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Big Picture

1. Student Experience
   - Curriculum
   - Student Housing
   - Diversity/Advising/Living Learning

2. Connecting the Campuses
   - Enhancing collaborations on the Ithaca campus
   - Enhancing collaborations between the campuses

3. Investment in Academics
   - Mounting multi-disciplinary initiatives that distinguish Cornell
   - Provide a sense of momentum that facilitates recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty
   - Balancing central and college priorities
## Efforts Underway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Academic Investment</th>
<th>Connect Cornell</th>
<th>Student Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary Initiatives</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Year Financial Plan</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Initiative</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Initiative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinge Project</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unification</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Housing

- Scope of the Problem
  - Deferred Maintenance
  - Swing Space
  - Sophomore Demand
  - Dining
  - Collegetown

- Framing the Solution

- Options

- Next Steps
Cornell-Owned Housing Occupancy
Undergraduate

46% of undergraduates live in Cornell’s residence halls and co-ops

*48% including Cornell-owned fraternities and sororities

- Freshmen
  - Occupancy: 99%
  - Enrollment: 3,000

- Sophomores
  - Occupancy: 59%
  - Enrollment: 3,500

- Juniors
  - Occupancy: 21%
  - Enrollment: 4,000

- Seniors
  - Occupancy: 11%
  - Enrollment: 4,500
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTAL TRAJECTORY

On-Campus
- FIRST-YEAR
  - Housed in traditional residence halls on North Campus
  - Centralized dining
- SOPHOMORE
  - More variety of housing options including North Campus, West Campus, Greek system, and co-ops
  - Various dining options

Off-Campus*
- JUNIOR
- SENIOR

*Accommodated in co-ops, Greek system, program houses, and West Campus as space is available
FULL IMPLEMENTATION

Cornell’s Housing Master Plan:

- Creates swing space for renovations and addresses critical deferred maintenance
- Addresses sophomore housing demand to alleviate lottery tension and pressure on the local housing market
- Creates a desirable, attractive sophomore “village” on North Campus that is distinct from West Campus
- Increases capacity of dining to support student growth on North Campus
Framing the Problem

- **Deferred Academic Investment**
  - Constrained academic budgets
  - No central strategic flexibility

- **Deferred Capital Investment**
  - Programmatic investment – BME and CIS
  - Academic buildings – McGraw, etc/
  - Existing student housing
  - Insufficient capacity – sophomores and swing space
## Constraint 1: Tuition Per Ugrad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gross UG Tuition</th>
<th>Aid from Unrest. Funds</th>
<th>% Unrest. Discount</th>
<th>Aid from Endow. &amp; Gifts</th>
<th>Total Cornell Grant Aid</th>
<th>% Total Discount</th>
<th>Net UG Tuition</th>
<th>Per-student Net Tuition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>$411.5</td>
<td>$79.0</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>$34.1</td>
<td>$113.1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$332.5</td>
<td>$24,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>$445.3</td>
<td>$111.3</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>$35.2</td>
<td>$146.5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$334.0</td>
<td>$24,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>$470.4</td>
<td>$111.8</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>$67.4</td>
<td>$179.2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$358.6</td>
<td>$25,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>$496.1</td>
<td>$138.1</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>$66.3</td>
<td>$204.4</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$358.0</td>
<td>$25,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>$531.4</td>
<td>$145.1</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>$79.0</td>
<td>$224.1</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$386.3</td>
<td>$27,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>$561.6</td>
<td>$161.7</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>$76.6</td>
<td>$238.3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$399.9</td>
<td>$28,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$592.7</td>
<td>$155.1</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>$78.3</td>
<td>$233.4</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$437.6</td>
<td>$30,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$623.2</td>
<td>$196.5</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>$38.6</td>
<td>$235.1</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$426.7</td>
<td>$29,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$644.4</td>
<td>$186.8</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>$44.3</td>
<td>$231.0</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>$457.6</td>
<td>$31,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17 Forecast</td>
<td>$677.0</td>
<td>$198.5</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>$40.8</td>
<td>$239.3</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$478.5</td>
<td>$33,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Constraint 2: Financial Aid Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% Unrestr. Grant</th>
<th>% Rest. Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Pennsylvania</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Chicago</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sorted in descending order of % Unrestricted Grant
Framing the Solution

