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ABSTRACT

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT THROUGH CITY-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS:
ENVISIONING AN EDUCATION DISTRICT IN SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

SEPTEMBER 2015

MOHAMMED M. ABDELAAL, B.A, BOSTON ARCHITECTURAL COLLEGE, BOSTON,
MASSACHUSETTS
M.R.P., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Mark Hamin

This thesis examines the impact of planning a potential new urban university campus in Springfield, Massachusetts on the city’s long term goals for urban revitalization. By exploring a collaborative and community-oriented process for higher-educational development, I propose a dynamic model that could work as a catalyst for urban revitalization.

The study will focus on the following: developing partnerships between the city of Springfield (government, community, local groups) and major educational institutions (such as the University of Massachusetts system); identifying potential sites suitable for the anticipated urban/mixed-use campus or compound; and studying and analyzing the forces within the city (neighborhoods around site) that would inspire and shape the ideal concept for a campus master plan.

I will use four major research strategies: (1) Developing a partnership that is to be both interactive and instructive, (2) selecting and analyzing three or more best practice case studies, (3) analyzing the existing conditions in Springfield, particularity the surroundings of selected sites, and, (4) a critically and professionally developed urban design vision for the right kind of university campus in Springfield that would highlight the main ideas and conclude with a master
plan as part of the overall recommendations of this research. Data are collected from books, journals, interviews, newspapers, website sources, and other published reports using a mixed-methods case-study approach. I expect that the study of this topic and the urban design programming and work associated with it would yield a successful model for campus planning and be potentially adopted or adapted by others in the future.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Overview

According to *College Planning & Management* magazine, all colleges and universities in the United States combined completed approximately $136 billion worth of new construction, additions, and renovations in the past ten years (2004 through 2014), and a total of $12 billion in 2014 alone.\(^1\) Funding and finances for higher education are not the focus of this research. These numbers, however, give a strong indication of the large amount of spending in higher education planning, construction and infrastructure development. This large volume of investment and the growing awareness of the importance of higher education development is an encouraging starting point. This study intends to explore how planning higher-education development could be a successful strategy for urban redevelopment in distressed urban centers.

In the past few decades, a number of urban problems have become common in some U.S. cities. Cases of declining urban life, troubled housing markets, slowing economic growth, lack of community engagement and programs, and higher unemployment rates are but only a few observed examples. Cities and urban centers are continuously seeking to address these problems with various planning strategies that aim to create better public services, higher growth rates, and an appropriate kind of urban revitalization. The City of Springfield, Massachusetts is an example that fits this category.

Less than ten years ago, the City of Springfield went through an economic crisis and budget deficit. In the past few years, however, the city has managed to show some signs of recovery with several examples of positive economic growth and urban improvement—more projects in the areas of government, higher education, health care, and public transportation. My research will focus on studying the city’s plans to invest in higher education as a means of sparking urban redevelopment, stimulating the economy, and fostering a progressive social environment. As a concrete example of that, in the fall of 2014, the University of Massachusetts (UMass) in Amherst, the flagship institution of the UMass system, in collaboration with the city of Springfield, announced the opening of the UMass Center in downtown Springfield. The Center offers classes in many fields of study to local Springfield college-age students for whom commuting to the main campus to take classes is a challenge. The Massachusetts and Springfield public officials as well as the UMass administrators have endorsed this decision and have been inviting students to enroll.\(^2\)

In reference to the new UMass satellite center in Springfield, there is a lot of enthusiasm and hope by all stakeholders: the city, the institution, and the community. However, only after knowing the actual student enrollment in the next few semesters will the parties involved get a true indication of the community’s reception of this new center. Student participation and feedback is essential to evaluate the initial success. It is expected that many local students who are enrolled in the nearby community colleges will be motivated to take advantage of the academic opportunities offered through the UMass system in their own backyard. However, there is always the uncertainty of starting a new project such as this one. In my thesis, I will research this city-university partnership as a prerequisite for success that will entail exploring the role of the university as an urban redeveloper. I also plan to dedicate a part of my research

to developing an urban design proposal envisioning a master plan for a fully developed\(^3\) higher education district in Springfield.

I will study how developing a vision, a master plan, for a higher educational infrastructure could become an asset for planning an actual university. I plan to use the case at hand, the opening of the UMass Center at Springfield, as an inspiration, not just to me, but to local partners as well, to imagine how, where, and what-if a university campus could exist in Springfield! In order to produce a master plan at some point, a complete process of research, data collection, programming, planning, and conceptual design is needed. For that purpose, the study will include the following:

- Studying City University relations and collaboration efforts
- Studying the history and principles of campus planning
- Analyzing the presence of an urban university campus and its role in inspiring opportunity, investment, and development;
- Analyzing best practice case studies of university campuses that have achieved successful city-university collaborations;
- Analyzing the socioeconomic profile of the city of Springfield;
- Analyzing existing higher educational institutions in Springfield and vicinity;
- Developing suitable academic programs;
- Exploring a planning process that will include site selection and urban context analysis.
- Utilizing Geographic Information System (GIS) technology for planning purposes

\(^3\) “Fully developed” here is used only hypothetically and not as a final physical plan, program, or design.
Research Questions

1. Related to city-university partnership:
   a. How could the planning of an urban university campus, in collaboration with partners, be a catalyst for development in a city?
   b. What is the best approach to engage the city-university-community into partnership?
   c. What are the university’s desired structure, programs, and goals (examples: educational programs, partnership with city and local business, contribution to Springfield’s economic growth)?

   Answers to these questions will be attained through interviews, joint meetings with city representatives, UMass administrators, local community leaders and developers, the literature review, and from the case studies.

2. Related to Campus Planning:
   a. How are university campuses planned in the U.S.?
   b. How can the proposed campus potentially contribute to the quality of Springfield’s urban life? (Examples: urban integration, quality of life and culture, energizing the regional economy through partnership, transportation, and sustainability).
   c. What urban design strategies could be applied to promote a higher quality education district?
   d. What is the desired program and size of the campus and what time range is reasonable for this plan?
3. Related to Case Studies:
   a. What are the selection criteria of best practice case studies?
   b. What lessons can be learned?
   c. Which model could help in achieving the objectives of the thesis?

4. Related to Analysis of Urban Context:
   a. How can the study of Springfield’s conditions (existing urban fabric/infrastructure, development projects, and other socio-economic profile relevant data) influence and inform a master plan for a university satellite campus?
   b. What is needed to develop the ideal master plan for a higher educational institution in Springfield? What are all relevant requirements and considerations?

**Propositions**

- The city of Springfield needs more higher-educational institutions (student body, faculty, and staff) for better and more progressive urban development and for growth and opportunities. Investing in higher education, scientific research, and other related activities (housing, commercial, and support projects) is an ideal approach to promote a better workforce and sustainable economic development.
- Creating active partnerships between the City, the University, and the local Community is essential to establish a best practice model for urban redevelopment.
- Envisioning a master plan for an education district in Springfield is an essential process toward achieving the goal of this research: it will raise awareness about the need for
this type of urban development, and it will communicate efficiently a practical model that can be used to support economic and urban development.

**Proposition I**

"Planning higher educational institutions in redeveloping urban centers" is a main strategy for urban revitalization

**Proposition II**

Commitment to creating "city-university partnership" is a prerequisite for success with such a strategy

**Proposition III**

Setting an inclusive "process of master-planning" is needed for demonstrating and achieving Propositions I and II

*Figure 1-1 Research Propositions*
Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations

• Developing here only a simplified form of partnership that does not fully represent the required lengthy process, which could include: identifying all stakeholders, conducting multiple meetings, developing relevant agenda, and discussing and identifying scope of work and development.

• My partial selection of data, references, sources, given the large pool of materials available that touches the subject from various perspectives.

• Time constraints for a planning work that needs multiple years that surpass the limited time available to finish thesis work.

• Individual undertaking of research work that would require teams and groups of people to do in an authentic undertaking.

Delimitations

• Interest in this topic came about through the inception of the UMass Center at Springfield.

• Current and emerging trends in higher education that include collaboration in planning and the role of universities in economic development are important factors that helped frame the research topic.

• My personal experience in architectural design and construction, and my professional experience in campus planning and resent study in the department of regional planning all enforced the selection of and work on this particular topic.
• Early findings of search results helped define the scope of the work and further exposure and reading of details; multiple revisions led to a further narrowing of the topic, which ended up with a more specifically delineated thesis and title.

**Research Method**

**Mixed Research Method**

A mixed research method seems appropriate within the context of this thesis given the adopted scope of work and the general aims, objectives, and propositions. The research will include work on the following:

1. **Literature Review:** Identifying, engaging, and analyzing relevant literature on the topic;
2. **Case Studies:** Selection and analysis of three best-practice case studies;
3. **Use of Quantitative Data:** Some reports from the literature provide data that are already collected and analyzed objectively. Research will include analyzing Springfield’s socio-economic profile, which will influence and guide my observations, evidence, and recommendations for redevelopment. Also, working with GIS will allow for use of geo-data, which is an ideal tool to visually map, analyze, and plan the selected sites.
4. **Qualitative Analysis:** Tools will include stakeholder conversations (one on one – arranging meetings with stakeholders), field notes, observations, and description/analysis of literature and existing research on the subject. It will also include selection, evaluation, and analysis of best practice case studies.
5. **Urban Planning Analysis:** Developing the preliminary work for the master planning of an urban university campus that incorporates all the above research, analysis, and findings.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

City-University Partnerships

The Role of the University in Urban Revitalization

There is no doubt, universities in the past, present, and future, represent one of the most important cultural manifestations that lead to progress, development and reform in a society. “Higher education, including the research complex... has become the most critical single feature of modern society.” Learning, training, preparing students for a highly competitive job market, in addition to being large employers themselves, universities continue to successfully act as generators of and contributors to the local economy of a city at the same time. Conceptually, the more a society expands its collective knowledge, the more investments that society will need to dedicate for the purpose of expanding that knowledge. Investing in higher education, and in expanding and maintaining the different fields of knowledge, have already become an established value and customary policy in advanced societies. There is an increasing awareness that for a society to head successfully towards the future, its members must be very well-equipped with the right kind of knowledge and the various scientific and technological tools that are needed for that journey.

