opportunities and services as a unifying force within the University community.”

In 2006, WTW Architects, in conjunction with Brailsford and Dunlavey, produced a detailed assessment report on the Union. The effort included detailed surveys of both students and faculty. The results revealed that both students and faculty agreed (40 percent) that the Union is “an environment that captures the Spartan tradition.”

In 2007, the mission was restated to “contribute to the enrichment of University life through a variety of facilities, services, programs and educational experiences directed to a diverse campus community and its guests.” The mission statement listed specifics, one of which read, “Support and enhance University traditions.”

In 2008, the MSU Union Strategic Planning Vision was drafted. Highlights included:

» The MSU Union’s location serves as a gateway to MSU and should therefore be considered the front door showplace of the University.

» The MSU Union should be an integral part of the University’s mission to become a World Grant University, Advancing Knowledge and Transforming Lives.

» The University Activities Board (UAB) provides campus-wide programs and activities in the MSU Union and at a variety of campus venues for the benefit of the entire University community. The University Activities Board should be recognized as the primary provider of campus events and financially supported by all stakeholders.

» We believe the MSU Union should be a robust service center that provides a wide variety of retail, dining and other service options.

» Most importantly, a comprehensive interior renovation is required to create a brand image and provide a guest experience that is welcoming, vibrant, dynamic and invigorating.

In 2010, the Smith Group provided a Master Plan for the Union, which included a review of the previous studies and made new recommendations. Their report identified three specific goals:

1. The master plan must be phased to make a visual impact with the first phase.

2. It must generate additional revenue to contribute to funding of future renovations of the Union building.

3. It must meet the needs of students today and tomorrow.
A true vision statement for the Union should outline what the organization wants to be, a long-term view towards the future that is emotive and a source of inspiration.

“The MSU Union exists to embody the finest Green and White traditions; to be the initial and lasting true Spartan Experience.”

A mission statement defines an organization, succinctly describing why it exists and what it does to achieve its vision – its fundamental purpose. A mission statement is action-based and guides decision-making.

A panel at the 2012 NACAS conference, led by Dan Adams, Ed.D., associate vice chancellor for campus enterprises at North Carolina State University, Sherry Wine, director, University Center Complex at Texas A&M University, and Michael Ellis, assistant vice president of student affairs at Colorado State University, shared their insights and lessons from years of student union construction. Key points included:

1. **Right people at the right time; the right team with stakeholder engagement.**
2. **Never underestimate the power of student voices; student support is critical to success.**
3. **Clear goals and decision-making processes:**
   - Establish a clear set of project goals that can be used as a constant benchmark throughout project planning.
   - Be as clear as possible about the vision, purpose, budget, priorities and program.
   - Clearly define communication and decision-making processes.
4. **Branding: The university’s message.**
   - The union isn’t just any building.
   - A union is a prospective student’s first glimpse of the university. It’s about recruitment and retention.
5. **Use multiple methods to reach your audience:**
   - University Newspaper
   - Banners and Posters
   - Web sites
   - Social Media
   - Videos
   - Presentation

6. **Know your peers.**
   - Visit and tour other student centers.
   - Ask questions; we like to share.
   - There is no ‘apples to apples’ formula

7. **Phasing**
   - Temporary facilities – creative thinking can reduce duration of construction, save money.
   - Pros and cons of phasing versus closing.
   - Revenue generation.

The MSU Union will celebrate its 90th birthday in 2015; its centennial is 2025. Now is the time to join forces with University Development and the administration to create a campaign for the future and build momentum for the reinvention of this important campus asset.

**Enlist student involvement.**
Make it their choice and get them behind the plan. It is likely students would support an additional fee for the union. At Colorado State University, students actually engaged in the design decision. They were presented with four choices, showing floor plans and costs, and they were told how much additional student fee it would take to support each scenario. Students neither chose the most expensive nor the lowest cost option, but they proved they were willing to invest in the Union’s future. There is precedence for such support at MSU. A 2006 survey asked if students would support a dedicated student fee for a renovation; 43 percent of the respondents were very likely and 40 percent somewhat likely to support the renovation fee. Only 14 percent indicated they were unlikely to support such a fee.

**Launch a compelling campaign: “The Union gets it Mojo Back.”**
A fundraising campaign at the University of Wisconsin rallies around this statement: “Memorial Union Reinvestment - Preserving the past; Building the future,” which is tied into the 100th birthday of its Union.

**Build a legacy.**
Share the history of the building and facility. What significant historical events have taken place here? Engage alumni in these memories.
The Mission of the Iowa State University Memorial Union is to nurture common ground, enrich and sustain individual lives, and remember.

We Believe

» That the Memorial Union is a student-centered, full partner in the educational process.

» That building community builds loyalty and social responsibility.

» That programs and facilities are a unifying force.

» That ideas and experiences are powerful ingredients in holistic development.

» That participatory decision-making builds world citizens and leaders.

» That service and convenience provides essential support to individuals reaching for long-term goals.

» That remembrance of alumni and our service personnel is an active duty.

The Memorial Union Values

» Participation, exploration, experience, service, volunteerism.

» Social interaction, collaboration, partnerships, inclusiveness, unity.

» Creativity, discovery, inventiveness, active risk-taking and problem-solving.

» Celebration, kindness, friendship, romance.

» Comfort, security, heritage, tradition, memories, stories.

» Proudfoot’s classic architectural design.
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Ohio Union

Our Mission
Serving fellow Buckeyes and acting as a steward of the Scarlet and Gray tradition, the Ohio Union exists to enhance the collegiate experience through quality programs, retail offerings, and involvement opportunities in a dynamic, inclusive environment.

Our Vision
Built on a foundation of innovation, the Ohio Union will be a premier facility that meets the changing needs of the college student by serving as a timeless center of activity, community dialogue and learning.

Our Values
» Service – We provide the highest quality service and seek to be active partners in our communities.
» Inclusiveness – We celebrate individual differences and seek to learn more about others.
» Tradition – We look to the past to learn about our history and seek to transfer this information to others.
» Involvement – We create opportunities for students to be involved and seek to engage more students each year.
» Teamwork – We know that our individual contributions are important and seek to collectively pool our efforts for maximum gains.
» Discovery – We provide students with the chance to learn more about themselves and seek to serve as a laboratory for learning.
» Personal and Social Development – We encourage students to explore opportunities and seek to provide a challenging and supportive environment to foster student development.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
Purdue Memorial Union

The purpose of today’s union differs little from the original intent of the students, faculty, staff and alumni who worked so passionately for a union building in the early part of the twentieth century. The following statement of purpose was drafted and formally adopted as part of the 75th anniversary of Purdue Memorial Union in 1999.

The purpose of the Purdue Memorial Union is:
» …to enrich the quality of life on campus and to build community amongst the diverse members of the University family – students, faculty, staff, alumni and guests – by inviting them to participate in formal programs and informal opportunities to gather, study, work, develop and have fun.
» …to support the public service aspect of Purdue’s Land Grant mission by providing conference facilities and services that bring the University into helpful contact with the outside world.
» …to use its facilities and resources to offer the services, conveniences and amenities needed by the campus community, while achieving the financial viability necessary to support both daily operations and long-term maintenance of facilities.

The Union stands as a permanent memorial to the Purdue men and women who served in defense of their country, protecting the very freedoms that we enjoy today. It is our duty and privilege to maintain the union as a point of identification with the University and its traditions, as a community landmark and as a symbol of the unity of spirit that transcends our individual differences.”
RECAP OF THE 2008 PLAN
At the time the 2008 10-year Strategic Plan was developed, the Kellogg Center was:

- Achieving consistent occupancy levels of more than 70 percent, which significantly exceeded occupancies of local properties in the 50’s and peer campus hotel occupancies that maxed out at about 60 percent.
- Experiencing a dip in Average Daily Rates for guest rooms in recent years due to intense price competition from area properties.
- Undertaking a finishes renovation to the lobby level and some of the meeting spaces.
- Facing the need for significant HVAC and other infrastructure systems upgrades that would be required to maintain its high ratings for guest comfort, while improving energy efficiency.

The tremendous asset that this property represents to MSU, as an important portal to the greater local and global community, as an active partner in furthering the educational mission of the University and as a valuable auxiliary business unit has been reaffirmed under every review and planning study, and the 2008 Strategic Plan was no exception. In light of this, and as an outcome of competitive benchmarking and financial analysis, the 2008 Vision for the Kellogg Center endorsed three initiatives for enhancing the destination value and revenue streams for this property:

1. Addition of 30 guest rooms within a new tower
2. Addition of 2,000 square feet of new meeting space
3. Addition of a 75-seat lounge/restaurant

The ROI analysis on these three projects indicated that only the rooms addition would be self-sustaining, but that the other two initiatives would better position the hotel to compete against current and planned area properties as well as enhance the capacity to attract larger, more profitable conference groups.

2009 MASTER PLAN AND 2012 UPDATE
Subsequent to the Strategic Plan, the Kellogg Center Master Plan was completed in December 2009. This plan was developed to address the following goals:

- Establish a long-range, unified vision for the Kellogg Center.
- Clarify recommended facility improvements tempered with infrastructure upgrades, code updates, financial constraints, funding streams, and seamless operations and project delivery.
- Strengthen the Kellogg Center’s core mission, “to be the leader in hotel and educational conference centers by creating positive memories.”
- Reinforce the educational mission of the University as a center for collaboration and outreach.
- Address specific facilities needs and priorities, including materials and systems upgrades, technology, a second dining venue, future guest rooms, entry, arrival, and registration improvements.
- Provide a guide for future project design phases, so that “Have you seen the new Kellogg Center?” soon becomes a reality.

This is a 10-year plan that incorporates the three initiatives from the 2008 Strategic Plan and folds them into a more comprehensive, phased plan that balanced continued “front-of-house” updates with necessary infrastructure upgrades totaling $42 million.

