

Master Plan Assumptions

A. Construction of New Facilities

1. The opportunity to shape the campus master plan with new buildings will be limited. State funding for new facilities has been quite episodic. It is unlikely that we will embark on an era of major construction within the next decade.
2. The campus does not have a history of major capital donations.
3. The university will, over time, retire its current debt. In considering debt financing, a key factor is the identification of firm revenue sources. Research and student housing are most likely to be able to generate revenue streams to cover debt.
4. In some future scenario, if the legislature is generous, the campus could consider devoting some operating budget funds to debt service.
5. A new approach is needed to develop conditional gifts for use in leveraging funds from the legislature.
6. Corporate sponsorships of Green initiatives and achievement of LEED standards might be viable.
7. We need to explore public/private partnership models and changes in legislation to authorize long-term lease-purchase models.
8. Tax credit models and partnerships with NPO's should be considered as a possibility.
10. A suitable site for additional science and engineering expansion (beyond the site reserved for ACTB) should be reserved. There is also a need to recognize that when science buildings become outdated they are candidates for conversion to other uses.
11. A suitable east-side site for a modern, flexible classroom and computer lab building suitable for business, computer science, and liberal arts education should be identified
12. A suitable west-side site for a multi-college west campus health sciences teaching/learning center should be identified.

B. Housing

1. The number of beds on campus has increased by 40% over last 6 years. We may be able to add another 200-300 over next 10 years.
2. Surveys indicated that 25% of students would like to live on campus. We now have 15% of students on campus.

3. On-campus housing may not grow much unless there is enrollment growth, and enrollment growth might be via hybrid model with a slight decrease in on-campus presence.
4. A modest increase in on-campus housing (~ 200-300 beds) might be contemplated in the next 10 years.
5. The possibility of a mixed-use complex that would include married student/junior faculty housing and a retail services component could be considered, although this option has not been studied thoroughly.

C. Demographics and Enrollment Projects and Related Choices

1. There is a possibility that there could be a modest (~10%) increase in enrollment, but this is not a certainty. There might be an increase due to introduction of hybrid on-line/on-campus instruction.
2. The campus master plan should address the possibility that sites will be needed to increase day care services for infants and children of adult learners.
3. The campus needs to provide ready access for future students who will participate in hybrid education models. For example, if there were 5,000 FTE engaged in this aspect of the curriculum, they would need to be able to find facilities when they periodically come to campus. The needs of these students should be considered in the way that the master plan addresses way-finding and identity issues.
4. Consideration should be given to development of a shared-use cultural center facility to highlight and celebrate the diversity of its student body. This could be in a stand-alone building, but it might also be possible to accommodate the centers in existing auxiliary buildings.
5. There is sufficient capacity on campus to deal with any foreseeable need for additional student affairs and academic advising/tutoring services.

This statement was prepared by Jim Foerster.

The major points outlined in these assumptions reflect the outcome of a February of 2008 meeting of the UIC Campus Master Plan Executive Committee.