The first part of this research will focus on building a collaborative partnership between universities and their hosting neighborhoods for the purpose of urban development. This subject, referred to in this research as “university-city partnerships (or collaborations),” is a part of a broader research topic: universities as real estate developers, considered by 21st century experts to be new or unexplored. One relevant piece of literature that addresses the research of

---

4 Talcott Parsons in David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel, eds., The University as Urban Developer: Case Studies and Analysis (Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2005), 3.
this thesis is David C. Perry and Wim Wiewel’s work: *The University as Urban Developer*. The book successfully researches a wide range of interdisciplinary topics that include: urban development, real estate, higher education administration, urban design, and campus planning. The research method presented in the book, as well as many of the 15 case studies identified, is studied here to help guide or clarify my research with this emerging academic and practice-oriented subject. General literature on this subject includes the following: the history of planning and building land-grant universities in the U.S.; the controversial relationship between university campuses and their localities, (traditionally referred to as ‘town-gown’); the significance of the university for the Society; the recent planning trend of building university-city partnerships in urban development efforts.\(^5\)

In urban reform literature, it is becoming more of an established paradigm, in academia and in private and public sectors, that investing in universities and their environments is essential to the overall health and wealth of a society. One main argument that many scholars in the past two decades have adopted is that the university can no longer be isolated from its surrounding community, nor even “intellectually” from other parts of the world.\(^6\) Perry and Wiewel identified more related themes:

The urban university is an urban institution—not only in terms of the transmission of knowledge, but in many other ways as well. The “university of the city” (Bender 1998; Cisneros 1995) with a “land grant mission” (McDowell 2001; Crooks 1982) serving as an “engaged” institution (Kellogg Commission 1999; Harkavy and Puckett 1994; Maurrasse 2001) with “urban goals” (Klotche

---

\(^5\) Perry and Wiewel, *The University*.  
\(^6\) Perry and Wiewel, *The University*. 4
1966; Nash 1973; U.S. Congress House Committee on Banking; Finance and Urban Affairs 1992; U.S. Congress House Committee on Education and Labor 1977; Grobman 1998) is a recurring theme of academic leadership and literature, especially in the late twentieth century.7

The influence of academic institutions on their local environment, economy, and development (usually referred to as “town gown” relations) is perceived to be a controversial one: at times, universities are criticized for being isolated (ivory tower) from the surrounding community without proper or sufficient contribution or, even worse, as giant institutions that eat-up and take advantage of the local real estate market in a city; at other times, they are praised for being a strong contributor to the local economy and even the main factor behind the social and economic prosperity of a city or town.8 In the opening of her book, Judith Rodin argues that urban universities “have not been the most agreeable neighbors. At best, their involvement with adjacent communities has been intermittent and inconsistent.”9 As far as my research is concerned, and given the situation of the city of Springfield and the UMass system, in addition to the positive announcement of the new satellite campus by both entities, I anticipate that the town-gown collaboration in this case ought to be quite a successful one. Further research and investigation of the history of town-gown relations can clarify and hopefully support this assumption, but more importantly, identify common problems and challenges to be avoided in order to successfully plan a new campus in the future.

The practice of the university as real estate developer has been documented with several examples. Perry and Wiewel note in their book, The University as Urban Developer, that

7 Ibid. 4.
9 Ibid., 3.
like real estate developers’ large city projects, whole campus construction in urban areas often
displaces residents and businesses but may still lead to positive changes for the neighborhood
and even the city as a whole. Examples of this are the Auraria Higher Education Center in
Denver, the Tacoma Campus of the University of Washington, the University of Illinois at
Chicago, and Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis.10 Furthermore:

The research activities of universities continue to expand; student numbers are
at or near all-time highs; and the expectation on universities to provide housing,
social activities, and support services continues to grow. Over time these
projects can have a significant effect on the neighborhoods surrounding the
campus.11

On the role of the university in community economic development, Evan Dobelle,
former CEO of the New England Board of Higher Education, noted in a speech to the Brookings
Institution in 1998, that the university is a “sleeping giant”. He added: “The nation’s more than
4,000 universities and colleges are place-based anchors in their local economies, with
considerable sunk capital costs that make moving almost impossible. As a result, universities
have a strong economic stake in the health of their surrounding communities.”12 A more specific
related theme is the university’s role in economic development. In regards to the
academic/research institutions in the U.S. and their budgets, the Initiative for a Competitive
Inner City (ICIC) reports that “...as of 1996 urban universities were spending about $136 billion

---

10 Perry and Wiewel, The University, 300.
11 Ibid., 301.
12 Steve Dubb and Ted Howard, "Linking Colleges to Communities: Engaging the University for Community
on salaries, goods, and services, which is more than nine times what the federal government spends in cities on job and economic development.”

Perry and Wiewel applauded the argument that the impact of universities “on central cities remains relatively unexplored,” and recognized the reality of “internal logic of development,” where the focus of university administrators is mostly on the institution’s members such as faculty, students, alumni, and donors, with less consideration for the external impact of the institutions. Perry and Wiewel argue:

Because universities are among the largest landowners and employers in cities, as well as major consumers of private goods and public services, they have a host of external constituents. Both indirectly, in light of the institution’s educational mission, but quite directly and dramatically, in terms of the university’s physical location, economic relations, and political demands, these constituencies often assert every bit the same level of claims on the university as they do on the firm, the church, or public agencies in the city.

From this general basis, Perry and Wiewell assembled groups of “scholars, academic leaders, university development experts, practitioners, real estate development specialists, and community leaders” to construct and evaluate various case studies of urban universities. They argue that this “is one of the first efforts to treat university real estate development” and is “a new area of academic as well as applied inquiry.” The authors identify four ways that lead to a contribution to this new university arena of activity, two of which are relevant to this thesis.

---

14 Ibid., 5-6.
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research: first, “how the university, through its land and building policies, embeds itself in the larger urban development process,” and second, how it establishes “a critical or evaluative tradition within which to build a long-standing and reflective understanding of the university as developer.”

Exclusion from Literature

Funding and Financing:

It would be useful to briefly include some general figures of cost estimates related to the anticipated size of the development since it would give some idea of the financial needs for this undertaking. It’s important to state, however, that searching for funding sources, methods, and any other related details and studies is well outside the scope of this study. For this reason it will not be included in this research.

Collaboration for Sustainability:

Another area of research that addresses university community collaboration is defined by sustainability scientists as “collaboration for sustainable transformation of urban environments.” This is a more specific approach to studying the role of the university in urban reform (or transformation as defined by specialists in the field). It focuses specifically on the university’s partnership with governments and industrial and scientific corporations for sustainable urban development. “The logic behind this call for collaboration is the recognition that no single actor or organization possesses the all-encompassing knowledge, resources or
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capacity to solve complex, interwoven sustainability problems on their own."\(^{18}\) The argument for collaboration, quoted above, is self-evident, and is precisely true for other forms of community-university partnerships, including the one discussed in this thesis. “Collaboration for sustainability” as an area of focus is excluded from the literature because of its different scope and research methods, and because it doesn’t directly address the main questions of this thesis.

**Town-Gown Conflicts:**

Despite the history of conflicts between universities and their hosting communities, and the problems, causes, and solutions associated with this area, it appears with little doubt, as far as the selected geographical context for this thesis, that as far as the City of Springfield and its communities are concerned, the role of the university as a force of urban revival and a land use developer is quite welcomed. Both representatives of the City of Springfield and the UMass System stated during the public announcement of the opening of the Center that building partnerships and collaborations are a priority for all parties (please refer to Chapter 4, basic data on the opening of the UMass Center in Springfield). Also, the study of town-gown conflicts is more appropriate for communities that have had existing university campuses for decades with various problems, and this is not the case in this thesis. Further discussion of this theme could be useful perhaps only to refer to the changing attitude of urban universities from the classical isolated “ivory towers” image to a more engaged urban campus that contributes to a city’s economy, growth, and urban reform. In addition to the irrelevance of town-gown conflicts to the specific case of Springfield, this thesis attempts to explore a new model for university community relationships, in which collaboration is included from the planning phase of the effort —an effective strategy to avoid conflicts.

\(^{18}\) Ibid.
Greater University Role in Urban Development

In his article, *Goodbye Ivory Towers, Hello Urban Campus*\(^{19}\) published in a Canadian architectural magazine, Rhys Phillips presents very strong arguments for a practical university involvement in fostering opportunities and growth in urban settings. He says:

Indeed, Richard Florida, U of T's superstar on the creative economy and its relationship to urban quality, warned in an article in “The Globe and Mail” back in 2008, that universities are more likely to be net exporters of knowledge than net importers. He concludes: "Rather than as an "engine" of development, then, think of the university as an ecosystem or infrastructure for a knowledge-driven, creative economy. The key to the future lies in building stronger bridges between universities and their surrounding communities.\(^{20}\)

He also highlighted the important concepts of building “human capital,” attracting “knowledge workers and their companies,” improving the “quality of urban life,” and the strategic role that the university could play in achieving this. The article presents a few case studies that demonstrated the strongly emerging trend of universities becoming more involved in creating the right kind of knowledge-based economy and urban development, where students, faculty, and personnel are a part of the overall enhancement of urban life, positively mixing with the local community.

In *The University as Urban Developer*, Perry and Wiewel amassed research on 15 case studies. Out of the 15, the following group bears some resemblance to my research topic: The University of Washington, Tacoma; Auraria Higher Education Center; the University of
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\(^{20}\) Ibid.
Pennsylvania; Temple University; and Georgia State University in Atlanta. I will include them in a larger list of case studies, some of which are only briefly presented in the literature review, and finally only three will be selected for a further analysis in this thesis. Most case studies on university urban development practices identified in Perry and Wiewel’s book are addressing existing relations between universities and their communities, with examples of how both the town and the university have successfully come a long way in realizing the need for establishing a working partnership. This is different from the case of Springfield where we propose a partnership aimed at setting up a vision for an entirely new academic institution with a mission for economic and urban redevelopment. With the new UMass Satellite Center in Springfield, both the city and the UMass system have already planted the seed for partnership, which reflects a strong interest in planning more academic (and complementary nonacademic) activities in the city. This partnership, with an absence of the historical town-gown conflicts, and with such a promising support from most stakeholders, gives hope to the likelihood that the partnership will proceed with a steady pace for successful development opportunities. The apparent realization of the need for building city-university partnerships could generate a wide range of activities associated with planning (and hopefully building) academic facilities, such as: employment, commercial and housing starts, urban life, sports, and cultural and artistic activities for the benefit of the university’s members and the local residents of the city.

The University of Washington, Tacoma exemplifies the way a university acts as a strong player in central business district (CBD). UW Tacoma considered 20 locations before narrowing the search to four sites. The final site choice was “hailed . . . as an important step for downtown’s economic renaissance.” The land purchasing process started in 1990, and by
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2002, the university had acquired 65 percent of the land for approximately $20 million. However, UW Tacoma opened its doors in 1997. Two years after land acquisition began (beginning in 1995) and for the next seven years, the university undertook the building project, which included warehouse renovation and new construction, at a cost of nearly $100 million, which resulted in a core campus of 12 buildings.\textsuperscript{23}

Historic preservation of abandoned buildings and warehouses has been a central component to the planning work of the UW Tacoma campus. Coffey and Dierwechter cited the following:

Two important dimensions relate to UWT’s physical impact on Tacoma’s long-derelict inner-city neighborhood: the aesthetic and architectural qualities of the campus as a major project in historic preservation; and the functional design of the campus environment, particularly as it relates to reurbanization and integration in the immediate area (cf. Wansborough and Mageean 2000).\textsuperscript{24}

Building on existing assets and properties of historic value is a remarkable lesson that is to be enlisted for use in the Springfield case. This is quite useful both for establishing a character for the academic institution and for the aesthetic quality of the urban place. In the case of UW Tacoma, the architects preserved a large part of the warehouse exteriors, and inside are classrooms and offices.\textsuperscript{25}

As far as the UW Tacoma economic impact, Coffey and Dierwechter conducted their own surveys and collected data from various local sources. The growing population of both

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid, 83.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid, 84.
students and faculty has had a positive impact on overall spending habits, which helped the local economy.\(^\text{26}\) For a student population of 2000 in the 2001–2 academic year, “the total effect of spending in the UWT area, is estimated at $56,700 per week, or about $1.7 million over the three academic quarters.”\(^\text{27}\) The only remarkable (negative) observation however is that students and faculty spending took place on campus more than off campus, which is something that the research intends to address in the case of Springfield, where patterns of redevelopment are to be planned to a more balanced way, and to pay equal attention to other forms of urban development in properties adjacent to the academic environments.