The most visible changes accomplished to date are the consolidation of the Lounge and renovation of the State Room, the continued updating of lobby level finishes, and the renovation of the north meeting rooms. The State Room remodel has been very successful, resulting in increased counts in both the lounge and the restaurant. The state of the economy has been challenging for the meeting and catering business and, along with loss of revenues associated with taking the rooms off-line for renovations, the banquet side of the house has experienced soft revenues.

Renovations and lobby work will be continued. However, planned updates of the HVAC systems and other infrastructure have not been funded.
Envision surveyed local competitors and peer campus hotels for comparative information on guest rooms, meeting space and food and beverage amenities. The properties included in the survey were:

**Local**
- Lexington Hotel
- Lansing Radisson Hotel
- East Lansing Marriott
- EDC / Candlewood

**Peer Campus**
- Marriott Kingsgate Hotel, University of Cincinnati
- Blackwell Hotel, The Ohio State University
- U Mass Hotel and Conference Center, University of Massachusetts – Amherst
- UGA Conference Center, University of Georgia
- The Marcum/Miami Inn, Miami University of Ohio
- The Morris Inn, Notre Dame University

A summary of this research is shown at the end of this section. Prominent findings from this research include:

**Guest Rooms**
- Kellogg has fewer rooms than all local competitors, whereas it is on par with or larger than most of the peer campus hotels surveyed.
- While attractively decorated, the Kellogg guest rooms and suites are smaller than local competitive hotels. In addition, the Kellogg bathroom configurations and sizes do not meet current market standards.
- This is also true of the comparison of the Kellogg Center to peer campus hotels, except older properties such as the U Mass Hotel and Conference Center and the Morris Inn at Notre Dame.

**Meeting Room Space**
- The Kellogg Center has the largest inventory of meeting space of all comparisons in this study except for the U Mass Conference Center (rooms) and the UGA Conference Center (space).
- These two campus hotel/conference centers are more relevant comparisons given the size of the institutions and the educational mission by which they are influenced.
- The Blackwell at The Ohio State University is associated with the School of Business, which puts a specific focus on the events it supports. In addition, OSU has significant meeting and conferencing facilities in at least two other buildings on campus – the Fawcett Center and the Ohio Union, both of which have as much or more meeting space than the Blackwell.1
- A more relevant metric for meeting room demand would be the lost business potential reflected in events/groups turned away during peak periods of demand (typically fall and spring in campus-based hotels and conference centers).

**Food & Beverage Amenities**
- The State Room is positioned as a fine dining restaurant with a less formal lounge dining option.
- Most of the properties surveyed have separate lounge and restaurant venues. While the combined configuration offers some supervisory and staffing advantages, there can be times when noise from a crowded lounge or large group from a conference infringes on the fine dining experience.
- Most conference properties also have been trending towards more casual atmospheres, menus and, accordingly, lower pricing.
- However, the State Room has enjoyed a solid reputation for culinary and service excellence in fine dining for many years, and tends to attract off-campus, off-property guests from the surrounding area. In fact, the market position of this restaurant seems to have been strengthened with the renovation, which is remarkable given the challenging economy for fine dining.
- Still, our research of the competitive/peer properties and the on-site conference industry in general suggest that the addition of a casual restaurant could enhance the marketability of the Kellogg Center and perhaps draw new business from the general campus population.
- An emerging competitor is RHS itself, in the form of Culinary Services, as noted below.

1 Envision Strategies is currently working with The Ohio State University
THREATS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Threats

» Size of guest rooms and configuration of bathrooms are not on par with competitive standards.
» Lower number of guest rooms relative to local competition negatively impacts marketability of the property for some groups and at peak times of the year.
» Demand records indicate the property is short on banquet space to accommodate 75 to 100 guests.
» Aging facility with significant need for infrastructure investments that guests will not see.
» While the addition of a casual restaurant would round out the F & B portfolio for this property, recent competition from Culinary Services (opening of Brody Square) is taking some of the low-end banquet and potential casual dining business off property.
» The Master Plan addresses most of the priorities identified by SHG, but it is not funded; currently working through small projects using available funds from operations, IT, etc.
» The Master Plan does not address:
  - The desire for more community gathering space, which is becoming an expectation in higher end hotels and conference centers, and could be particularly conducive to supporting the educational mission of the property and University.
  - Improving space to support the expansion of Spartan Signature Catering.

Opportunities

» Even if all of the Master Plan initiatives are fully implemented, some of the basic features of the hotel, especially the size and configuration of the existing guest rooms cannot be changed in a cost-effective manner. While the brand equity of the Kellogg Center and its connection to MSU remain very strong, the rooms are competitive threats that could become more pronounced as newer properties join the local market.
» The addition of 30 guest rooms should bring larger groups without compromising the current occupancy rates.
» The addition of meeting space as addressed in the Kellogg Center Master Plan is still relevant and needed for the property to remain competitive.
» The new casual restaurant
  • Concept and position in marketplace are not clearly defined.
  • Some on team feel could draw from State Room rather than build overall revenues.
  • Could move to back of hotel overlooking river with outdoor seating

FINANCIAL CONUNDRUM

» The Kellogg Center requires at least $15 to $20 million in infrastructure improvements that will not necessarily help it be more competitive in the marketplace, but must be done.
» The cost for improvement projects, such as adding a casual restaurant and more guest rooms, is over and above this, and has not been budgeted nor has funding has been identified.
» The infrastructure and basic renovations must be done in the near term to maintain viability in the marketplace; however, a closer look at the feasibility and cost/benefit of replacing the hotel should be conducted before making any significant additions to the property.
» Looking forward, RHS may want to consider the option of replacing the Kellogg Center on a new site. One potential site is further south on Harrison, closer to the stadium. Features of the new hotel/ conference center must include:
  » A 1,000-seat banquet facility and associated meeting rooms
  • 220 guest rooms
  • Continuing Education facilities, which are core to its mission
  • Culinary Labs for the Hospitality Business program
  • Pool
  • Parking deck
  • Service corridor
» This site would offer a similar public face and easy access off Harrison, while providing a closer proximity to major athletic events, which is a significant connection to alumni, parents, visitors and VIPs.
» Critical to underwriting the full cost of replacing the Kellogg Center is the deposition of the existing building. RHS cannot vacate the property without transferring the cost of maintaining it to another building. RHS cannot vacate the property without any covenants that may exist that would restrict the repurposing of this property.
» Need to approach the Kellogg Foundation to understand any covenants that may exist that would restrict the repurposing of this property.
» Financing Considerations
  • Major donors
  • Must approach the Kellogg Foundation to understand any covenants that may exist that would restrict the repurposing of this property.
  • Capital campaign
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to Campus</th>
<th>Kellogg Center Hotel and Conference Center</th>
<th>Lexington Hotel</th>
<th>Lansing Radisson Hotel</th>
<th>East Lansing Marriot</th>
<th>EDC/Candlewood</th>
<th>The Penn Stater /Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On MSU campus</td>
<td>6.75 miles</td>
<td>4.0 miles</td>
<td>0.2 miles</td>
<td>On MSU campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from MSU campus</td>
<td>from MSU campus</td>
<td>from MSU Campus</td>
<td>from MSU campus</td>
<td>Remote from center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Kellogg Center Hotel and Conference Center</th>
<th>Lexington Hotel</th>
<th>Lansing Radisson Hotel</th>
<th>East Lansing Marriot</th>
<th>EDC/Candlewood</th>
<th>The Penn Stater /Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Rooms</td>
<td>160 incl. suites</td>
<td>212 rooms incl. suites</td>
<td>256 rooms incl. suites</td>
<td>180 incl. suites</td>
<td>127 Rooms</td>
<td>300 rooms incl. suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-room suites w- whirlpool</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchenettes/c-store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Capacity</td>
<td>10-1000 pp/35,000 SF</td>
<td>14,000 SF</td>
<td>10,000 SF + 3,240 reception</td>
<td>400 pp/ 12,000 SF</td>
<td>936 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Conference Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 rooms</td>
<td>15 rooms</td>
<td>12 rooms</td>
<td>12 rooms</td>
<td>41 rooms/ &lt;30,000 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Kellogg Center Hotel and Conference Center</th>
<th>Lexington Hotel</th>
<th>Lansing Radisson Hotel</th>
<th>East Lansing Marriot</th>
<th>EDC/Candlewood</th>
<th>The Penn Stater /Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>The State Room</td>
<td>Christie's Bistro</td>
<td>Capitol City Grill</td>
<td>Bistro 43 + Lounge</td>
<td>Mingle/Mixx</td>
<td>Garden, Legends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Hours</td>
<td>6:30 am - 10:00 pm</td>
<td>6:30 am - 10:00 pm</td>
<td>6:30 am - 10:00 pm</td>
<td>6:30 am - 10:00 pm</td>
<td>Sun-Thur:11:30 am -9:00 pm, Fri/Sat:11:30 am -10:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Concept</td>
<td>Regional/Fine Dining</td>
<td>Steak House with Pasta and Asian influences</td>
<td>American Steak House</td>
<td>Casual American</td>
<td>Fine Dining University Club</td>
<td>American Regional Sports Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, sports bar</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, outdoor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Shop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mail-like lower level</td>
<td>C-store</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web Presence</th>
<th>Kellogg Center Hotel and Conference Center</th>
<th>Lexington Hotel</th>
<th>Lansing Radisson Hotel</th>
<th>East Lansing Marriot</th>
<th>EDC/Candlewood</th>
<th>The Penn Stater /Penn State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TripAdvisor</td>
<td>No Rating</td>
<td>4.5 stars, #3 of 23</td>
<td>4 stars, #5 of 23</td>
<td>No Rating</td>
<td>3.5 stars, #3 of 9</td>
<td>4 stars, #11 of 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelp</td>
<td>3.5 stars for rooms 3 stars for food</td>
<td>3.5 stars for rooms 1 star for food</td>
<td>2 stars for rooms no rating for food</td>
<td>3.5 stars for rooms no rating for food</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>4/5 for hotel 4/5 for Legends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedia</td>
<td>4.5/5</td>
<td>3.0/5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayak</td>
<td>3.0/5</td>
<td>3.0/5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
<td>3.0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels.com</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>3.0/5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
<td>2.5/5</td>
<td>No rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HotelPlex.com</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>3.0/5</td>
<td>3.0/5</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>2.0/5</td>
<td>No rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Hotel Property Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to Campus</th>
<th>Marriott Kingsgate Hotel, University of Cincinnati</th>
<th>Blackwell Hotel, Ohio State University</th>
<th>U Mass Hotel and Conference Center, Amherst, MA</th>
<th>UGA Conference Center, University of Georgia</th>
<th>The Marcom/Miami Inn, Miami University of Ohio</th>
<th>The Morris Inn/Notre Dame University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus in University Center</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Rooms</th>
<th>Exceptional Features</th>
<th>Conference Capacity</th>
<th># of Conference Rooms</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198 rooms incl. suites</td>
<td>151 incl. suites</td>
<td>300 indoor, 500 outdoor</td>
<td>26 rooms/ 20,000 SF</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 rooms incl. suites</td>
<td>(rooms addition under way)</td>
<td>600 pp</td>
<td>22,000 SF</td>
<td>Bistro 2110/Lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 rooms incl. suites, 2 location</td>
<td>275 pp</td>
<td>600 pp</td>
<td>36 rooms</td>
<td>University Club + student dining options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 rooms, no suites</td>
<td>356 on 2 levels</td>
<td>24 rooms/ 45,000 SF</td>
<td>200 rooms incl. suites</td>
<td>The Savannah Room + student dining options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>Tavern at the Miami, Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>Sorin's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Restaurant Hours</th>
<th>Restaurant Concept</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Room Service</th>
<th>Catering</th>
<th>Fitness Center</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Pool</th>
<th>Business Center</th>
<th>Gift Shop</th>
<th>Web Presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caminetto/ Bearcat Lounge</td>
<td>11:30 am - 8:30 pm</td>
<td>American Grill</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Off site</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TripAdvisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bistro 2110/Lounge</td>
<td>7:00 am - 8:30 pm</td>
<td>American Fine Dining</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yelp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Club + student dining options</td>
<td>11:30 am - 8:30 pm</td>
<td>Fine dining</td>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Expedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Savannah Room + student dining options</td>
<td>7:00 am - 8:30 pm</td>
<td>American regional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kayak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavern at the Miami, Courtyard</td>
<td>7:00 am - 8:30 pm</td>
<td>American regional Continental Fine Dining</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hotels.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorin's</td>
<td>7:00 am - 8:30 pm</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>HotelPlex.com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Web Presence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TripAdvisor</th>
<th>Yelp</th>
<th>Expedia</th>
<th>Kayak</th>
<th>Hotels.com</th>
<th>HotelPlex.com</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 stars, #9 of 72</td>
<td>3/5 for hotel 4/5 for Caminetto</td>
<td>3.5/5</td>
<td>4.0/5</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>3.5 stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 stars, #1 of 138</td>
<td>4.5/5 for the hotel</td>
<td>4.0/5</td>
<td>4.0/5</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>4 stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 stars, #1 of 3</td>
<td>4/5 for hotel</td>
<td>4/5 for hotel</td>
<td>2.0/5</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>4 stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 stars, #6 of 21</td>
<td>4/5 for rooms</td>
<td>4/5 for rooms</td>
<td>3.0/5</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>4 stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 stars, #3 of 8</td>
<td>2/5 for food and rooms</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 stars, #10 of 30</td>
<td>2 stars for rooms</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
<td>No rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISION FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