- Business as usual (tuition increases, FA policy, modest salary growth, cost constraints) is not a path to addressing challenges

- Need a responsible and creative solution that balances objectives

- Fundamental principles:
  - Do not sacrifice one type of investment for the other
  - Do not predicate building projects on future philanthropy
  - Have a solid revenue plan for commitments
General Plan

- Build dorms to provide swing space, more sophomore capacity, and new students
- Modest enrollment will enable construction financing without constraining academics
- Student growth will come with more faculty and staff
- Growth in student body will generate funds for academic investments
Housing Plan Details

- Increase freshman intake by 250-275 students
- Couple with analysis of Gateway Course issues and efforts to decrease class size
- Initiate capital project on North campus for 1250 beds and new Dining; Complete by Fall 2020
- Renovate Balch
- Partner with others to improve Collegetown
Again: Why Increase Freshman Class?

1. Provides funds for academic investment

2. Addresses shifts in college enrollments

3. Accommodates new academic programs

4. Solves a major student life problem
Undergraduate Enrollment Growth

- Each admitting College has requested more freshmen admits

- Major College Needs
  - CAS at historic low as percentage of total and students taking more CIS and Business courses
  - Engineering added BME
  - CCB growth (Hotel and Dyson requesting more students for many years)
  - CALS growth to offset Dyson revenue loss
  - Loss of state revenue in contract colleges (ILR and HE requesting more students)
Potential Downsides

- Potential drop in USN&WR Rankings
- Class size increases
- Exacerbate gateway course issues
- Potential downgrade of bond rating
Undergraduate Enrollment Growth
Possible USWNR Rankings Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Impacted by Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Expenditures Per Student</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Class size</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Student to Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19%
Discussions to Date

1. Fall ‘15: Leadership discussions on deferred maintenance and housing; Discussions with UFC and FPC; U3 Consulting engaged for student housing master plan; Provost’s Capital Planning Committee established to prioritize deferred maintenance projects

2. Spring ‘16: BoT discussion of academic and facilities challenges


4. September ‘16: Discussion with BoT, Executive Committee, and Finance Committee Chairs; UFC Discussion; Joint meeting of Finance and Executive Committee of BoT. 2.5 hr discussion - recommendation to go forward with full plan

5. October-November ‘16: U3 Final report; Presentation to Deans – agreement on scale of student increase; Presentation to Academic Affairs and Student Life; Presentation to Full Board; Faculty Senate; SA; UA; GPSA
Components of Proposed Overall Solution

- **Academic**
  - Achieve academic program investment
  - Grow revenues in the Colleges

- **Capital**
  - Investment in repairing academic buildings/classrooms
  - Program investment – BME, BME
  - New student housing
  - Renovations of existing dorms
  - Work on Collegetown (safety and affordability)
$300M Faculty Initiative Campaign

- Tight focus on faculty needs
- Grow the endowment
- Unite campuses around a common cause
- Explore challenge feasibility
- Hunter launches and successor completes
- Anticipate next comprehensive campaign
Trustee-Related Next Steps

1. Discussions with BoT Regarding New Debt
2. Discussions with New President
3. BoT Approve Capital Plan
4. Initiate Capital Plan
5. Initiate Campaign – Investing in Faculty
Faculty-Related Next Steps

○ Work with curriculum committees on liberal education and gateway courses strategies

○ On Provost task force identify priorities for academic buildings and classroom investments

○ BME, BS&CB, and CIS faculty work on plans for new and growing programs

○ On Task Forces identify opportunities to recruit outstanding faculty in multi-disciplinary initiatives
Questions?