Quite similar to the case we plan to examine in Springfield, “most community leaders agree that UWT has been a catalyst for continued development in the southern portion of downtown Tacoma. . .”\(^\text{28}\) In addition to two major development projects that preceded the opening of UWT, after the university opened, many associated developments quickly began to take place including: housing, a museum, a convention center, a new high school, various professional offices, and others; a causal relationship was established. “Besides the investment in the university itself, hundreds of millions of dollars in public and private investment in projects immediately surrounding the campus came on the heels of campus construction.”\(^\text{29}\)

Perry and Wiewel summarized, in more general terms, the role UW Tacoma played in the re-urbanization of Tacoma’s inner city in the following areas: “The university’s impact on historic preservation; the role of the university in promoting economic renewal; land use issues and concerns related to the development of the site; and the perceived role the university plays

\(^{26}\) Ibid., 87.  
\(^{27}\) Ibid., 87.  
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in community development, particularly as related to social welfare and equity.”\textsuperscript{30} Coffey and Dierwechter summarized these points in their conclusion of the study as follows:

UW Tacoma... is a classic example of bringing together the criteria that Jane Jacobs (1961) argues are necessary for healthy, viable urban districts... [bringing] about a degree of renewal, rehabilitation, and regeneration that is rare in most of America’s central cities... The city’s leadership in particular views the university as a key reason for the reversal of Tacoma’s overall fortunes—a significant contribution for an institution whose primary mission is social, not economic.\textsuperscript{31}

**University Development and Participating in Local Politics:**

“University real estate development is a political process.” Through several case studies, this statement by Perry and Wiewel describes how urban university development works. They argued that without real understanding of the local politics and the associated requirements, it becomes impossible for an academic institution to move forward with development, and that mobilizing political support is quite essential to set the institution’s goals, which are to build collaboration and perform negotiation with city and other public and private institutions.\textsuperscript{32} This political process cannot happen without a true commitment of the institutional leadership. A case study that illustrates this is Georgia State University, Atlanta, where a city without a downtown master plan “benefited from a university that took over the downtown planning process”—as part of a multi-billion dollar development project—“and became, through its own

\textsuperscript{30} Perry and Wiewel, 12.  
\textsuperscript{31} Coffey and Dierwechter, “The Urban University,” in Perry and Wiewel, *The University*, 95.  
\textsuperscript{32} Perry and Wiewel, *The University*, 13.
real estate redevelopment efforts, the lead institution in the overall central city redevelopment process.”

Other case studies that build on this concept are Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, the University of Louisville, and Saint Louis University. The common theme in all these academic institutions is “how university leaders are able to imbed their institutional development agendas into large citywide redevelopment agendas based on the arts, entertainment, sports facilities, and tourism.” These models of development required a leadership that valued building collaboration with “a citywide range of actors including private investors, federal agencies, and municipal and state governments.”

**Lessons from Previous Work on City University Relations:**

Perry and Wiewel summarized fourteen conclusions concerning city university relations. The following are the most relevant and can be useful to the process of my research:

1. Universities participate in real estate development to secure additional space and to improve the surrounding neighborhoods.

2. Urban projects that include university participation are generally successful (and profitable), but they usually take a long time and require long-term planning.

3. Success requires a strong commitment from leadership at the highest level.

4. Success also requires a good deal of in-house expertise and the ability to make decisions quickly.

5. Partnership comes with challenges, and many academic intuitions may choose to take the lead and work alone on development projects for financial reasons. However, private developers have the ability to work more quickly, which reduces project costs.
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6. City-university relations have improved in the past few decades “in terms of ethical criteria and principles of fairness and transparency.”

7. University and city government relations are reciprocal in most cases—both are important and necessary for each other.

8. Both public and private universities have similar development processes.

9. University projects take longer than private commercial projects because of the multiple levels of stakeholder involved and because of financing delays.36

Each of these points is described by the authors such that it can be restated as a hypothesis to be tested more formally. However, the most interesting recommendation for further research came in the closing paragraph of the book where the authors aimed for further research close to my specialist area of interest. They state:

Another area where more work would be useful is related to best practices and models for success from which practitioners might benefit. Clear case descriptions of planning process, the use of intermediaries, community involvement, development of relations with local government, and financing models are likely to be helpful to universities as they continue to expand in the future.37

**Recent Trends in Higher Education Planning**

“Partnership/Collaborations” and “Integrated Planning” are identified as key issues or “trends” by the Society for College and University Planning, SCUP, in its 2014 report on trends in  
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higher education. It is important to note that all continuing and emerging trends in higher education that the report includes are identified by all member academic institutions during the society’s annual conference and the five U.S. regional conferences. This fact confirms that all the new trends are true and relevant to all different regions in the nation as identified by experts and professional university planners. In addition to traditional partnerships such as university-community and university-business, this report identifies new areas of partnership and collaboration that include state and international entities and partnerships for “comprehensive learning models.” These emerging trends also include a new “Interdisciplinary educations model” that addresses changes in the campus culture both academically and physically to include more collaboration and multidisciplinary models of learning and the impacts these have on planning academic programs and space needs.

While realizing the significance of collaboration for creating an interdisciplinary educational model and the need for further discussion and study in that area, this particular point is relevant, but outside the scope of research. However, it could serve as an isolated research topic that aims at studying the impact of this new trend on new ways of allocating academic spaces and could function as well as a study of cross disciplinary arrangements for teaching and research. This would be truer for existing academic institutions that own existing properties and facilities that were not designed and built for the changing world of newly emerging trends in the sciences and technology and their multidisciplinary models of learning.

SCUP’s report directly addresses the university and its community as a continuing trend in higher education. The term University-community partnership is seen to encompass all of the following: university-city, university-business, university-community college, and university-

39 Ibid., 8.
secondary school partnerships. That is quite revealing. However, it is not possible for this thesis to address all these areas, each of which can be a topic for a narrowed investigation. Therefore, referring to university-city and university-community partnerships will continue to be used to express the subject.

The following points from the SCUP report (on campus-community collaborations) are relevant and will be incorporated in this research:

- The traditional term “town-gown” doesn’t reflect the complexity of today’s levels of collaboration, which include economic development; it needs to be replaced by a better description that more accurately reflects campus-community interactions and partnerships.
- Campus-community partnerships take many forms: city land donations, financial contributions, hospitals and health care, new campuses. Collaboration models may involve multiple campuses, business partners, city and other levels of government.
- Innovative partnerships between corporations and institutions are creating permanent research centers on campuses and technology parks as well as opportunities for collaborative research. The SCUP report sees this research model as an economy booster as it “creates new university/community research models, seeds the new employee pool with grad students, and potentially turns into exciting new ventures for their department or campus (e.g., Massachusetts Medical Device Development Center (M2D2 at University of Massachusetts Lowell).”
- New campuses are being established in a way that benefits and redevelops surrounding communities.
• Increased sharing of data across academic disciplines will impact how campuses are designed in the future.

• Integrated planning and design is reaching into pedagogy; hypothetical workshops model ways to bring IT, researchers, and facility staff together to address ways that they can merge their agendas to create flexible learning environments.

• Capital construction engages all constituent groups in the process, from the beginning of creating the master plan to actually making the decision to construct a building.

• Campus-community collaboration encourages collaboration within the institution, with other institutions, and with the government through the sharing of services (spaces, equipment, programs, transportation, human series, and offices).40

**University and Community Engagement:**

Steve Dubb, a higher education expert, compiled a summary of different kinds of community engagement efforts and practices undertaken by universities in the last two decades. That summary is a collection of feedback by university professors who research and teach community engagement. Figures of these diagrams are included here for reference as they highlight the main points that can be considered further by administrators and academic planners (See figures 2.1 through 2.3).
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It is not surprising that there are voices in academia that prefer the traditional model of the university as an “Ivory Tower”—where seclusion for scholarly research is the core value. In response to that, Dubb noted, “We believe that universities, as institutions that educate millions, employ over two percent of the American workforce, and have a joint purchasing power of over $350 billion a year, can do far more”\(^{41}\) than only academic research.

“Service-Learning” is seen as the most visible result of the rise of university community engagement programs. Service-learning is a “course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.”

Figure 2-2 The Service Learning Model

Source: Dubb and Howard 2007, 53.

Characteristics of Effective Partnership

City and Community: Community development is a main objective of the city of Springfield. For this reason, and for the purpose of this thesis, the city (such as the Office of Planning & Economic Development) is seen as the main representative of the community or public in the different sites and neighborhoods identified for this study. So, University-
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Community partnership and University-City partnership, despite being different, will be used interchangeably since identifying the political differences between the community and the city (as distinct stakeholders) is not the research focus of this thesis.

Building partnership takes time and effort and is a challenge. “...There is continuing difficulty around the issue of partnership goal setting and the articulation of one’s own expectations of the partnership.”44 Building a successful and effective partnership has a lot of requirements such as commitment; shared vision, mission and common goals; maintaining work on growth and development; fair sharing in benefits and profits; sharing in decision making, in funding, and in maintaining relevant development initiatives; community and public engagement; and continuous meetings and discussions.45 Many of these ideas or requirements for success will be incorporated in multiple ways, through the research method, and in setting the agenda and the shared vision for developing and planning the proposed campus.

**Campus Planning and Design - Planning Urban Universities**

**Origin and Meaning**

“The scholarship of campus design and planning” is the main area where past university development practice exists.46 This is the second main gateway to my thesis research. The term “campus,” its appearance, and what it involves is at the core of describing university development and practice47 The word origin and history of “campus”: "College grounds, 1774, from the Latin "campus" meaning "a field," probably properly "an expanse surrounded" (by
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woods, higher ground, etc.)... First used in a college sense at Princeton University."48 Using or defining the term “campus” is relevant to this thesis research. However, what is more important is not the term campus or its conventional meaning, but the study of how a collaborative partnership between the city and the university could yield a model, a plan, or a vision (not campus) of an academic institution that could become a catalyst and vivid nucleus for urban revival in Springfield. Perhaps, the classic meaning of the term “campus” is not significant anymore, at least in the context of this thesis, since it has always –traditionally– represented the concept of a distinct academic community (ivory tower) that is isolated from the city49, and this is precisely what this thesis challenges.