Focusing on energy consumption reduction strategies.
RHS SUSTAINABILITY VISION STATEMENT
Ensuring MSU’s long-term sustainability through innovative and balanced strategies that support stewardship, fiscal responsibility and partnership.

1. Energy Conservation Strategies — Electricity, GHG, Steam, Emissions from Transportation
   » Assist in the implementation of MSU’s Energy Transition Plan and in meeting goals.
   » Be a role model and encourage behavior change and education around energy use.
   » Ensure energy conservation measures are practiced and that applicable standards, policies, metrics and assessments are in place, as changes are made.
   » Assist with commissioning and retro-commissioning processes, being mindful of fiscal responsibility and follow up.
   » Look for opportunities to reduce energy use in campus renovations.
   » Review RHS’s divisional vehicle use and truck deliveries, consider conservation strategies.

2. Water Conservation Strategies
   » As we renovate, consider and support conservation strategies for low flow fixtures, sub-metering dining areas and water conserving equipment.
   » Be aware of renovations and sustainability impacts with regard to water use.
   » Consider how water use affects energy use.

3. Food Waste Strategies
   » Assist with closing the food loop and be cognoscente of how food waste ties into energy.
   » Support efforts to reduce food waste, reduce food cost, review portion control, increase education and other tactics.
   » Review cost impacts of controlling food waste.
   » Implement and monitor trayless dining at Shaw and Yakeley. Encourage trayless dining in other venues.

4. Sustainable Procurement Strategies
   » Increase local/regional purchasing strategies, when fiscally able and available.
   » Know where our food and other products come from and how they are manufactured.
   » Track and monitor what our vendors do related to sustainability and recognize impacts.
   » Be knowledgeable of sustainability certifications and standards such as, LEED, Forest Stewardship Council, Marine Stewardship, Certified Organic, Energy Star, Water Sense, etc.

5. Connecting Sustainability, Education and Research
   » Be knowledgeable of how RHS partners with education and research as in the RHS/RISE/SOF collaboration with the Bailey Greenhouse, MSU’s Anaerobic Digester and food waste, Spartan Engineering, MSU Beef, MSU Poultry, MSU Research and Student Grant Opportunities.
   » Look for potential research opportunities that help conserve resources and improve sustainability.
   » Continue to develop a living and learning laboratory for RHS and MSU around sustainability.
   » Help by letting others know what RHS and MSU are doing in the area of sustainability.

6. Material Diversion
   » Implement MSU’s Standard Operating Practices (SOPs) for recycling and reuse.
   » Ensure recycling and reuse practices are in place and look for opportunities for expansion.
   » Participate and promote special event recycling initiatives.
   » Study processes to increase repurposing of salvaged furniture, fixtures and equipment.
   » Strive to achieve a 70% landfill diversion rate by 2017 (MSU goal).

7. Social Responsibility
   » RHS is committed to supporting education and decision making in settings outside of the classroom in which residential and community members embrace and practice sustainability by exploring the complex interactions between people and the environment
   » Sustainability is a core value at MSU and RHS. RHS employees are expected to model behaviors that embrace sustainability and assist in educating those that do now know what we do.
Michigan State University will foster sustainability by aiming to provide for all of its stakeholders’ needs in socially just ways both in the present and throughout time. We will attend to human well-being by better understanding our roles within a bounded natural system; bolster the ability of complex systems to adapt to changing circumstances for the good of all beings; include and encourage the voices of all stakeholders; and respect the value of preserving choices and a world as rich in resources and possibilities for future decision makers as we have now. These commitments will be honored through our approach to education, facilities operations, and interactions within our larger local, regional and global communities.

— the Energy Transition Plan

MSU RHS is a leader among its peers in sustainability. Not only has the University been a forerunner in its thinking, it has made dramatic progress in reducing its carbon footprint and by implementing many strategies. MSU has become a role model among its peers. However, MSU has significant energy production challenges. Recognizing this, the Sustainability section of this report places the most emphasis on energy consumption reduction.

MSU is expected to reach the plant capacity for steam in 2018 and electricity in 2039. Federal and state air quality and emissions regulations will require capital improvements and contain fuel choices in the relatively near future. Eventually, fossil fuels will no longer be available, or they will be too costly to use. MSU normally grows by 1 million square feet per decade, although the last decade saw growth of 2 million square feet in mostly high energy demand science buildings. It should also be noted that MSU has added new dining facilities which also have high energy requirements. If growth continues at this pace of 2 million square feet per decade, MSU will need to add steam capacity by 2018. An additional power plant could cost as much as $100 million.

RHS is an active participant in contributing to the university’s overall sustainability efforts. With RHS housing nearly 15,000 students, there are significant opportunities to continue its current efforts and further reduce energy consumption. Also, RHS can continue to increase student activity in even further advancing RHS in its leadership role as a sustainability leader.
The goals of the Energy Transition Plan are as follows:

1. **Improve the Physical Environment** – currently, only two percent of energy is renewable at MSU.
   - Strategies
     - Pursue aggressive, sustainable energy conservation and reinvest in energy savings for the future.
     - Implement a smart-growth strategy to minimize the amount of new square feet added to the campus.
     - Create a system that connects energy and space costs and incentives to the end user.
     - Employ more aggressive building energy standards.
     - Monitor and improve energy efficiency standards.
     - Maximize switching to alternative cleaner fuels.
     - Implement more aggressive building energy standards.
     - Monitor and improve energy efficiency standards.
     - Maximize switching to alternative cleaner fuels.
   - **Committee Recommendations**
     - Prioritize conservation activities.
     - Provide resources to invest in renewable energy infrastructure and fuel switching.
     - Switch to natural gas in the short term because of compatibility with existing boilers; it emits 45 percent less carbon dioxide than coal.
     - Use more biomass at the power plant and purchase green energy (electricity) from utility providers.

2. **Invest in Sustainable Energy Research and Development**
   - Promote sustainable energy research by using campus living as a learning laboratory and developing, evaluating and demonstrating new technologies.
   - Build on well-organized, sustainable energy research programs by aggressively seeking expertise and sources of funding.
   - Systematically invest a portion of energy costs and cost savings in sustainable energy demonstration projects on campus.
   - Streamline facilities, policies and systems to enhance cross-disciplinary, cross-functional collaboration among academic units, faculty, staff and students.

3. **Become an Educational Leader in Sustainable Energy**
   - Educate stakeholders about MSU’s long-standing commitment to ongoing research in sustainable energy.
   - Share MSU’s energy transition process and lessons learned from it.

