Student Relations Advisory Committee

Friday, March 12, 2004

Bates Room – Michigan Union

12:00-1:30pm

Approved April 2, 2004

Present: Barbara MacAdam (Chair), Gregg Gunnell, Carl Akerlof, Al Burdi, Royster Harper, Simone Taylor, Annette Haines, Susan Hollar, Frank Cianciola, Jong-Jin Kim, Tiffany Pak

Absent: Martin Gold, Marilynn Rosenthal, Jens Zorn, Ed Willis, Jesse Knight

Meeting began at 12:15pm

1. Approval of Minutes from 1.30.04 meetings

Minutes from January meeting approved

2. Proposed Timeline from MSA for 2004-2005 SSRR Amendment Process

(see pink handout)

Proposed statement of amendments will occur in November, followed by discussion through December and January.

We will invite Lyric Chen and Priya Mahajan from the MSA Student Rights Commission to come to our meeting in April to get more information about the process. We will also invite Keith Elkin from OSCR to review the process and the proposed new timeline with us. We need to ensure that all groups who can submit proposals understand and can work within the proposed timeline.

Is SACUA willing to be on the same timetable as the one proposed? This is a reasonable process, definitely a workable roadmap. It is not a legal deadline, rather it is more of an outline, especially because it is hard to predict/control something that may happen in the future.

3. Residential Life Initiative Update – Vice President Harper
• Housing System will face a renovation and new construction of residence halls
• 20-year time frame in line
• 95% freshmen, 46% sophomores live in the residence halls
• 60% international in family housing
• Currently we have a wide range of architectural structures

The planning process occurred in 3 inter-related phases:

1. Discovery: institutional scan, market research (supply and demand, student surveys), local market analysis, peer benchmarking (of other universities)
2. Analysis: building by building review, preliminary capital and operating budgets – get a sense of what our needs are, what are program requirements
3. Draft Recommendations: financial (what can we afford?), facility (what kinds of changes do we need to make?), and program plans (how do we leverage what is unique to each building?)

Three key themes: improve intellectual climate, increase faculty presence, increase length of stay

Research was gathered through: surveying students, dining survey, local competitors (rental properties, retail food outlets), peer benchmarking (11 institutions), and looking at comparability

4 major drivers for housing renewal and new construction

1. Condition (what’s appropriate investment?)
2. Capacity (how many students should we house?)
3. Composition (what’s ideal mix of class levels in the hall?)
4. Program (what is need to enhance student’s learning in residence halls?)

*These drivers come with the assumption that the housing capacity will increase

*We have not invested more because we have been trying to keep costs down

KEY FINDINGS – MARKET RESEARCH

• There is an incremental demand for suite or apartment style units
• The supply of traditional double and single rooms is adequate – this would balance what we currently have
• There has been a steady decline in single graduate students in housing
• Composition change: number of upper class and graduate students in the residence halls has been steadily decreasing

How do we create an environment with smaller community of students with upper-classmen support?

• Programming: creating small living communities within halls
• 20-25 student communities: including upper-class advisor, and a shared common space
• Facility design can encourage a sense of community, making a large institution smaller, shared safety and security awareness
• Building on the concept of neighborhoods – there is something unique in this facility

We currently have 5 distinct neighborhoods:

1. North (amenities, transportation, social life)
2. Family housing
3. Hill
4. East
5. Central

Current plans:

• Reinvest to preserve assets
• First priority is undergraduates
• Creative small living communities within existing halls, and where it is appropriate
• Move to contemporary standards
• Suite or apartment-style for new housing
• Upgrade technology infrastructure (network connections)
• Improve dining efficiencies and satisfy student preferences
• Reduce and rethink current dining facilities

Renovate selected halls in priority order

§ Continue fire-life safety upgrades

§ Address ‘most at risk’ halls (Mosher Jordan, Stockwell, West Quad)
§ Address halls when swing space can maintain capacit

Construct new housing

· Assess appropriate increase in beds

· New construction should add suite-apartment style to inventory

Other issues:

International graduate students also an important issue

· These students currently live on north campus & family housing
· Northwood I, II, and III could be reconfigured for upper-classmen and single graduate students
· This will create 600 internal swing spaces
· Oxford Housing could also accommodate single graduate students

Campus community team also looking at off-campus housing

· Encouraging thoughtful stewardship when students move off campus
· Challenging landlords in a different way
· Helping change accommodations for students

Academic spaces within residence halls would come from renovated dining spaces

Update on Housing Director Search:

· There were 12 candidates in December
· We narrowed it down to 4 candidates, who were interviewed in February
· VP office making a decision at this point

Meeting Adjourned at 1:40pm

Minutes submitted by

Tiffany Pak

SACUA SRAC Student Intern