To Plan

The word origin and history of “planning,” from “plan”: “n. 1670s as a technical term in perspective drawing; 1706 as "drawing, sketch, or diagram of any object, "from French plan "ground plan, map, "literally "plane surface" (mid 16c.), from Latin planum "level or flat surface," noun use of adjective planus "level, flat" (see plane (n.1)). The notion is of "a drawing on a flat surface." Its meaning as a "scheme of action, design" was first recorded in 1706, possibly influenced by French planters "to plant," from Italian planta or "ground plan."50 As a noun the word plan is understood and used more to refer to a drawing, a sketch, a map, or a diagram, while as a verb, in addition to referring to producing the above graphic representations, it goes beyond that to include preparing, arranging, scheming or going through the process of developing specific programs, procedures and policies. American architect and art
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historian Paul Turner, in his book *Campus: An American Planning Tradition*, stated that:

“planning... can mean many different things, ranging from the design of a single building to the creation of a master plan involving many structures, their surrounding environment, and the gradual execution of the plan over a period of time.”

In this thesis, it is not the purpose to challenge the traditional meanings of neither plan nor campus. However, the broad meaning of both terms –more specifically for planning- allows for multiple interpretations. Within the higher education context, this thesis proposes a greater emphasis on practicing “planning” more like a creative act of envisioning (designing), informed by strong research and analysis, and enforced by a reciprocal city-university partnership.

**Contrast with Historical Models**

Planning and building university campuses (campus planning) in the U.S. changed dramatically from the colonial period —such as the extraordinary precedent of Thomas Jefferson, master builder of the University of Virginia, who “devised the curriculum..., selected the site, designed the buildings, wrote the specifications, supervised the construction, picked the first teachers, served as Rector, and in his last days rendered duty as the influential member of the Board of Overseers.”

Jefferson’s 18th century

---


‘master plan’ approach stands in contrast to the 21st century collaborative, inter-disciplinary, complex and continuous process presented in this research.

In the early days of planning university campuses in the U.S., the primary vision was to create what Jefferson called an “academical village” that offers a secluded educational environment with all its associated needs for students, faculty, and staff. The architect was not only responsible for designing the buildings but also creating the whole community (the English collegiate model): academic spaces, dormitories, dining halls, and recreational facilities. The buildings received much attention and were designed with a distinctive architectural character that highlighted the status of the academic mission and had an effect on its constituents.53

In addition to the classical concept of the “quad,”54 well established in Europe, green, wide, and open central lawns (mall) were almost always a requirement, and both were intended to create an enclosed space that encourages educational interaction and atmosphere or what we would call today “campus life.” Somewhere near the heart of the campus, there was the chapel and the library, highlighting their symbolic spiritual and educational significance. The spacious open and usually green campus with its remarkable architecture and landscapes has become a distinctive American campus-planning ideal. Le Corbusier wrote about it in 1933:

Figure 2-4 The Quad, 1606 at German University
Source: Dober, 2011, 77.

53 Turner, Campus, 3.
“Each college or university is an urban unit in itself, a small or large city, but a green city....The American university is a world in itself.”\textsuperscript{55}

The use of the term campus began with its Latin meaning of a field, but later the word assumed a wider meaning to refer to the property and all buildings on it.\textsuperscript{56} Turner argues that historians gave little attention to (neglected) the subject of campus planning because as of 1982, no work had been published on the history of campuses, and very little had been written about how campuses are planned or colleges and universities are designed. It is not the purpose of this thesis to investigate why that is because it is different subject, but also because the field of planning in general is multidisciplinary, complex, and more inclusive in nature, making it quite a very challenging task to do. Also, in many cases, especially in the past few decades, college campuses grew arbitrarily and disproportionality due to the complexity of programs, site conditions, funding circumstances, and other political factors. Turner divided the historical development of campus planning in the U.S., which he saw as—more as result rather than planning process—in the following six summarized types:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure_2-5_The_Green_Open_Lawn.jpg}
\caption{The Green Open Lawn}
\end{figure}

Source: Cornell University, Facilities Services.

\textsuperscript{56} Turner, \textit{Campus}, 4.
1. The open quadrangle university, forthrightly part of the towns they were in and of the society whose values they represented;

2. The nineteenth-century college in nature, often poised on a hill;

3. The informal, park-like campus plans of the early land-grant schools, reflecting populist values in reaction against the elitist formality of the classical college;

4. The Beaux-Arts organization of the new American university, with its complex and orderly system of parts;

5. The revival of the English medieval enclosed quadrangle, expressing the resurgence of conservative collegiate values;

6. The recent [1980s] campus plans generated by circulation patterns, reflecting the fluid and unpredictable nature of contemporary education.57

Today, with thousands of higher educational institutions in the U.S., the characteristics of university campuses vary widely; they are in rural or urban centers, with traditional or contemporary styles, with unified or dispersed layouts, compact or large in size, isolated from or connected with their hosting communities, with or without a master plan — and everything in between. To capture the characteristics and complexity of university campuses in the twenty-first century, a report published by the Society of College and University Planners states that the academic institution, “moves from traditional learning environments, to blended and online learning (cuts across technology, academic planning, institutional planning, and accreditations).”58 A detailed study of university campuses today (their planning, design, operations, complexity, and growth) would be highly useful. However, for the purpose and scope of this thesis only relevant planning models are included, (see Chapter 3: Case Studies).

57 Turner, Campus, 304–305.
58 SCUP, Report.
From Planning to Design

Professional architect and planner Richard P. Dober identified four factors needed to classify campus plans from a practical, non-historical/theoretical perspective: (1) The span of time of the plan from short to long term' (2) Areas encompassed by campus plans in terms of land use and the relation with neighboring communities; (3) the precision of the campus program from abstract to specific academic facility programs and construction projects; and (4) the characteristics of the design as linked to site and program and as an activity and as a result. These can be summarized here to describe the “plan” as a physical form in terms of: Time, Site, Program, and Design. Defining these four areas through a process that involves city-university collaboration is central to this research. Furthermore, a full inventory of all aspects of the institution’s operations the breakdown of the space requirements into smaller increments, and the use of “pilot planning” in the initial phases until a final development plan is done are common strategies. Typically, the university campus consists of the following main parts: Buildings, outdoor space, and supporting site elements such as utilities and circulation. When planning new campuses, Dober identified a process that includes: (1) Preliminary Programming for: Instructional facilities, Libraries and Museums , Research Facilities, Centers of extra-curricular life, Institutional services, Housing, Sports, recreation and physical education, Parking and circulation, Utility systems); (2) Preparation of a diagrammatic development plan; (3) Site selection criteria: size, condition, setting, accessibility, and cost; (4) Final development plans: land use arrangement, location of facilities, linkages; (5) Phase one project plans (Dober 1963 p.289).

59 Dober, Image and Identity, 46.
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A shift from the traditional model of campus planning in the U.S. (more particularly the post-World War II area of urbanism) was identified by Perry and Wiewel as developed by popular campus planners like Dober. They argue that "the development requirements of the modern urban campus are no longer served by a developmental celebration of traditional American pastoralism," in which the campus was seen as a "green carpet upon which buildings are placed." In response to this traditional method of planning and the town-gown conflicts that it caused, they argue: “The notion of campus is changing and the ways it is planned and built reflect new needs of the communities—both academic and urban—that study, work, or live in and otherwise use university-owned buildings and land." The reasons for this change are quite important. Perry and Wiewel argue that three reasons have caused "city wide planning, design, and development goals to become key elements of university development plans." They are: 1) the tradition of planning isolated/self-centered academic institutions that caused long-term town-gown conflicts; 2) The fading of “the traditional notion of the campus” due to changes in university real estate development policies and capital requirements that dictate more mixed-used projects with nonacademic uses; 3) The nature of today’s university development plans that are for “community and city redevelopment as well as educational projects.” This new trend of building academic-municipal partnerships was Perry and Wiewel’s gateway to a host of case studies on city-university, city-neighborhood, or city-community collaborations with successful urban land-used and regional development strategies.

Turner described a departure from the traditional model of a planning colleges and universities after World War II, a model that “usually produced a unified design, specific in its
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overall form and architectural character.”68 The new approaches are quite different as they were intended to respond to the complexity, unpredictability, and progressive nature of modern academic institutions. Formal unified plans were proven to be hard, even impossible, to fully execute without major changes. That led to adopting more flexible, long-term, and case-by-case approaches to campus planning. The focus shifted from the final form of the plan (desired by the master architect/planner or even the institution) to the process of planning itself.69

Setting a Vision for Changing Campus Planning Needs

Architect and campus planner, Lewis Roscoe, in his book “Planning the Campus: Planning Rationale, Process, and Organizational Structures for Colleges and Universities: Some Experiences at Cornell University, Recommendations for All,” identified key issues to be considered when planning higher educational institutions. Starting with how the 21st century’s changes in planning of campuses are shifting away from traditional, model colleges and universities, he states: “Universities will become more global, technology-driven, and more diverse, bringing together students from different cultures and age groups.”70 Teaching methods, learning environments, study subjects, and types of students are continually changing. He further added: “The need for planning to accommodate these changes will grow. Perhaps high-tech regional learning centers will be part of the answer.”71 Awareness of this change is essential in dealing with the reality of this time and age, so that campus planners can develop the right vision for long term planning strategies for educational institutions. In reference to the

68 Turner, Campus.
69 Ibid., 260.
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emerging trends in higher education, he adds: “Strong colleges and universities will develop mixed forms with upbeat and inspirational modern campuses offering distance options.”

Planning a campus is a very complex undertaking and in addition to the many details that are included, general fundamental considerations are to be clearly identified at the onset of the process: Long-term Planning and Change; Campus Visual Quality; Land-use and Density; Circulation, Traffic, Parking and Transportation; Growth; Landscape Planning; Campus and Neighborhood issues; a Participatory Campus-planning process. The Cornell Model of the campus planning process starts with the academic institution setting a campus planning policy, a campus-wide plan, a precinct plan, site selection, .... Later planning steps are excluded from this study because they deal with advanced planning phases related to particular project design and construction.

**Identifying Specialist Area in the Literature**

Three general topics converge in my thesis question: administration of academic institutions (mostly in the field of Education), planning universities for economic development (as related to policy planning), and the physical planning of university campuses (in terms of urban form and design). Discussing higher educational institutions such as universities, their history, administration, operation, mission and contribution to society is quite relevant to this research. Planning educational institutions, their facilities and academic programs and their many requirements are also relevant. However, the priority and focus of this thesis is on the
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“visioning, planning and design” of urban university campuses as it relates to collaborative planning. Building on the concept of city-university partnership is central. Cultivating this reciprocal partnership along with a study of campus planning is anticipated in order to define my specialist area, which is to be explored and tested in this research; it starts with the proposition that building a city-university partnership is the cornerstone for planning (envisioning) an urban academic institution that in turn will work as a catalyst—a model for urban revival. The key concept of this research is to set a building partnership between the key stakeholders (the municipality and the academic institution) as the first step towards achieving an optimal urban redevelopment. The second is to transform this partnership and its shared mission and vision, into a well-developed successful urban campus master plan.