At MSU, the BTU consumption per gross square foot has decreased since fiscal year 2006-2007.
MSU has actively pursued LEED accreditation in its new construction as well as renovations. Below are successes through 2011. Note the high number of residence hall LEED projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>LEED Registered Year</th>
<th>LEED Certified Year</th>
<th>LEED Certification Level</th>
<th>LEED Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>32,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Dairy Center/Dairy Barn</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>20,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli And Edythe Broad Art Museum</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU Surplus Store &amp; Recycling Center</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>73,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brody Hall</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>144,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secchia Center</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>182,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Hall</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Certified</td>
<td>112,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Hall</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons Hall</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Certified</td>
<td>113,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw Hall</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>275,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather Hall</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Certified</td>
<td>113,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Hall</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Certified</td>
<td>115,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Hall</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Certified</td>
<td>116,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wells Hall                     | Pending              | —                   | Certified                | 230,107             

Creating a culture of change is very important, and RHS is committed to educating its population on the importance of sustainability.

**An MSU staff member reviews real time energy data on the energy dashboard in Emmons Hall.**

Educate the Community on MSU’s Energy System and Continue Behavior Change for Energy Conservation

Energy education should also continue in order to help the MSU community understand and participate in working toward the goals of the Energy Transition Plan. Campus behavior studies in 2008 showed that students had little understanding of MSU’s energy infrastructure or its impacts. Building reports confirm that many faculty and staff still do not practice energy conservation behaviors. Education alone will not produce the changes needed; however, it is a critical component to the culture change needed to make the Energy Transition.

Total greenhouse emissions at MSU have begun to decrease as a result of many strategies being put into place.

**Analysis and Strategies for Energy Conservation**

Below is a series of analyses illustrating how MSU residence halls compare on energy and water usage. By identifying underperforming buildings, MSU can decide where investments are best spent. The following graphs are comparative analyses of energy and water usage in the residences at MSU. It should be noted that some residence halls include dining components, which increases the energy usage for those buildings. For all charts, building bars shown in orange indicate buildings with dining components.
Steam & Electricity
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Orange bars indicate buildings that have integrated dining
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Electricity
Electricity is used for lights, fans, pumps, plug loads, etc. Retro-commissioning can help identify systems that are operating at less than ideal efficiencies. Replacing outdated, inefficient equipment with modern high-efficiency equipment will help reduce these energy intensities.

Electricity-kBtu-sf-yr

Orange bars indicate buildings that have integrated dining

Electricity $-sf-yr

2.64
Steam
Steam is used for heat and hot water and, in most cases, cooking equipment (buildings with dining area indicated in orange). Because MSU is facing the likelihood of outgrowing its steam capacity by 2018, it is recommended that poorly performing buildings are identified and strategies be implemented to reduce steam consumption. MSU is in a heating climate, where steam has a high demand. Energy modeling will demonstrate what the potential energy savings could be and what steam reduction strategies might prolong the need for new steam generation. Window replacements, adding building insulation and reducing infiltration are primary strategies.
Water

MSU has an abundance of water, with the total annual cost being an average of $30 per year per resident student. Although efforts should be made to reduce water consumption, the cost savings is relatively small when compared to the investments required to replace older fixtures with low-flow fixtures. However, as water will only become more scarce over time, water conservation should be included in any sustainability strategy. Part of the process also should include a plan to address water quality on campus. Buildings with a dining component are indicated in orange.
Energy Reduction Efforts and Strategies

1. Lighting
   
   a. Occupancy Sensors
      - By implementing occupancy sensors in student rooms, hallways, stairwells and shared spaces, lighting reductions of at least 10 percent can be realized. In Wilson Hall, for example, $30,000/yr. in lighting energy could be saved.

   b. CFL or LED Lighting
      - By installing LED lighting, MSU can dramatically decrease electricity use in the residence halls. Below is an example where Wilson Hall was evaluated as an example for replacing the current lighting system (assume fluorescent) with LED lighting. The payback is between 7-8 years with as much as $83,000 electricity savings per year in Wilson Hall alone. This analysis did not consider the savings in bulb replacement as LEDs have a much longer life span than CFL lights. Based on the savings below of $0.23/sf per year, a rough estimate is that RHS could save $1,355,000 per year in lighting electricity alone if all residential buildings were converted to LED lighting.

   c. Daylight Harvesting
      - By using daylight harvesting, whereby lighting is controlled to take advantage of daylight coming through windows, further energy reductions can be realized. In a daylight harvesting system, the controls will maintain a minimum foot-candle lighting level in a room as set by the user. The daylight harvesting controls will adjust the artificial lighting up or down to maintain the lighting level set point thereby saving energy by not over lighting a space.
2. HVAC

- Retro commissioning
  - Ensuring that heating and cooling equipment is functioning at its optimum efficiency will prevent energy from being wasted and save money.

- Occupancy sensors with temperature setback
  - With an occupancy controlled heating system, after a student room is unoccupied for a given period of time, the heating system can be reset to a lower temperature. Once the room is occupied again, the temperature will be automatically reset. By tying the occupancy controls into a building automation system, room occupancy and temperatures can be monitored for inefficiencies in the heating system.

- Window sensors prevent heating from occurring when windows are open in student rooms.

- CO₂-based demand control ventilation
  - In order to minimize the outside air required, a CO₂ based fresh air system will monitor the CO₂ levels in the building and adjust the outside air to maintain a healthy quality of indoor air most efficiently. Outside air has to be treated which consumes considerable steam heat in the heating months.

- Energy recovery from exhaust air
  - Many buildings have a continuous exhaust system for bathrooms. The air that is being exhausted is usually at room temperatures and exhausted directly to the atmosphere. By first routing this exhaust air through a heat exchanger, the heat can be recovered to pretreat outside air being brought into the building for ventilation. This can further reduce the steam heating demand on buildings.

- Infiltration
  - Older buildings typically have higher rates of infiltration. Leaky buildings can lose significant energy through cracks, old windows and doors and a variety of other ways. Infrared camera technology can help identify poorly performing buildings for renovations or retrofits with new window and doors.
» Improve R-values of exterior envelopes to decrease heating demand.

Example ECM (Energy Conservation Measure) demonstrating steam energy savings in Holmes Hall with upgraded windows and interior insulation.
3. Water

- **Current Activities**
  - Water meters have been installed on all residence halls to monitor water usage.
  - Green cleaning methods have been implemented throughout campus.
  - A 2010 water audit is guiding a major effort on water conservation on campus.
  - A plan to provide metering changes in other areas of campus is being developed to track 15 percent of unaccountable water use.
  - Construction and renovation projects on campus are incorporating low-flow and LEED-certified plumbing fixtures and appliances.
  - Water use on campus by category: Because residence halls use 17 percent of the water on campus, there is a great opportunity to reduce the amount of water being used. An aggressive effort is being made to maximize the opportunities for water use reduction. Special attention should be given to improving the water quality in order to allow for ultra low-flow fixtures in the future.

- **Additional Measures**
  - Low-flow shower heads
  - Dual-flush water closets
  - Low-flow urinals
  - Low-flow lavatories
  - Tap water filters/dispensers at water fountains to reduce bottled water use

- **Laundry**
  - High efficiency washers and dryers with sensing technology

4. Recycling – total current recycling is at 42 percent.

5. Green Cleaning

- Biodegradable hand and surface cleaning products
- Cold-water only biodegradable floor cleaning chemicals
6. Dining

- Locally grown and produced supplies
  - Buy from local farmers when possible.
  - Create student-run campus farms for herbs and vegetables that can be used by students and dining facilities.

- Pre-consumer food waste composting
  - More than 8,000 pounds of food waste was diverted from landfill in 2010-2011 while supporting vermicomposting and hot composting research projects.

- Biodegradable composting disposables
- Waste reduction
  - Trayless serving can result in as much as 80 percent post-consumer food waste.
  - Meat fats directed to local farmers for bovine feed.
  - Waste vegetable oil diverted to biodiesel.

7. Transportation

- Transportation Services
  - Transportation Services motor pool fleet is comprised of approximately 400 vehicles. A breakdown of the number and types of vehicles is below.

  - The largest impact has been with the hybrid fleet. Although fully electric vehicles are the most efficient, full conversion of the entire fleet to electric currently is cost prohibitive. MSU will continue to evaluate environmentally friendly forms of transportation as they become available.
• Electric vehicle charging stations are being installed on campus, making the appeal of electric vehicles more convenient and attractive.

» Bikes
• The MSU Bike Service Center recycles and refurbishes bicycles in order to lease them to members of the University community. The Bike Services Center also serves to actively support, promote and advocate for increased bicycling on the MSU campus.
• Address pedestrian safety to encourage more walking and biking on campus. Students cited the two most common reasons for not riding a bicycle frequently as a lack of covered parking and a lack of safe, well-marked roads between campus and local residences. More covered parking is desired near the residence halls and should be addressed.

Every day, nearly 48,000 students, more than 10,000 faculty and staff, and thousands of visitors converge on 2,000 developed acres of land that make up MSU’s campus in East Lansing. So how they get to MSU and how they move about the 26 miles of roads and 100 miles of sidewalks on campus is a big issue for their convenience and for the environment.

• Bike Registrations and Bike Population
• Bike registrations are 7,543 as of 2010, accounting for 30 to 40 percent of bikes on campus. This indicates that there are between 19,000 and 25,000 bikes on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF BIKE REGISTRATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

» CATA bus service
• 90 percent of students ride the bus, while 30 percent ride at least three days a week.
• Students moving further from campus in search of more affordable housing places more pressure on the off-campus bus routes as a means of accessing campus.
• The University’s Cooperative Assessment Team and CATA are working on a long-range system plan to address bus transportation capacity.

» Car sharing
• MSU partnered with Zipcar in January 2011 to provide car sharing options for students, faculty and staff. The initial Zipcar fleet consisted of six vehicles. Based on impact studies, each Zipcar can take up to 15 personal vehicles off the road.