The transition from the subject of “building city-university collaboration” to the subject of “campus planning,” and towards envisioning the academic institution could work by achieving the following:

- Setting-up (adopting) a shared vision and a mission for the proposed academic institution, and in collaboration with the identified stakeholders (the City of Springfield and the University of Massachusetts system).
- Focusing on ways through which this academic institution could work as a catalyst for economic development, job growth, and long term urban revitalization; attracting investments, construction projects, and funding for knowledge-based economy.
- Focusing on creating practice-based, community-oriented educational programs that connect well with Springfield’s assets and needs: industrial heritage, medical center,

---

75 I found this description of “urban design” as a track and area of concentration at Rutgers’ website: The Edward J Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, Environmental and Physical Planning Concentration, http://policy.rutgers.edu/academics/uppd/.
sports education (basketball, volleyball, and athletics). This would inform a particular approach to planning for particular types of facilities and projects.

- Focusing on how the physical planning and design of this academic institution would provide a model of success.

Planning and Urban Development

The following points are basic findings identified through the examination of the literature. They are included here as part of the effort to define, or further explore, my specialist area in the literature as well as to help connect with the later phases of research that will be conducted:

- The value of investing in creative urban development initiatives: new urban campus, new architecture/urbanism, new academic opportunities, new ideas, new higher quality urban life—all meant to create a new progressive image for Springfield and construct the right kind of reputation it needs in order to find a place among the 21st century American cities.
- Selecting the appropriate academic programs and connecting this with or through the development of the proper campus plan and programs: academic/non-academic facilities, on/off-campus housing, outdoor space, road networks, parking.
- Ensuring that city-university partnership is present throughout the entire process.

Literature Review Summary

The two main themes covered in this thesis are: 1) collaborations between universities and their hosting communities that define their role in urban revitalization and 2) campus
planning in the U.S., its history, evolving complexity, and planning processes. Exploring these two themes in depth and uncovering the links and overlaps between them is the gateway that defines this thesis research, its questions, objective, and most importantly my area of interest. The literature identified revealed the following:

- Collaborations between universities and their communities have existed in the past, but town-gown conflicts and lack of coordination were more visible characteristics throughout. In recent years, with the rise of collaboration and integration as a trend in the field of planning in general and in campus planning in particular, multiple examples of successful campus-community partnerships (or change toward them) emerged and became a common trend, more particularly at the turn of the 21st century. University-community collaborations take multiple forms according to the conditions of the institution, its location, leadership, and finances, and its history of conflict or accord. The reciprocity related to city-university collaboration is evident: sustainable institutional and academic research growth, more off-campus economic opportunities, job creation, and other related initiatives for a better quality urban life.

- Campus planning is also a controversial field; although being designed from the beginning, like the practice of architectural design and construction in general, the planning of university campuses has changed. Planning in the early years (18th century) developed from a simple-minded, unified, and static understanding of design and construction, the process of teaching and learning, and life in general. Previous historical studies of the development of campus planning as a practice are scarce due to the complexity of the process of planning, the ever-growing and changing demands and needs of higher educational institutions, and the understanding of the planning profession as a branch of the practice of architectural design and construction. The
planning of college and university campuses, as practiced and documented by professional architects and planners, involves a typical process of site selection, academic and physical programming, preliminary planning, and development planning that leads to a more detailed planning, design, and construction timetable of particular facilities.

- Obviously, with thousands of existing university campuses in the U.S., and only a small addition of totally new campuses, the discussion and study of either, or both, subjects (building partnership and campus planning) in the literature focuses more on addressing the many complex issues related to the former. However, even in the case of planning a totally new campus, in most cases, the selected sites will require adaptive reuse of existing properties; the changes in leaning towards multidisciplinary, practice-based educational models will require more complex, flexible, and integrative approaches to planning; and the increasing need for urban campuses will encourage planning more higher educational facilities in or near populated urban centers.

- Unlike the historical example of Thomas Jefferson, who singlehandedly planned, designed, and managed the construction and administration of the University of Virginia, today, fifteen years into the 21st century, all decisions related to the planning, building and operating of higher educational institutions, almost without exception, are to be deliberated and derived in an inclusive manner even if only within the constituency of the academic institution. Collaborations between all stakeholders—more particularly the university and its hosting community—are expected at the planning and management of large scale academic facility projects.
CHAPTER 3
CASE STUDIES

Selection and Analysis

Each case study needs to be a relevant precedent to my thesis, with a potential of being informative to my research. Similarity of a city’s urban setting, socio-economic profile, size, and planning goals are indicators used in the selection of each case study.

• **Location:** the study will focus on cities that are located only in the U.S., except if there is a case study that offers a very similar context or addresses my thesis question directly.

• **Relevance:** the study will focus on university campuses that are planned, built, or redeveloped to engage, and address the needs of their local neighborhoods and communities, which is the central concept of my thesis.

• **Innovation:** I will attempt to select case studies that offer innovative approaches to campus planning, program and interaction, architecture, roads, landscapes, parks, and other planning frameworks.

• **Building Inventory:** data, maps, history, policy, collaboration story, results.

• **Identify similarities:** Evaluation will focus on examining how descriptive and instructive the case study is to my thesis; what particular strategies were developed, and what findings or success stories were achieved that can be utilized in my research and can help guide the process of campus planning. The evaluation process will also take the selection criteria points and examine them further.

• **How the case study addressed my thesis question:** specific examples of best practices established in the case selected.
Case Study 1: University of Maryland, College Park

College Park City University Partnership (CPCUP)

College Park City University Partnership (CPCUP) is the nonprofit, local development corporation sponsored by the City of College Park and the University of Maryland. The Partnership’s mission is to promote and support the economic welfare of College Park and the University of Maryland through activities including commercial revitalization, community development, and quality housing opportunities consistent with the interests of the City of College Park and the University of Maryland.

Data below, pages (43–47), is obtained from the CPCUP website.

History:
• The College Park City University Partnership (CPCUP) was established in 1998 for the purpose of forging stronger ties between the City of College Park and the University of Maryland. Founding members worked to build a development organization that would harness the power of both parties for the purpose of improving the Route 1 corridor and surrounding community.
• CPCUP is a non-profit local development corporation whose Board of Directors represent key officials from the City of College Park and the University of Maryland, as well as members of the community who have worked – or are working – in the financial, real estate and legal professions. Its purpose is to promote and support commercial revitalization, community development and quality housing opportunities consistent with the interests of both the City and the University.

Past Development/Housing Initiatives:

• Supported the conception and implementation of the “Varsity” housing and retail development.
• Supported the creation of the “Enclave” by bundling three properties, getting money for the demolition of existing structures on these sites and working with a developer to build quality housing on the new site.
• Generated development principles around the Knox Box and Northgate areas of College Park
• Converted three rental homes into owner occupied housing by renovating them, gifting them to new owners who signed a covenant insuring that the homes would remain owner occupied.
• Performed different housing studies to determine the housing needs of College Park.
• In partnership with the College Park Housing Authority, created the Work-Live College Park program. This program, funded by the Maryland State Department of Housing and Community Development, the City and the University of Maryland, was designed to address foreclosures in the City and incentivize the local workforce to live closer to work. Accomplishments of this program included:
  • Brought five new families to College Park through down payment assistance
  • Purchased five foreclosed or abandoned properties, renovated them and sold them to eligible buyers.
  • Landscaped three of these properties with the design expertise of the University and a $10,000 Capital One grant.
  • Provided eight hours of home ownership counseling to 132 employees of the University, the City and other area employees.

About the City:
• College Park is situated just minutes from the nation’s capital, the City of College Park is home to the University of Maryland and a wide variety of shops, restaurants, attractions and recreational opportunities. There are 130+ locally-owned and independent businesses. The City is comprised of over 30,000 residents that reside in diverse settings from quaint neighborhoods to luxury student housing complexes. With abundant transit options, beautiful parks and historic homes, College Park is “A Smart Place to Live”.
• At the heart of the city is Downtown College Park, which is just footsteps from the University campus and

Figure 3-2 College Park Major Districts
Source : shopcollegepark.org.
home to staple restaurants like Bagel Place, Cornerstone Grill & Loft, The Original Ledo Restaurant, Marathon Deli, Plato’s Diner, RJ Bentley’s, and many others. Downtown is the center of nightlife in College Park with live music at several establishments.

- Traveling up Route 1/Baltimore Avenue, the main street in College Park, there are more dining options such as Bobby’s Burger Palace, The Board and Brew Cafe, Hanami Japanese Restaurant, and Looney’s Pub in the Lower Midtown area. The Upper Midtown area of Route 1 is a transitioning area featuring restaurants (Azteca Cantina and Mamma Lucia’s), big box stores (Best Buy, Home Depot, and Shopper’s Food Warehouse), and a variety of services (Framer Studio, multiple hair salons, and Wood’s Flowers and Gifts). The northernmost neighborhood, Uptown, is easily accessible from the Capital Beltway and home to businesses including Einstein Bros. Bagels, Ikea, and Potbelly Sandwich Shop.
- Beyond Route 1, commercial districts exist in Berwyn and Hollywood. Berwyn Road is a quaint street in the center of the City featuring a small strip of locally-owned businesses.
- Exploring beyond the commercial areas, College Park is home to some of the best recreational opportunities in the region. College Park is home to bike trails, Herbert Wells Ice Rink, Junior Tennis Champions Center, Lake Artemesia, the University of Maryland Golf Course, and much more.

About the University:
- The University of Maryland was founded in 1856, the University of Maryland at College Park is the flagship school of the University System of Maryland and one of the nation’s top public research institutions.
- It is home to 12 colleges and schools, offering more than 200 academic degrees to 38,000 students drawn from 50 states and 114 different countries. The University employs 4,410 faculty, making it the biggest employer in College Park, MD.
- The University’s renowned academic community is addressing important scientific and societal challenges, including climate change, the economy, energy, homeland security, and public health. The University partners with governments, major corporations, nonprofit organizations and educational institutions around the world.
- The campus, situated in the heart of College Park, Maryland on 1,250 acres, is built around a central mall, anchored by McKeldin Library and the Main Administration Building – and surrounded by classroom buildings. There are more than 270 buildings on Campus. Most feature the red brick and white columns that define Colonial Revival architecture.

CPCUP – VISION 2020:
- Today’s college campuses aspire to be more than isolated centers of learning. Increasingly, universities are working hand-in-hand with adjacent neighborhoods and local governments to create more livable communities that are mutually enriching and benefit everyone who lives, works, plays and learns in the area.
- Create a thriving, sustainable University District, consisting of the City of College Park and the University of Maryland campus, along with interested neighboring communities.
- Envision UMD staff living and raising their families close to their workplace, and College Park residents benefiting from the student and intellectual community in their neighborhood. We want to attract high-paying jobs and make our community safer and greener. And we want Prince George’s County – and the State of Maryland – to benefit as well, even as they provide critical support.
• Building upon this history of success, in 2011, at the request of University President Dr. Wallace Loh, City of College Park Mayor Andrew Fellows, and City of College Park City Council, CPCUP has developed a vision for the University District to be achieved by the year 2020. This University District Vision has been endorsed by UMD and the City of College Park, as well as county and state leaders.
• The City of College Park, Prince George’s County, the University of Maryland and the State of Maryland are all working together to create and implement this integrated, comprehensive community development strategy for the University District around College Park, MD. Our unified goal is to make the University District of College Park a great college town by 2020.

CPCUP Vision 2020 Areas of Focus: (Housing and Development, Education, Public Safety, Transportation, and Sustainability).

**Housing and Development:**

**Figure 3-3 Vision of Housing and Development by CPCUP**

*Source: collegeparkpartnership.org.*

• Increase single-family home ownership.
• Expand the number of UMD affiliated businesses.
• Expand private, professional employment and housing for young professionals and families as part of redeveloping Route 1, the East Campus and the College Park Metro Station with walkable, mixed use, smart growth development.
• Increase undergraduate housing west of Route 1 and provide more graduate student housing.
• Redevelop downtown College Park into a vibrant, walkable mixed-use neighborhood offering attractive new housing, office and retail options.
• Redevelop the East Campus into a center of innovation and entrepreneurship that attracts businesses that are affiliated with or wish to be near UMD.
• Major walkable, mixed-use development at College Park Metro stop.

**Education:**

• UMD faculty, staff and others move to College Park so their children can attend local schools.
• Identify a permanent home for the College Park Academy in College Park and continue to grow its enrollment.
• Expand child care, pre-K, and elementary school by integrating a program similar to that of the University’s Center for Young Children (CYC)

Public Safety:
• College Park is safer—and perceived as safer—than most of the nation’s best college towns as well as those communities in the Washington, D.C., area where UMD faculty and staff currently live. Extended the UMD Code of Student Conduct throughout the City of College Park (and beyond) to promote family-friendly behavior in local neighborhoods.
• Expanded jurisdiction of UMD police force to a number of City neighborhoods, including Lakeland, Crystal Springs, Calvert Hills, and the area of relatively new high rise student apartment residences along the west side of Route 1, north of the University’s Founder’s Gate.
• Fifteen security cameras and four license plate readers placed off campus in the City.
• Expand the number of off-campus security cameras along with 24 hour surveillance.
• Integrate all sworn officers (including University of Maryland Police Department, Prince George’s County Police, College Park City contract officers), 911 dispatch personnel and the new cameras into an effective and efficient system.
• Expand efforts to educate all community residents about how to respond to inappropriate and/or illegal student resident behaviors.
• Explore establishing a “safety ambassador” program (unarmed police aides) to efficiently enhance the effectiveness of our police.

Transportation:
• Reduce commute times for University District residents and UMD employees and expand the walkability of the University District.
• Successfully won inclusion of University District priorities in Governor Martin O’Malley’s and the Maryland General Assembly’s 2013 transportation packages, which will add more rail cars and two more trains per day to the MARC commuter rail line, fund the Purple Line and invest $20 million to proceed with rebuilding Route 1.
• Expanded and improved the quality of the bus service serving City and Route 1
• Continue our focus on implementing the Purple Line and rebuilding Route 1
• Further improve MARC service.
• Expand pedestrian and bike infrastructure within the University District.
• Enhance Route 1 Ride Bus Service—increase frequency, add evening and weekend service.

Sustainability:
• The University District will protect and conserve our natural resources, increase the use of clean, renewable energy sources, reduce greenhouse gases, provide green spaces and build green.
• College Park is a certified Maryland Sustainable Community
• The City and the University are implementing “green” projects to increase residential energy efficiency, reduce storm-water pollution, plant trees, increase use of local food and many more.
How Case Study (1) Addresses Thesis Questions:

The University of Maryland’s facilities master plan and strategic planning documents include details about building partnership with the community. The large historic campus is divided into multiple districts in the master plan, each receiving planning analysis that identifies opportunities, improvement initiatives, and implementations of redevelopment initiatives—many of which emphasize the goal to create connections and collaborative development with the city of College Park. There is no specific reference however, or further discussion of, the CPCUP initiative. This case study is selected in this study primarily because of this initiative. CPCUP sources provide only general principles, guidelines, and updates on building city-university collaboration; involved university leaders communicate that facilities management and planning at the university handles planning, implementation and the design of projects according to the adopted facilities master plan.

This case study is useful primarily in reference to the formation and function of CPCUP. The fact that University of Maryland College Park is one of the largest higher educational institutions in the nation, with a historic, large district campus, and has been most pivotal for the city of College Park, marks this university and its campus and facilities planning processes as different from the objectives of this thesis research. However, due to the remarkable city-university initiative (SPCUP), with its vision and work areas (housing and development, education, public safety, transportation, and sustainability), and how it captures the ideals being pursued in this thesis, lessons learned from this initiative are included in this study as an example of how city-university partnerships could work.
Table 3-1 UMCP Case Study Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership is adopted by leadership</td>
<td>Existing, old large campus</td>
<td>A good model for partnership—creating a nonprofit organization that includes members from the city and the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer urban problems</td>
<td>Principles for university involvement in urban revitalization in housing, safety, and sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study 2: University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

West Philadelphia Initiatives

University of Pennsylvania planned and implemented policy designed to stimulate neighborhood reinvestment in West Philadelphia, where the campus is located, known as the West Philadelphia Initiatives. The road to establish this policy was paved by “commitment of University leadership, administrative support, funding, and academic resources” for several years. Implementing this policy led to positive results such as: declining crime rates; reliable maintenance of streets and public spaces; the creation of a new university-assisted public school; a stronger real estate market; the development of new retail facilities patronized by shoppers from both the campus and the community; and a major increase in the participation of neighborhood and minority residents and businesses in university-sponsored construction projects and the procurement of supplies and services.

---
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Five broad areas of work are established in this case study:

1. Cleanliness and safety of streets and neighborhoods
2. Reviving retail development
3. Advancing excellence of primary education
4. Creating job opportunities “though economic inclusion”
5. Enhancing housing development and choices

The report details the entire process of organizing and implementing this impressive initiative of city-university partnership. It first presents a long history of the economic problems,
urban deterioration in areas surrounding the university, and early efforts to solve them. Then it explains the emergence and formation of policy and organization for the initiative and how the university’s leadership chose to handle the deteriorating physical conditions of the neighborhoods that surround the campus. The initiatives were “not part of an academic program. Instead, the initiatives were an administratively driven approach that was academically informed, lead and managed by the University’s President and senior administrators." In that regard, Former University of Pennsylvania President Judith Rodin, who pioneered the initiative, stated the following regarding the role of the university:

Only one entity had the capacity, the resources, and the political clout to intervene to stabilize the neighborhood quickly and revitalize it within a relatively short time period, and that was Penn. If Penn didn't take charge to revitalize the neighborhood itself, no one else would. Beginning with the Trustees and me, the leadership of Penn would take full responsibility for directing and implementing the West Philadelphia Initiatives.

This powerful statement by the former president of the university shows how commitment of leadership is so central to achieving university involvement in urban revitalization. The primary role of the university’s leadership focused on establishing internal institutional delegation of responsibilities that went beyond normal campus administration practices in order to establish this initiative. Although outside of the scope of this thesis, it is quite useful to include how the university’s involvement in reforming its context initiated internally, and how the administrative structure took shape. Figure 3-6 from the report presents
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the structure of the initiative’s delegation of responsibilities. A closer review of each position listed in this administrative diagram would be very useful to any institution that intends to create a system of leadership and operations for involvement in urban reform and other off-campus institutional development efforts.
Figure 3-6 West Philadelphia Initiative Delegation of Responsibilities

The report then detailed the implementation activities of the initiative, which included work on promoting public safety, improving the housing market, upgrading retail facilities and commercial corridors, increasing minority employment opportunities, and creating a new neighborhood school. Communication with the neighborhood included sending a group of messages to other stakeholders in the surrounding community. These messages confirmed that the university was committed to the development of the neighborhoods, would be forming partnerships with local groups and institutions for partnership, consultation, and coordination, would be sensitive to the real estate market in these neighborhoods and would not expand academic facilities in these areas, which had been a concern for the locals. It is remarkable to learn from the report that communication, consultation, and coordination with local groups had been a customary practice by the university before implementing all elements of the initiative.\textsuperscript{82}

UPenn’s engagement in urban revitalization consisted of the following: For the next phase of planning for implementation, the report highlighted some principles for effective planning approach—or guidelines for successful university engagement in urban revitalization. The four defining characters propose that planning strategies should be: 1) Area-wide: encompassing all neighborhoods; 2) Market-driven: addressing real estate market, and social and political realities; 3) Data-linked: using census data and other municipal records; 4) Collaborative: engaging all stakeholders in planning through communication and coordination. In addition, economic development strategies were focused on utilizing local resources, inviting other partners to be committed to participate in investment proposals, and working for the benefit of both the institution and all stakeholders in the local community. In light of the previous, negative historic experience of UPenn expansion in the 1960s, in this initiative the university decided to take a different approach to involvement in urban revitalization. Instead of

\textsuperscript{82} Kromer and Cramer, \textit{West Philadelphia}, 14.
simply adopting their own—or even the community’s—agenda with no regard for any other stakeholder, the university identified general elements after consultation and dialogue with the community, and then involved all in a process of planning and implementation:

The University’s overall approach to the West Philadelphia Initiatives emphasized five basic principles, established by the administration and the trustee committee: Clear identification of investment priorities and return objectives; Leveraging of Penn resources with public, private, and civic support systems; Stimulation of market forces to revive the housing and commercial climate; Ongoing consultation and sustained dialogue with community members prior to and during implementation, and a willingness to modify plans as needed in order to maximize community support; and Commitment to improvement activities that are sustainable, so that, after an initial commitment of resources over a period of years, the University could limit its role in neighborhood reinvestment to focus appropriately on its core mission as an institution of higher education.”

Moreover, it is so important to present three principles that were not to be followed that the university adopted in guiding its strategy for participation: first, the university would not expand towards the west, where there were existing residential neighborhoods, and to limit expansion only to the east where deteriorated properties and areas existed; second, not to act

---

in isolation and to engage the local groups; and third, not to be committed to anything other than those elements that the university had the capacity and resources to deliver.\textsuperscript{84}

In many ways, this analysis of the guiding principles is so essential and useful to any institution that considers involvement in urban revitalization efforts. First, it clearly shows the level of respect and sensitivity the institution shows to its surrounding neighborhoods in every possible way, which is especially essential to building partnerships. Second, it acknowledges real political, social, and economic challenges and attempts to address them properly through openness, data analysis, communication, and discussion. Thirdly, it focuses on serving the interests of the academic institution by considering its leading role in creating and managing the initiative—despite being voluntary, this very rewarding and necessary part must be performed for the good of all, including the university and its constituencies.

The university then used existing planning efforts developed in recent years (at the beginning of the then new initiatives) by the city and other local groups and organization. Also, it is quite remarkable that the Office of Real Estate utilized the university’s academic capacity and resources such as:

The University’s Cartographic Modeling Laboratory (CML), creating a joint venture between the School of Design and the School of Social Work, bringing together faculty and students from both disciplines to collaborate on urban and social policy projects through the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and spatial research.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{84} Kromer and Kerman, \textit{West Philadephia}, 17.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., 19.
The following goals and summaries are obtained from *West Philadelphia Initiatives: A Case Study in Urban Revitalization*, pages (58–63):

**The Initiatives’ Identified Five Goals and Strategies:**

**Goal 1: Improve neighborhood services and capacity**

**Strategies:**
- Establish a University City special services district to manage 1) coordinated sanitation, security, and other services, leveraging existing institutional services; 2) advocacy for improved city services and capital improvements; 3) monitoring of code and license violations; and 4) marketing and promotion of University City.
- Improve on- and off-campus pedestrian-oriented street lighting.
- Maintain a strong public-safety presence.
- Promote public and private initiatives to improve the area’s public areas and streetscapes through community greening programs.