» Car pooling
• MSU provides reduced parking fees for car pool participants. The CATA Clean Commute program serves as a locator service to help establish carpool groups. Currently 42 people are registered as using the service; this is low compared with the number of employees.

8. Education

» MSU has more than 600 Environmental Stewards who are credible resources for environment-related information. Decreases in building energy use are directly related to behavior changes as a result of these stewards, since these decreases cannot be attributable to technology. This program will continue to grow over time as more recruiting takes place. In particular, increasing the number of student environmental stewards is a priority.

» Create an online reporting system for students to report issues relating to building efficiency such as:
  • Fans that run continuously when they should not.
  • Dripping faucets.
  • Over-heated or over-cooled spaces.
  • Drafty spaces from high infiltration.
CONCLUSIONS

MSU RHS actively pursues a variety of methodologies to minimize its carbon footprint and raise awareness among its population. RHS is also recognized as a leader among its peers for the progress it has made and the strategic thinking it demonstrates. RHS is also strengthening its position by measuring its progress on a continual basis. By measuring each building’s energy use, RHS is able to identify underperforming buildings and develop approaches to increase the efficiency of those buildings. RHS is aggressively engaged in all aspects of sustainability from food waste strategies to social responsibility. Contributing to the overall Energy Transition Plan success through energy conservation is where RHS can have the most impact. Considering the fast approaching energy production challenges that MSU faces, RHS can have its highest impact by directing additional efforts toward reducing its buildings energy usage intensity. It is the recommendation of this report that further studies be conducted through energy modeling of ECM (energy conservation measures) for each building in order to develop a long range plan for their energy use reductions. The energy reductions from these ECMs can produce significant savings thereby reducing the load on the central plants and possibly prolonging the need for additional plant capacities. In addition, the energy savings can reduce revenue expenditures and provide more funds for investments in renewable energy sources or needed projects. RHS has made great strides as a sustainability leader among its peers and is facing the challenges of the future of energy aggressively and responsibly and will continue to innovate and lead.
FINANCIAL STRATEGIES

Increase revenues, decrease expenses to maximize the Spartan Experience.
Housing: Furnished residence hall room, window coverings, all utilities, high-speed Internet connection, cable TV hook-up, linen service, waste and recycling service, E-suds laundry facilities, Wi-Fi in quiet study and public campus areas, dedicated Resident Assistants and Living Learning Services staff, 24/7 reception desk service, building and campus security, and convenient access to classrooms and MSU Intramural Sports fitness facilities.

Dining: Basic “Silver” plan provides unlimited meals at any of the 11 residence hall dining facilities from 7 a.m. to midnight seven days a week. All Silver plans also include free daily access to a Combo-X-Change meal at any of the Sparty’s, Union Pizzeria, Union Deli, Serrano’s or Riverwalk Market retail dining locations on campus.
Since the 2008 Strategic Plan, Residential and Hospitality Services has focused its financial expenditures in a very methodical way. The effort has been two-fold; the first has been to support the Neighborhood concept with capital projects including the addition of engagement centers and the second, the renovation and reorganization of the dining and Sparty’s concepts in the “lead with dining” effort. This has renovated public space in some of the older facilities, allowing the greatest number of students to experience these renovations. In addition, RHS has taken on the complete renovation of the Brody Neighborhood buildings, whose conditions were identified as those most in need of full renovation. RHS also has added sprinkler systems for life safety improvements in many buildings, when funding can be steered toward these buildings as part of renovation projects.

As we move to the next phase of the strategic plan, the available debt capacity is approaching the upper limit. Continuing to reduce expenses, increase efficiency, and increase revenues is the prudent path. While the division has done an excellent job of maintaining its buildings, renovation becomes the only option as systems reach a certain age. Capital reinvestment is necessary. There is still a lot of work to be done to “Deliver Outstanding Spartan Experiences” and support student persistence, retention and success to graduation.

Michigan State continues to provide an affordable residence hall living experience on campus, and this remains a value at $37 per day, based on double occupancy. For fiscal year 2012-13, MSU residence hall rates are again among the lowest in the Big 10 conference (9th lowest of 12). In the State of Michigan, MSU housing rates are also very competitive with both public and private universities. MSU’s unlimited residence hall meal plan is unmatched in the Big Ten conference and within the State of Michigan. Most other meal plans have limited weekly or block meal access, or are entirely retail-charge based.

However, careful evaluation of RHS residence hall and apartment rates, in comparison to local competitor rates, needs to be monitored regularly.

APARTMENTS

Competition from the off-campus market, in combination with the deterioration of Spartan Village, continues to challenge RHS retention efforts. In August 2011, Capstone Properties opened “The Lodges,” a new 700-bed apartment complex on Hannah Boulevard, east of Michigan Athletic Club. Free bus service to the center of campus is provided. Capstone has been marketing this complex to MSU East Neighborhood residence hall students aggressively. A 300-bed apartment complex also has been completed on the northeast corner of Hagadorn and Mt. Hope Road. An additional private student apartment development is being planned for construction on the former Red Cedar golf course on Michigan Avenue. This land is adjacent to the west boundary of the Brody Neighborhood and would compete with RHS residence halls for tenants.

On-campus apartment options can cost as little as $13 per day at Spartan Village, $18 per day at Williams Hall, and $23 per day at University Village. Many different meal plans may be added to these apartment options.

MSU apartments continue to be isolated and characterized separately from traditional residence halls. These should be treated within the system as residence halls whose unit type is apartment-style. Since the off-campus market is so strong, MSU cannot compete with that market offering apartments, but it can compete if the apartments such as University Village, Williams and VanHoosen are consistently treated as residence halls with the added value that implies.

Currently, Spartan Village cannot compete with the off-campus apartment offerings or as a residence hall community. Spartan Village does provide family housing that is important to the MSU mission, but the buildings have exceeded their life expectancy and no longer provide a viable Spartan Experience for those who live there. This mission-critical aspect requires further discussion at an administrative level. Spartan Village has comparatively little debt and produces more than $1 million per year in net income. The previous strategic plan slated Spartan Village for demolition in 2017. RHS has begun to take units off line without reinvestment as they lose viability, and there is no desire to spend limited capital resources in this location. The 2017 date is still five years out. As the buildings continue to deteriorate, it will be increasingly difficult to promote these buildings as supportive of the positive nature of a Michigan State Spartan Experience. While continuation of the complex until at least 2020 is beneficial from a margin standpoint, and it is shown in the financial forecast as remaining operational until 2023, this is not realistic without pouring additional JIT funds into the buildings.
The Office of Investments and Financial Management has expressed concern that RHS not surpass $285 million in bonded debt obligations. If the status quo is maintained for the next 10 years, the division will reach debt capacity in 2015. Projected increases are occurring each year at a rate slightly higher than the corresponding increase in revenue resulting in a $14 million reduction to RHS reserve through FY 2021. By the year 2016, the $12 million bottom limit of the cash reserve will drop to a deficit of $3.8 million, growing to deficit of $11.5 million by 2023 and effectively eliminating all cash reserve funds.
### REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Income</td>
<td>$5,154</td>
<td>$8,470</td>
<td>$8,811</td>
<td>$5,139</td>
<td>$5,921</td>
<td>$5,957</td>
<td>$10,288</td>
<td>$10,804</td>
<td>$11,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Income %</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Expense</td>
<td>$3,885,000</td>
<td>$2,704,391</td>
<td>$5,320,078</td>
<td>$5,520,685</td>
<td>$5,729,053</td>
<td>$6,247,018</td>
<td>$6,996,972</td>
<td>$6,329,306</td>
<td>$6,671,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FISCAL YEAR: FY 2011-12

- **Total Revenues**: $144,918,000
- **Total Expenses**: $110,525,000
- **Net Income**: $34,393,000
- **Operating Income**: $34,879,000
- **Operating Income %**: 24.02%
- **Net Income %**: 23.56%

### Yearly Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$3,937,000</td>
<td>$4,122,000</td>
<td>$4,230,000</td>
<td>$4,340,000</td>
<td>$4,450,000</td>
<td>$4,560,000</td>
<td>$4,670,000</td>
<td>$4,780,000</td>
<td>$4,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>$3,885,000</td>
<td>$2,704,391</td>
<td>$5,320,078</td>
<td>$5,520,685</td>
<td>$5,729,053</td>
<td>$6,247,018</td>
<td>$6,996,972</td>
<td>$6,329,306</td>
<td>$6,671,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Income

- **Operating Income**: $34,879,000
- **Operating Income %**: 24.02%
- **Net Income**: $34,393,000
- **Net Income %**: 23.56%

### Net Income

- **Net Income**: $34,393,000
- **Net Income %**: 23.56%

### Debt between income variance

- **Debt between income variance (Operating Expense)**: $12,863,000
- **Debt between income variance (Net Income)**: $12,404,000

**Spreadsheet based on current projected conditions - Status Quo, Spartan Village off line 2017**
MSU RHS traditionally has not offered alternative housing rates for renovated versus non-renovated hall rooms. The MSU Administration historically has expressed concerns about not wanting to create different perceived economic classes within the freshman class based on ability to pay. Recently, however, the possibility of offering some renovated residence hall rooms at a higher rate has been considered. Development of an alternative residence hall rate structure, distinguishing renovated from non-renovated rooms, is an option used by many other Big Ten universities. A renovated rate differential of $250 per semester ($500 per academic year) for Brody neighborhood, Shaw Hall and Mayo Hall could generate approximately $1.9 million in additional room revenues per year. These incremental revenues could provide increased resources for future renovations or program enhancements. Similarly, additional fees for housing outside of traditional room and board rates have not been utilized. Significant Board and Administrative emphasis currently is placed on the total cost of education, and efforts are being made to contain or reduce those amounts. Room and board rates are approved by the MSU Board of Trustees annually.

Adjusting the room rate structure to differentiate between renovating student rooms and non-renovating could produce, on average, $2.2 million in additional revenue over the next ten years.