![Figure 3-7 Neighborhood Service Activity Areas](source: West Philadelphia Initiative: A Case Study in Urban Revitalization, 2005, 21.)
Goal 2: Provide high-quality, diverse housing choices

Strategies:
• In partnership with city agencies and community groups, acquire, improve, and recycle deteriorated or vacant properties in key locations.
• Attract new homebuyers to University City through financial incentives to encourage Penn-affiliated families to buy or improve homes in the neighborhood and through pre-purchase counseling services to prospective homebuyers.
• Stimulate new investment in West Philadelphia real estate by developing programs to support the rehabilitation of deteriorated or vacant multifamily properties.

Figure 3-8 Enhanced Mortgage Program and Other Targeted Activity Areas

Goal 3: Revive commercial activity

Strategies:
• Through joint ventures, invest in real estate development to improve the retail climate near campus.
• Acquire problem retail establishments and convert them to better uses in collaboration with area residents and businesses.
Goal 4: Accelerate economic development

**Strategies:**
- Leverage Penn business relationships to facilitate enhanced purchasing, contracting, and employment opportunities for West Philadelphia residents and businesses.
- Stimulate major business relocation and expansion in University City, using Penn’s purchasing relationships (which supports $650 million in annual institutional purchasing).
- Collaborate with public- and private-sector partners in commercial corridor revitalization efforts.

Figure 3-9 Location of Revitalization Activities


Goal 5: Enhance local school options

**Strategies:**
- Create a University-assisted pre-kindergarten through 8th grade public school in an adjacent neighborhood, with Penn’s academic resources integrated into the curricular and community life of the school.
• Continue and enhance existing academic and institutional efforts to improve other area public schools.

Figure 3-10 Location of Penn Education Activities


Accomplishments of the West Philadelphia Initiatives’ goals

1. Improve neighborhood services and capacity
   • Crime reports requiring a response from Penn’s Division of Public Safety decreased by 40 percent overall from 1996-2002. Robberies dropped by 56 percent during this period; assaults declined by 28 percent; burglaries dropped by 31 percent, and auto thefts by 76 percent.
   • Respondents to a resident survey reported that University City is “cleaner” or “much cleaner” (95 percent of respondents), “safe” (71 percent), and that the atmosphere of the area is “better” or “much better” (95 percent).

2. Provide high quality, diverse housing choices
   • Average home sale prices in University City increased from $78,500 in 1995 to $175,000 in 2003.
4. Enhance local school options
- The Penn Alexander School opened in 2001, with kindergarten and first grade classes. The planned expansion of the school was completed on schedule, with full enrollment, from pre-kindergarten to 8th grade, achieved by 2004.
- The Graduate School of Education began a school-wide reform of an existing public school, Lea Elementary, including a three-year intensive intervention to strengthen curricula in literacy, math, and science.
- The Graduate School of Education provides additional state-funded contractual services to Lea Elementary, as well as to two other public schools, Wilson and Bryant.
Penn’s Center for Community Partnerships helped to develop more than 150 academically based, community service courses taught by Penn faculty from diverse disciplines working in schools throughout West Philadelphia.

**How Case Study (2) Addresses Thesis Question:**

It is notable to learn about the commitment of the university’s leadership to addressing local urban, economic, social, and development problems that are not actually caused by the institution, but are spreading in its own backyard. That sets a model for a positive approach in dealing with these problems rather than ignoring them and letting things deteriorate even more. Partnership here is understood in terms of a voluntary commitment by the academic institution to contribute to its hosting community and help in its reform and recovery. The report, a primary source on the initiative, does not show what kind of partnership role the city of Philadelphia played, but in this case, with one of the largest and oldest universities in the U.S., we can presume that the city welcomed and approved the university’s initiatives for urban revitalization in the neighborhood surrounding the university district.

The use of GIS as a planning and analysis tool in graphically demonstrating the goals and strategies established by the initiative is one main research method approach that this thesis is adopting. While the maps are not clear, probably due to the fact that they were produced over ten years ago, they are still important. It is remarkably relevant to see how simple and expressive this map tool can be to highlight how and where the initiatives develop.
Table 3-2 UPenn Case Study Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership is adopted by leadership</td>
<td>Existing large Campus</td>
<td>A good model for urban revitalization—the academic institution took a voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leadership/partnership role that aimed at identifying problems and the main areas of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban deterioration in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Example of university involvement in urban revitalization, housing/economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development, neighborhood safety, that led to higher quality urban life and lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crime rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Higher Education can no longer stand apart, but must be collaborative and partnership-driven." – 2009 UMR Plan

University of Minnesota, Rochester is a campus that was founded with a clean slate. More importantly, from day one, partnership with two major Rochester-based corporations, Mayo Clinic and IBM, was the cornerstone of planning and constructing this science/biotech-oriented university branch.

An “Education District” in downtown Rochester was envisioned back in the 2009 UMR Master plan. The goal was to focus on health science and biotechnology education to prepare students for emerging related, practice-based, and research careers. Even more, the 2009 UMR plan suggested the creation of a comprehensive plan for the entire downtown in Rochester in order to study and examine the presence of the university campus, the need for partners, and exploring ways to stimulate demand for more commercial and residential development. As a result of collaboration among

all stakeholders, including the city of Rochester, the university, Mayo Clinic and other local
groups, the plan endorsed the “Educational District” in downtown Rochester. Moreover, the
2009 master plan included guidelines for campus development over the next decade and to set
a vision for long-term growth. The guidelines envisioned campus buildings and open space
designed through collaboration in which the partners are physically included in both planning
and presence. The plan also established a timeline with key roles and a process.88

It is quite remarkable to note that the downtown master plan, which is complementary
to the UMR master plan, also included collaborated efforts with other major Rochester
economic development initiatives that took place in 2014. These included a six billion-dollar
health care and medical development known as DMC, and a comprehensive master plan for
Soldiers Field Memorial Park. The 2014 UMR master plan states the intension to construct its
first academic building within 6–8 years.89

Calculation of student population was a key issue in decision making. Calculating
cost based on enrollment and adopting a commitment to share facilities represented
an optimal cost model. Because of this approach, the actual space needs were reduced in comparison to traditional campus planning standards.90

| Source: University of Minnesota Rochester, Master Plan Report, 2009 |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                         | **ENROLLMENT OF**  | **ENROLLMENT OF**  |
|                         | 1,500             | 5,000             |
| CLASSROOM               | 19,000 ASF        | 53,000 ASF        |
| TEACHING LABS           | 49,000 ASF        | 190,000 ASF       |
| OFFICES                 | 22,000 ASF        | 84,000 ASF        |
| LIBRARY, STUDY, INFORMAL LEARNING | 23,000 ASF | 84,000 ASF |
| TOTAL                   | 113,000 ASF       | 411,000 ASF       |

88 Envision UMR. 4.
89 Ibid. 9.
**UMR Master planning:**

Work on the master plan started with an engagement process that included stakeholders from all parties, the public, the city, the university, and other businesses. That effort included:

- A web based survey of UMR constituents for feedback on needs and preferences.
- Meetings among all stakeholders for discussion and consultations
- The consultant team (Sasaki) worked with the UMR Campus Planning Advisory Committee.
- Three open forums and a town hall meeting were held as part of planning the new campus expansion.

![Figure 3-12 Research/Education Adjacencies](source: UMR, Master Plan Report, 2009.)

![Figure 3-13 Building Heights](source: UMR, Master Plan Report, 2009.)
The Selection of a Campus Model:

The main policy adopted by the UMR planning committee was a “community campus” model (also defined elsewhere as “distributed campus” model) where university students, faculty, and personnel would mix with the downtown community. Facilities were intended to engage academic uses and nonacademic uses vertically where public uses such as retail can be at the lower levels, and educational activities (classrooms) are in the upper floors. One UMR student was quoted as saying: “Seeing Mayo Clinic employees in the skyways is an inspiration.
for my career ambitions. This statement highlights the wisdom of locating educational activities along with professional and advanced level research activities in the same facilities as it works as a motivation to success among students—something that could best serve the academic institution in order to achieve its aspirations. This is essential to this thesis, when planning or selecting a site for an educational district in the city of Springfield. Three themes overlapped in forming the community campus model: Campus in the City, where the campus is integrated within the urban fabric of the city; Campus on the Park, where the campus works as an open link between downtown and the main park; and Campus Connectivity offering a multimodal model of transportation connecting the campus with its urban context.

UMR has articulated several principles that are intended to guide the planning and implementation of the Educational District. These principles include:

- Leverage public-private partnerships to build capital projects, deliver educational programs, and create research opportunities;
- Establish a “front door” opening from downtown Rochester into the education district and a gateway from the education district to Soldiers Memorial Field Park;
- Maintain transparent and active ground floor uses;
- Maintain a connected and pedestrian-friendly district throughout;
- Create a strong architectural identity along Broadway and 6th street;
- Encourage walking, cycling, transit use, and other alternatives to private vehicles;
- Hold all capital projects to UM’s B3 sustainability guidelines.

Figure 3-17 Proposed Location of Education District - Connection to Downtown Rochester

Source: Envision UMR, 2014.
The consultant team proposed a master plan\(^\text{92}\) that represents a vision for how the education district could become a reality. It integrated the main principles set in the overall policy adopted by all partners. The composition of the master plan shows the mixed-use formation of the campus (known here as Educational District). Review figures (3-12 to 3-20) for proposed site plan and vision details.

\(^{92}\) https://r.umn.edu/about-umr/growth-umr/campus-master-plan
The master plan document presents the entire process of master planning, which includes the following: framework, projected development capacity, urban design guidelines, open space, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit frameworks, vehicular access and parking, infrastructure, and partnerships.

Figure 3-20 Site Development

How Case Study (3) Addresses Thesis Question:

This case study is by far the most relevant to my thesis and research. It covers the three key elements of this thesis: first, adopting a policy that builds a working partnership among the university, the city, and local groups is at the core of the plan; second, planning the expansion of a branch campus that is relatively new (founded a little over a decade ago) is similar to our case where we attempt to plan a new campus in the area; and third, the detailed analysis and development of a campus master plan by a professional urban planning firm is quite inspirational and educational in many ways to the master planning process and regional and contextual analysis developed in this thesis.