---

### Financial Forecast with a modified Room Rate Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room &amp; Board Increase %</th>
<th>Room &amp; Board Rate per Academic Year</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 1</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 2</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 3</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 4</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 5</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 6</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 7</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 8</th>
<th>Yearly Increase</th>
<th>EXPENSES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### REVENUES:

- **Re Isa Hall Room**: $52,450,015
- **Rate Structure Change**: $53,541,000
- **Revenue from Room and Board**: $55,055,970
- **Revenue from Dorm**: $55,854,276
- **Income and Expenditure**: $60,139,520
- **Revenue from Board and Room**: $62,515,031
- **Revenue from Board and Room**: $64,888,375
- **Revenue from Board and Room**: $67,516,236
- **Revenue from Board and Room**: $70,219,523
- **Revenue from Board and Room**: $72,995,204
- **Revenue from Board and Room**: $75,876,436
- **Revenue from Board and Room**: $78,875,585

#### EXPENSES:

- **Personnel Services**: $37,870,000
- **Utilities**: $11,050,000
- **Food Purchases**: $25,984,000
- **Fiscal Year 1**: $12,800,000
- **Fiscal Year 2**: $13,724,000
- **Fiscal Year 3**: $14,698,400
- **Fiscal Year 4**: $15,602,800
- **Fiscal Year 5**: $16,592,200
- **Fiscal Year 6**: $17,576,600
- **Fiscal Year 7**: $18,557,000
- **Fiscal Year 8**: $19,547,400

---

**Notes**

- Projected Yr. 1: FY 2011/12
- Fiscal Yr. 1: FY 2012/13
- Fiscal Yr. 2: FY 2013/14
- Fiscal Yr. 3: FY 2014/15
- Fiscal Yr. 4: FY 2015/16
- Fiscal Yr. 5: FY 2016/17
- Fiscal Yr. 6: FY 2017/18
- Fiscal Yr. 7: FY 2018/19
- Fiscal Yr. 8: FY 2019/20
- Fiscal Yr. 9: FY 2020/21
- Fiscal Yr. 10: FY 2021/22
- Fiscal Yr. 11: FY 2022/23

---

### Financial Forecast with a modified Room Rate Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Projected Yr. 1</th>
<th>Yr. 1 Budget</th>
<th>Yr. 2 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 3 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 4 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 5 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 6 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 7 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 8 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 9 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 10 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 11 Forecast</th>
<th>Yr. 12 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014/15</td>
<td>$146,818,000</td>
<td>$148,806,000</td>
<td>$150,897,000</td>
<td>$152,988,000</td>
<td>$155,079,000</td>
<td>$157,170,000</td>
<td>$159,261,000</td>
<td>$161,352,000</td>
<td>$163,443,000</td>
<td>$165,534,000</td>
<td>$167,625,000</td>
<td>$169,716,000</td>
<td>$171,807,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015/16</td>
<td>$135,416,000</td>
<td>$137,406,000</td>
<td>$139,497,000</td>
<td>$141,588,000</td>
<td>$143,679,000</td>
<td>$145,769,000</td>
<td>$147,859,000</td>
<td>$149,949,000</td>
<td>$151,039,000</td>
<td>$153,129,000</td>
<td>$155,219,000</td>
<td>$157,309,000</td>
<td>$159,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016/17</td>
<td>$124,014,000</td>
<td>$126,004,000</td>
<td>$128,095,000</td>
<td>$130,186,000</td>
<td>$132,277,000</td>
<td>$134,368,000</td>
<td>$136,459,000</td>
<td>$138,549,000</td>
<td>$140,639,000</td>
<td>$142,729,000</td>
<td>$144,819,000</td>
<td>$146,910,000</td>
<td>$148,990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017/18</td>
<td>$112,612,000</td>
<td>$114,602,000</td>
<td>$116,693,000</td>
<td>$118,784,000</td>
<td>$120,875,000</td>
<td>$122,966,000</td>
<td>$125,057,000</td>
<td>$127,149,000</td>
<td>$129,239,000</td>
<td>$131,329,000</td>
<td>$133,419,000</td>
<td>$135,509,000</td>
<td>$137,599,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>$101,210,000</td>
<td>$103,200,000</td>
<td>$105,291,000</td>
<td>$107,382,000</td>
<td>$109,473,000</td>
<td>$111,564,000</td>
<td>$113,655,000</td>
<td>$115,746,000</td>
<td>$117,836,000</td>
<td>$119,926,000</td>
<td>$121,016,000</td>
<td>$123,106,000</td>
<td>$125,196,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes**

- Delta between income versus Expense (%)
- less Debt Service Costs
- Dining Cash Sales +2% 13,216,000
- Total Revenues = 144,916,000
- Conferences +2% 12,316,000
- 12,171,000
- 12,046,000
- 11,910,000
- 11,774,000
- 11,638,000
- 11,502,000
- 11,366,000
- 11,230,000
- 11,094,000
- 10,958,000

---

**Financial Highlights**

- **Revenue Increase**: 3.8%
- **Expense Increase**: 3.8%
- **Operating Income**: 3.8%
- **Net Leverage**: 3.8%
- **Change in Net Leverage**: 3.8%
Financial Forecast with a $350 Renovation Fee

Room & Board Increase %  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room &amp; Board Rate per Academic Year</th>
<th>$0.154</th>
<th>$0.476</th>
<th>$0.911</th>
<th>$0.915</th>
<th>$0.525</th>
<th>$0.997</th>
<th>$10.268</th>
<th>$10.094</th>
<th>$11.106</th>
<th>$11.508</th>
<th>$12.012</th>
<th>$12.486</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Fiscal Year:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr.</th>
<th>Project V. 16</th>
<th>Budget V. 17</th>
<th>Forecast V. 18</th>
<th>Forecast V. 19</th>
<th>Forecast V. 20</th>
<th>Forecast V. 21</th>
<th>Forecast V. 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>$20,131,000</td>
<td>$20,610,000</td>
<td>$21,121,000</td>
<td>$21,655,000</td>
<td>$22,213,000</td>
<td>$22,794,000</td>
<td>$23,399,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$21,121,000</td>
<td>$21,655,000</td>
<td>$22,213,000</td>
<td>$22,794,000</td>
<td>$23,399,000</td>
<td>$24,035,000</td>
<td>$24,696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$22,213,000</td>
<td>$22,794,000</td>
<td>$23,399,000</td>
<td>$24,035,000</td>
<td>$24,696,000</td>
<td>$25,486,000</td>
<td>$26,295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$23,399,000</td>
<td>$24,035,000</td>
<td>$24,696,000</td>
<td>$25,486,000</td>
<td>$26,295,000</td>
<td>$27,225,000</td>
<td>$28,275,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue

A one-time $350 renovation fee for approximately 7,000 new students (freshmen and transfers) per year (payable upon completion of the housing contract) could provide up to $2.45 million in annual debt service payments sufficient to support $20 million in capital for building renovations. Funding the $40 million with an MSU 30-year internal loan is an alternative financing plan that does not exceed the RHS budgeted external bonded debt capacity limit of $285 million. This proposed internal loan would be paid back by fiscal year 2043-44. Based on renovation costs within the State of Michigan, $40 million would fund approximately 150,000 square feet of renovation, equivalent to two of the four buildings in West Circle or half of the Akers residence hall. This represents a specific and limited source of funding to address RHS’s most vulnerable facility needs.

Adding a one-time $350 renovation fee, beginning in 2013, produces an average of $2.45 million each year in additional capital funds for renovation over the next 10 years (based on 7,000 freshmen).
Sophomore Mandate

MSU housing policy states that all freshman and sophomore students with fewer than 95 credits are required to live on campus. The sophomore mandate has been waived due to sufficient house counts. Student assessment surveys reveal students who live on campus maintain a higher grade point average and graduate in shorter time than students living off campus. Enforcing the sophomore mandate could generate an additional 1,000 residence hall student per year, with resulting revenues increasing by approximately $9.2 million per academic year. The system capacity at more than 17,000 beds (excluding Spartan Village) can accommodate the increase without impacting the number of juniors and above who choose to live on campus.

Eliminating the sophomore waiver of the on-campus residence requirement would produce an average of $4.5 million in net additional capital funds for renovations each year, (1,000 more students would produce around $9.2 million in additional revenue and $4.7 in additional variable expenses for a net contribution of $4.5 million per year).

### Financial Forecast with Sophomore Mandate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Income</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Rate per Academic Year</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Rate</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Income</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Rate per Academic Year</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board Rate</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>Projected Yr. 1</th>
<th>Budget Yr. 2</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 3</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 4</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 5</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 6</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 7</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 8</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 9</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 10</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 11</th>
<th>Forecast Yr. 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Res Hall Room Income</td>
<td>32,800,000</td>
<td>33,000,000</td>
<td>33,200,000</td>
<td>33,400,000</td>
<td>33,600,000</td>
<td>33,800,000</td>
<td>34,000,000</td>
<td>34,200,000</td>
<td>34,400,000</td>
<td>34,600,000</td>
<td>34,800,000</td>
<td>35,000,000</td>
<td>35,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Cash Sales</td>
<td>12,600,000</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>13,400,000</td>
<td>13,800,000</td>
<td>14,200,000</td>
<td>14,600,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,400,000</td>
<td>15,800,000</td>
<td>16,200,000</td>
<td>16,600,000</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
<td>17,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Space Renovation</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
<td>1,165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Fees</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>144,316,000</td>
<td>144,804,000</td>
<td>151,510,391</td>
<td>165,087,466</td>
<td>177,761,935</td>
<td>184,111,224</td>
<td>190,861,405</td>
<td>207,113,956</td>
<td>212,472,168</td>
<td>218,739,587</td>
<td>219,788,507</td>
<td>220,088,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Yearly increase | 2.68% | 2.42% | 2.06% | 2.54% | 3.58% | 3.18% | 3.67% | 3.36% | 3.57% | 3.29% | 3.58% | 3.60%

### EXPENSES:

| Personnel Services | 3.98% |
| General Operating | 3.98% |
| Student Affairs/Residence Life | 3.98% |
| Repairs & Maintenance | 3.98% |
| Communications & Bandwidth | 3.98% |
| University Overhead | 3.98% |
| Laundry | 3.98% |
| Insurance | 4.40% |
| Equipment | 2.52% |
| Miscellaneous | 2.52% |
| Total Expenses | 3.98% |

### Data:

| Operating Net Income | 25,377,000 |
| Lea Debt Service Costs | 1,939,000 |
| Lea Just-In-Time Maint. Expenditures | 10,483,000 |
| All Funds Net Income | 846,000 |
| Mar. R.H.S. Cash Reserve Balance | 45,000,000 |
| Min. R.H.S. Cash Reserve Balance | 20,131,000 |
| Capital Renovation Fund | 8,311,000 |

### Notes:

- Corrected values have been submitted to the University of Michigan's Annual Report for FY 2012-2013.
- The University of Michigan's Annual Report for FY 2012-2013 has been approved by the Board of Regents.
Financial Forecast Notes:
1. MSU enrollment levels will remain constant (per OPM). Freshman enrollment of 7,200 and average house count of 14,400 will remain constant.
2. Room & Board rates will increase an average of 3.95% per fiscal year.
3. Current residence hall districts will be preserved. Students displaced during residence hall renovation will be placed in other halls.
4. Total RHS 30-year bonded debt of $285 million will be realized in FY 2015-16.
5. Sufficient net income will be produced each year to fund debt service costs, JIT/maintenance expenditures and allow a minimum balance of $12,000,000 in the RHS reserve account.
6. In FY2017-18, all remaining 1,028 Spartan Village Apartments are planned to be demolished in this scenario. A $73 million reduction in revenues and a $3.9 million reduction in expenses is recorded.
7. FY13-14 begins a one-time, $350 renovation fee for freshmen living in the residence halls. Proceeds used to pay debt service on a proposed $40 million MSU internal loan to renovate Campbell Hall, Williams Hall and Yakeley-Chlchori Halls. Renovation Fee separate from room and board rates.
8. Beginning with fall semester 2015, a renovated space addition of $350 per semester ($200/semester) per room will be charged for all students living in Brady Neighborhood, Shaw Hall and Mayo Hall. This equates to $350 more per year for the approximate 3,800 beds in the three renovated residence hall areas and will generate an additional $1,300,000 in room revenues each year.
9. FY14-15 the sophomore housing mandate will add 1,000 residence hall students for an average annual house count of 15,400 for each year. FY14-15 room revenues added = $5.8 million. FY14-15 dining revenues added = $5.4 million. FY14-15 variable expenses added = $4.7 million.

Increase Food Sales Revenues
Continued expansion of student off-campus meal plan sales and faculty/staff meal plans could provide additional resources for plant cash repairs. Added sales will increase pressure on the capacity of the food venues and will have to be balanced with takeout options and possible expansion needs.

FINANCIAL SUCCESS FACTORS
Success factors include the safety, security and academic achievement of students. Net income sufficient to maintain financial viability is required to guarantee this success. Financial viability includes meeting bond obligations; providing Just-In-Time (JIT) maintenance funds for repairs and improvements and maintaining an adequate reserve balance to address unforeseen emergencies. If financial goals are not met, reductions in JIT/plant cash expenditures will be utilized to offset any deficits.

Projected MSU enrollment targets, renovation debt costs and historical JIT requirements provide the basis for the division’s financial goals:
1. $30 million in net income from operations before debt service costs.
2. Managing JIT expenditures to $12 million annually.
3. Debt service costs of $18 million annually.
4. Managing yearly cash flow to maintain RHS cash reserves at $12 million. This amount equates to one year of JIT/plant cash expenditures held in reserve for unforeseen situations. The MSU Vice President for Auxiliary Enterprises supports the $12 million minimum reserve balance goal as reasonable.

As an auxiliary division of MSU, RHS has to be financially self-supportive for all operating and debt obligations.

Financial Model Assumptions
1. Residence hall house counts maintain a minimum of 14,400 per academic year. Residence Hall capacity allows for 14,400 students per year to be housed even with one residence hall being closed per year for renovations.
2. Spartan Village and University Village Apartments maintain an occupancy exceeding 85 percent. (Note: This will not be likely at Spartan Village as the buildings decline and are taken off line.)
3. Maintain a minimum incoming freshman residence count of 7,200 beds each year.
4. Room rate increases are assumed at 3.95 percent per year.
5. Apartment Rate increases are assumed at 1 percent per year.
6. Dining Sales increase 2 percent per year.
7. Conferences increase 2 percent per year.
8. Yearly utilities cost increases are capped at 8.5 percent per year.
9. University Overhead Payment does not exceed $3 million per year.
Just In Time (JIT)

A review of the fiscal year 2012-2013 Plant Cash Projects (JIT) breakdown suggests that a revised method of distribution might be desirable, including a separation of renovation projects from JIT. This would provide a better management scenario. The current JIT budget is set at $12 million. Previously, when there has been an increase in revenues due to a higher freshman enrollment, additional funds were directed to the Plant Cash Projects account to fund renovation work. An alternate approach is to maintain a strict JIT budget, which is specific for building maintenance and repair and systems upgrades. Renovation projects should be managed from a separate fund that fluctuates and can have cash accumulate over a succession of years to fund larger renovation needs. A potential budget breakdown for JIT is as follows:

This allocates an increase in funds to allow for systematic upgrades to critical systems and/or energy conservation measures that would be beneficial.

All renovation projects that entail the full spectrum of systems and services would be tracked and budgeted separately. This fund would fluctuate, depending on enrollment and other factors, including fee options outlined above. It would prioritize the highest and best-use projects from a division-wide approach.

| Interior (Refresh) | 1,792,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Furniture | 1,300,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Carpet | 492,000 | 500,000 |
| Exterior Envelope | 0 | 3,000,000 |
| Window Replacement | 0 | 1,800,000 |
| Roof Replacement | 0 | 1,000,000 |
| Insulation and Weatherproofing | 0 | 200,000 |
| Site Repairs | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Building Infrastructure | 1,532,000 | 3,200,000 |
| Elevators | 1,100,000 | 1,000,000 |
| MEP | 232,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Sprinklers | 1,000,000 |
| Life Safety Inspections | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Environmental Remediation | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Technology | 1,715,000 | 1,200,000 |
| General Updates | 1,515,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Shared Classroom | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Equipment Needs | 85,000 | 100,000 |
| Accessibility | 275,000 | 500,000 |
| Sustainability Projects | 148,000 | 200,000 |
| Lighting | 105,000 |
| Water Conservation | 43,000 |
| JIT Total Annual Budget | 5,797,000 | 9,950,000 |
Residential and Hospitality Services needs to continue exploring ideas and options for increasing revenue to the highest levels at Michigan State University as buildings and systems continue to age and deteriorate. RHS continues to elevate and improve the impact the division has on student success. With new systems for tracking student success tied directly to place of residence, access to services in the engagement centers and socialization within dining halls, RHS will be able to correlate student persistence, retention and graduation directly to their Spartan Experience. This will support the need to revise revenue streams in order to provide the excellent value and education students have come to expect. Without a plan to increase revenue or decrease expenses by 2016, the division will begin to experience cash-flow issues and an erosion of cash reserves. By 2022, RHS could find itself in a break-even situation.
Measuring project viability against Persistence, Retention and Academic Success.
Akers Hall Existing Unit Plan

Akers Hall Option A – Convert to graduate student efficiency; all new construction.

Akers Hall Option B – Convert to double suites
Residential and Hospitality Services previously had identified Akers Dining as the last project to be accomplished in the 2008 Strategic Plan. The $20 million Akers renovation will be funded with $14 million in bond debt and $6 million from RHS reserves. The original timeline for the design of the new food venue was to be presented to MSU’s Board of Trustees in September of 2012 (authorization to begin planning and design), followed by authorization to bid in June 2013 and authorization to build in December 2013.

Akers and Hubbard are predominantly freshman residence halls, with nearly 83 percent freshmen in each. Akers has the lowest return rate of any residence hall within the system at just under 14 percent, followed closely by Hubbard Hall at 18 percent. Akers is unique within the system due to the quad room configuration. The unit's two bedrooms are long and narrow, with shared desk space outside the bedrooms. While this unit does have a private bath, the density of the unit and its odd configuration continues to be undesirable. The East Neighborhood's location on the edge of campus could lend itself to an upperclassmen or graduate student demographic if the buildings were renovated into efficiency-style units with increased privacy. At over 330,000 gross square feet, a renovation of this magnitude is estimated at around $87 million in today’s dollars, an amount exceeding available funds. Occupancy would fall to half the current total of 1,260 beds as a result of such a renovation. An alternative solution is to re-categorize the unit type from a quad to a double suite, redefining the two bedrooms as singles, adding doors for privacy and providing living room furniture in the former desk space. This would have a limited construction cost impact, increase student retention, and increase demand for living in Akers. It would, however, decrease the revenues for this particular building.

Understanding the future configuration of Akers and Hubbard is important so that the supporting food venues and the new engagement center mesh with the population's dynamics. Food venue sizes are determined by neighborhood populations and are impacted by changes and fluctuations.

The historic core residence halls are located in West Circle in the North Neighborhood. The five buildings were erected between 1930 and 1945 in a traditional brick Gothic style. Mayo Hall was renovated in 2008, leaving the remaining buildings, representing a combined 315,500 gross square feet, in need of full renovation. As part of the original lead with food effort, a new dining hall is being designed and built in Landon Hall, and the current dining hall in Yakeley Gilchrest will be vacated. Since West Circle is adjacent to the MSU Union, a new engagement center is being incorporated into MSU Union renovations to serve all of the North Neighborhood.

West Circle's unique architectural character, and its location in the original heart of campus and near downtown East Lansing, continues to appeal to students. West Circle has a return rate of between 30 percent at the low end (Yakeley Gilchrest) to 86 percent (Williams). Overall, West Circle averages a 60 percent return rate. Unlike Akers, these buildings succeed because they offer a scale and character unavailable elsewhere on campus. The buildings and their aging systems need reinvestment to ensure these residence halls remain part of the historic fabric of the campus and Michigan State's heritage.

This presents a dilemma. Which projects should receive funding? Which is the priority? Moving forward, RHS needs to examine each and every project against the goals of Persistence, Retention and Academic Success. A litmus test for project viability might include the following considerations:

Completion of the project will ensure:

1. **Students desire to remain in the residence hall system longer than current figures for the same residence halls currently reveal.**
2. **Students desire to remain in the same residence hall longer than current figures for the same residence halls currently suggest.**
3. **Faculty desire to increase their time in the residence halls, increasing the number of opportunities for student and faculty engagement.**
4. **Potential to help increase the numbers of students who choose MSU as their first choice.**
Target for renovation project:

1. Accessibility and compliant lifesafety measures in place.
2. Systems within the building will decrease the energy consumption (steam and electric) compared with current consumption.
3. The exterior envelope will be improved such that energy usage will decrease.
4. The buildings themselves, when fully renovated, can serve as educational venues in sustainable practices.

Building risk can be identified:

1. The building envelope is deteriorating, causing continued damage to the structure and risks full closure if not renovated.
2. JIT money is insufficient to keep the buildings functioning.

Key success factors will be identified for each project, along with a vision statement to guide the team. This applies to both physical projects as well as organizational, technological and communications initiatives. Determine what metrics should be tracked to support the success factors. Looking back and evaluating work that has been completed is an important tool for the continued divisional revitalization. A post mortem for each project or initiative should be conducted within a year of the project’s completion. Has the project met established criteria? If not, what should be done differently next time? Share this information with the entire division. Allowing enough time between projects to assess success or failure will inform the next project and focus resources where they can best support the institution’s mission.

OVERALL SUCCESS METRICS: MEASURING SUCCESS

The changes RHS has made feel successful, and it appears that students are more engaged. However, intuition needs to be supported by proof—facts and figures that will allow the RHS story to be shared more widely. Useful metrics might include:

- Success of living-learning program students who live in a residence hall and how long they remain there.
- Success of students who access the engagement centers (both on- and off-campus students), who are not in a living-learning program.
- Sophomore success correlated to living on campus versus off.
- Number of years a student lives in a residence hall compared to their persistence to graduation.
- Student participation in dining plans and correlations to student graduation rates. Dining represents a key social component of student success.
- Student access to auxiliaries and auxiliary programs from tennis and golf to the Union. Do these contribute to student persistence and retention? Can this be tracked and measured?

RHS’s recent organizational progress and project successes are a foundation for a solid track record of progress. Finding the right balance between agility and responsiveness against careful planning and positioning of limited resources will be challenging.
COMMUNICATING THE FUTURE

Maximizing messages in the social media age.
“A digital immigrant is an individual who was born before the existence of digital technology and adopted it to some extent later in life. A digital native is a person who was born during or after the general introduction of digital technologies and through interacting with digital technology from an early age, has a greater understanding of its concepts.”

The Division of Residential and Hospitality Services has evolved since the 2008 Strategic Plan, becoming flexible and nimble to change. The culture has morphed, giving a greater ability to respond more quickly, finding clever new approaches and resourcefulness in the progressive world of communications. Communication has gone beyond the realm of print media to distribution through social media. With it comes a new world of challenges and opportunities.

RHS has united with a singular focus and intent in support of the institution’s mission for student success through persistence, retention and graduation. From Engagement Centers, to revitalized Sparty’s locations, to the new Residence Education and Housing Services, RHS has much to share with students, faculty and staff. Communication strategy—that information to share, who to share it with, and how to present it with today’s evolving digital communications—is essential. Connecting with students, faculty and staff is about being “heard.”

It involves identifying the communication mission, building a cohesive message that is shared division-wide, then strategizing how to reach students, faculty and staff. It identifies each department’s strengths and weaknesses, as well as their needs and expectations as it relates to the communication strategy.

Knowing your message, identifying your target audience and selecting the right tool to present the information used to be the three steps to effectively communicate a message. Today, Residential and Hospitality Services must find the sweet spot between students who engage and adapt their communication styles to new frontier technologies, and staff, faculty and administrators who are slower to adapt. Students are the digital natives; the rest are the digital immigrants, to use the words of author Marc Prensky.1

Understanding social media and all it offers to the technologically savvy student is crucial to developing a successful communication strategy to reach this audience. An essential strategy assesses need, continually reassesses and understands how students are communicating differently and what they expect from Michigan State – specifically from RHS.
One method of understanding social media is to incorporate it into daily practice. Communicating using social media requires dedicated resource time for frequent updates, response to inquiries and monitoring. A plan should constantly re-evaluate trends and adapt. Social media lacks the tight message control that is inherent in other communication methods. Much social media encourages instant engagement, which can be posted immediately, uncensored with potential negative content. It has the potential to enhance or debunk reputations.

College students want to be connected constantly, informed instantaneously, and choose what they find suitable for immediate, if any, response. On the flip side, social media can represent information overload; finding a simpler, more honest way to get the message read is a challenge.

The RHS Marketing Communications group is an award-winning team, while the perception is that the Information Technology group is understaffed to meet the needs and challenges of the division. Information Services has recently reorganized to have Strategic Integration Managers work closely with each unit. This strategy supports a synergistic relationship that is necessary to realize a communications plan. Additionally, a core group representing all units, with student advisors, should guide the division’s communications strategy. Use students as a resource on ways to keep pace digitally.

Units working together should:

1. Ensure that communications aren’t counterproductive;
2. Align what is communicated with the right communication platform;
3. Make simplicity and honesty the foundation;
4. Understand target audiences for each message and their different communication styles.
5. Ensure relevancy in all communications.

FREE AND INFORMAL
The Internet and social media offer young people control over their social lives without adding debt to a debt-phobic group. They also want a media-rich life, full of images and sounds, not just text; multi-media delivery is an effective way to share information and increase attention. As important is the need to monitor where messages are delivered. Send the same message to multiple sites, and students will feel beleaguered; rely on e-mail, and important messages may go unread. Blast emails are impersonal; young people want the message to be personal, honest and clear.

“The future of messaging is more real time, more conversational and more casual,” said Andrew Bosworth, director of engineering at Facebook, where he oversees communications tools. “The medium isn’t the message. The message is the message.”

The POSTGENs, discussed earlier in this report, will continue to use Facebook as their preferred media site. E-mail sites like Yahoo and Hotmail are now in a steady decline, dropping 6 percent since 2009, 18 percent among 12- to 17-year-olds, according to the research company comScore, while instant messaging, texting and Facebook remain strong with 4 billion messages daily. James E. Katz, the director for the Center for Mobile Communications Studies at Rutgers University, said this was not the death of e-mail but more of a downgrade, thanks to greater choice and nuance among communications tools.

2. S. Craig Watkins, associate professor at the University of Texas at Austin.
FACEBOOK
“Connect and share with the people in your life.”
EAT AT STATE Facebook Page
887 Likes | 52 Talking about this
“Where can I find the Eat at State Food Truck?”
Shanacee S.
Celebrate State – Residential and Hospitality Services – MSU
231 Likes
MSU LiveOn
1,358 Likes | 14 Talking about this
Messaging: Much like e-mail but allows students to communicate with people they may not know as well personally. If they do not have someone’s e-mail address, like a student they just met in a class, they can “friend” them on facebook and send them a message easily. Some students may even prefer facebook messaging for all their personal communication over e-mail and only use e-mail for school related things.

Statuses: Students love to broadcast in these short status updates. They summarize their day or a recent event that they think others who are interested in their activities would want to see.

Photo Sharing: post and share personal photos.

TEXTING
Primary means of communication between friends on a daily basis, used more often than phone calls.
Used most often when communicating places to meet or short pieces of information.
Used between people who see each other often – roommates, friends and classmates.

E-MAIL
Students use e-mail to keep up with professors, classes, friends and family.
School e-mail address will be monitored closely
Most likely at least one other personal e-mail address if not more.

PICTURES
“Organize and share things you love.”
Michigan State has a strong presence, but not a calculated one – okay, good.
Gaining popularity in strides and allows you to search and post things by topic. Students use this to find everything from new recipes to new hairstyles.

LINKEDIN
“Be great at what you do.”
12,279 employees on LinkedIn
“Michigan State University researchers will use a $7.8 million grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to help eight African nations improve their sustainable farming methods.”

CHATS
A lot of students, who have smart phones, might use facebook or google chat on their phones while they are out and about.

They are constantly logged into either facebook and email and are communicating with at least one person via chat.

Use chat clients to communicate with a range of friends and family members from close to distant.

Usually this kind of communication is out of convenience and is “idle” chatter or more conversational and is less likely to be immediately relevant like texting.

GOOGLE +
“Share the right things with just the right people.”
“A new study out of +Michigan State University suggests that anxiety may be holding women back when it comes to career choice.”

BLOGS
Students also frequent blogs that may relate to their niche interests. They are less likely to be using these means to communicate with people they know in real life and more likely to be using them to talk to people solely online who have similar interests.
INFOBESITY

1. The relentless feast of online information, typically through search engines.¹

2. The feeling of busting at the seams with tweets, status updates, texts, emails and too much information!

3. “The deleterious effect of excessive data consumption on the fitness and agility of individual and corporate minds. With the volume of new data being produced doubling every three days (vs. every three decades a few generations ago), infobesity will become dramatically debilitating, though it will stimulate the growth of technology filtering tools. Those who master infofiltering will jog confidently through the fog, while those who don’t will keep staggering into lampposts.” ⁵

“Most students use all of these [social media] regularly. They are used to juggling a number of different communication methods, even simultaneously. If a friend does not use Facebook chat or have text messaging, a student will use a combination of methods to reach everyone in his or her circle.” – Ashley Lefew, Virginia Tech Student

⁴ Urban Dictionary
⁵ The Learning Circuits Blog