Table 3-4 UMR Case Study Summary Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership is adopted by leadership</td>
<td>Exciting campus, recently planned</td>
<td>A good model for urban revitalization—the academic institution created an active partnership with all parties, the city, large local research/business corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus is new, relatively small</td>
<td>Less urban deterioration</td>
<td>Example of university involvement in urban revitalization, economic development, friendly streets, bicycling and pedestrian improvements, and higher quality urban life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included phases of master planning that envisions future growth</td>
<td>Only one academic institution</td>
<td>Campus planning process, context analysis, programming, seizing, partnerships in planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed along a city master plan done by same consultants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

SPRINGFIELD: CONTEXT, HIGHER EDUCATION, AND ROOTS OF COLLABORATION

Community Profile

Historical Background

Settled in 1636, the City of Springfield is the main cultural and commercial center in the Pioneer Valley Region. Springfield is the third largest city in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Along with the cities of Chicopee and Holyoke and their neighboring communities, Springfield comprises the fourth largest metropolitan area in New England after Boston, Worcester, and Providence. Located on the eastern bank of the Connecticut River in Western Massachusetts, just north of the Connecticut state line, Springfield is largely a developed and urbanized city comprised of 33 square miles, or approximately 21,147 acres.

In addition to the Central Business District, Springfield has several historic and distinct neighborhoods. The mix of Victorian and contemporary affordable houses in these neighborhoods earned the city the nickname, “City of Homes.” Notably, Springfield is also described as the “City of Firsts.” The first gasoline powered automobile was built in Springfield by J. Frank and Charles E. Duryea in 1891. The Indian Motorcycle, the first gas powered cycle, was built in Springfield in 1901 by George Hendee and Springfield is home to the Indian

Figure 4-1 Main Street 1905

Source: Library of Congress as shown at shorpy.com
Motorcycle Museum. The city is also the birthplace of the game of basketball and is the location of the Basketball Hall of Fame.93

The city has a strong partnership with the business community, which contributes to the revitalization of the Central Business District and recent economic development initiatives. “Springfield is home to eight of the region’s twenty largest employers, including Mass Mutual Life Insurance, Solutia (a Division of Monsanto Chemical Co.), and Smith & Wesson. Major cultural institutions include the Springfield Symphony, City Stage, Springfield Civic Center, and the Springfield Library and Museums Association—all of which are located in a[n] historic downtown site. Springfield is also home to four colleges and four hospitals. Even with vibrant, historic neighborhoods, a newly reinvigorated downtown and an active cultural base, Springfield, like many urban areas in the Northeast, has seen a decrease in population in recent years. Since 1990, the City’s population declined an estimated 2.1% to 153,703 residents in 2013.”94

The metropolitan Springfield area is home to a half-million people. Major cultural institutions include the Springfield Symphony, City Stage, MassMutual Center, and the Springfield Library and Museums Association. The region’s interstate bus and Amtrak train stations are located in Springfield. The city is the hub of intercity bus service provided by the Pioneer Valley Transit Authority. It is home to several colleges, including Springfield Technical Community College, American International College, Springfield College, and Western New England College and School of Law. Springfield’s state of the art medical facilities include Mercy

---


94 Ibid.
Hospital, Kindred Hospital Park View, Shriners Hospital for Children, and Baystate Medical Center, a Tufts Medical School teaching hospital\textsuperscript{95}.

The following data summaries, in pages (75–76), are obtained from the community profile of the city of Springfield developed by Pioneer Valley Planning Commission:

### Table 4-1 Population Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>163,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>152,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>156,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>151,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>153,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>153,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Race and Latino Population

- **White**: 55.3%
- **Black**: 25.0%
- **Asian**: 2.9%
- **Other**: 22.0%
- **Latino (of any race)**: 38.8%

\textit{Note: Race \%s can be greater than 100\% because of multiple race persons.}

### Table 4-2 Percent of Population by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 &amp; over</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4-3 Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>9,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Open/Public</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreational</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Land</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Land</td>
<td>4,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4-4 Residents in the Labor Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Labor Force</th>
<th>Percent Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>65,014</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>65,501</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>66,360</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>66,546</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>66,269</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>65,994</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>66,310</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65,712</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>66,123</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>67,609</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>68,369</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.
**Table 4-5 Household Income**
Source: PVPC.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $9,999</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 &amp; over</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median Household Income:** 2010 $46,739

**Persons Below Poverty Level:** 2010 27.6%

---

**Education in Springfield:**

Education is increasingly important to the present and future of all demographics in Springfield. Ensuring that educational opportunities are provided from an early age and extend into adulthood, from “cradle to career,” and maintaining the highest quality for all education are essential factors for sustainable economic and social progress.

---

**High School Graduation Rate:**

High school graduation rate is a major indication of the educational and social health of a community. It has become the minimum requirement for any serious

---

employment opportunities and participation in a regional economy. Springfield’s graduation rate is lower than that of the region and the state of Massachusetts. As of 2013, 55% of enrolled students in Springfield Schools graduated within a customarily timeframe, while the state of Massachusetts graduation rate for the same year is 85%.

**Attainment of Higher Education:**

In today’s job market, higher education attainment is a primary requirement for access to well-paying jobs. The relation between a higher level of education and higher income is evident throughout. Educational attainment is calculated by measuring the percent of the population that is over age 25 with a bachelor’s degree or higher. As of 2012, close to 40% of Massachusetts residents had obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher.

However, for Springfield, only about 18% of residents had obtained education to that level 97. “Rates vary widely by neighborhood. Less than one in ten residents hold a

---

97 Ibid., 43.
bachelor’s degree in five neighborhoods of the city, including the South End (4%),
Brightwood (6%), Bay (6.8%), and Old Hill (6.9%). East Forest Park (28.22%), Forest Park
(22.6%), and Sixteen Acres (23.2%) are the city’s most highly educated neighborhoods.
Undoubtedly, there is a correlation between household income and educational
attainment. Although the city’s rate has increased by 7.4% since 2008, the overall trend
remains flat."98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA BY NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Corners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Forest Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-5 Data by Neighborhood
Source: PVPC

Major Higher Educational Institutions in Springfield

The following summaries of higher educational institutions in Springfield, (see pages 79
to 83 in this document), are obtained from the official websites and reports published by each
academic institution as cited:

1- Springfield College:

A private, independent, coeducational four-year college offering undergraduate and
graduate degree programs. It offers bachelor’s and master’s degrees, and doctoral
programs, in many fields. Springfield College was founded in 1885 as a School for

98 Ibid.
Christian Workers by Rev. David Allen Reed. In 1905, the school became a degree-granting institution, in 1912, it took the name International YMCA College, and in 1954 the name officially changed to Springfield College. 99 The College consists of one main campus that spans 100 acres and 10 residence halls and many academic facilities. The college contains five schools: the School of Arts, Sciences, and Professional Studies; the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; the school of Health Sciences and Rehabilitation; the School of Human Services, and the School of Social Work. 100

Quick Statistics: (from Springfield College’s official college website101)

Enrollment (Undergraduate and graduate full- and part-time, Academic Year 2013–14)
Traditional programs on the main campus include: Arts, Sciences, and Professional Studies; Health Sciences and Rehabilitation Studies; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; and Social Work (enrollment count does not include the School of Human Services).
Springfield College Total Enrollment: 5,049

Traditional Campus Enrollment
Undergraduate: 2,204
Graduate: 1,082
Sub-total: 3,286

School of Human Services (10 Regional Campuses)
Undergraduate: 1,319
Graduate: 444
Sub-total: 1,763

Total Employees (Fall 2013):
Full-time Faculty: 208 (Approximately 84 percent with doctorate or terminal degree)
Full-time Staff: 439
Total Full-time: 674

Degreed Alumni Total (Fall 2013):
Undergraduate (bachelor’s) degree: 38,385
Graduate degree: 14,421
Total earned degrees: 52,806

2013–2014 Tuition and Fees

Undergraduate tuition/fees, full-time (per year): $32,560
Undergraduate room and board (per year): $10,920
Graduate tuition (per credit hour): $908
Room & Board costs may vary depending on residence hall, meal plan, and room occupancy.

Endowment
(as of June 30, 2013)
$53,821,982

Operating Budget
(FY 2013–2014)
$154,930,224

2- Western New England University (WNE):

This private university, with a heritage of teaching law, business, and accounting, was founded in 1919 as the Springfield Division of Northeastern University. In 1951 it was chartered and the name became Western New England College. In 1956 a 34-acres main campus was planned—and now is 215 acres with 24 major buildings and other academic facilities—in a suburban neighborhood of Springfield. In July 2011 the College officially became Western New England University. The university consists of five academic schools: College of Arts and Sciences; College of Business; College of Engineering; College of Law; and College of Pharmacy.

Facts and Figures (from Western New England University’s official website)

Faculty:
Western New England University has a faculty of 205 full-time instructors of whom 90 percent have received their terminal degrees. The University also has 130 adjunct instructors who share specialized knowledge of their discipline and professional experience with their students. The Western New England University School of Law has a distinguished legal faculty numbering 33 full-time instructors and approximately 30 adjunct instructors.

Students:
The University enrolls approximately 3,770 students: about 2,550 full-time undergraduates, 630 in full- and part-time programs in the School of Law and 550 in part-time undergraduate and graduate programs. Approximately 71% of full-time undergraduates live on campus (88% of freshmen). About 90% of freshmen receive financial aid.

Alumni:
Western New England University has more than 42,000 alumni, of which 7,000 are graduates of the School of Law. These alumni reside in all 50 states and in 26 countries around the world.

3- American International College (AIC):
A private, coeducational, four-year comprehensive institution of higher learning that was founded in 1885 as the French Protestant College by Rev. Calvin E. Amaron. It 1892 it expanded its admission programs to include women, minorities, and new immigrants to the U.S. With a successful history of growth, today, the College academics include three schools: the School of Business, Arts, and Sciences; the School of Health Sciences; and the School of Graduate and Adult Education.
Fast Facts (from American International College’s official website)104

The Campus:
25 buildings in the neo-Georgian tradition; 72 park-like acres in the midst of an urban environment

Enrollment:
1,492 undergraduate students, and just over 1,650 graduate students, for a total of 3,142 students.

Student/Faculty Ratio:
Undergraduate: 14 to 1; Graduate: 8 to 1

4- Springfield Technical Community College (STCC):
Located on the 55-acre Springfield Armory National Historic Site, Springfield Technical Community College was originally established in 1964 by the city of Springfield as Springfield Technical Institute (STI). In 1967, STI moved to three buildings on the Armory grounds as it was being phased out. In 1968 the name changed to Springfield Technical Community College. 35 acres of the site are used by STCC and 20 acres remain managed by the U.S. National Park Service for historic preservation. Numerous historic buildings have been repurposed as classrooms in addition to newer facilities built on-site with the oldest building dating to 1808. STCC began with 400 students and 20 faculties. Out of a total of 15 community colleges in Massachusetts, STCC was the 12th established. STCC is the only co-educational, public technical community college in Massachusetts. In October 1, 1996, STCC Assistance Corporation purchased the 18-acre site across from Federal Street to become the STCC Technology Park. STCC currently

offers associate degrees in over 30 programs and many certificate/completion programs.

**Quick Facts 2014** (from Springfield Technical Community College’s official website)\(^{105}\)

**Enrollment (Fall):**
Full-time: 3085,  
Part-time: 3537  
Female: 3823,  
Male: 2799  
Average age of all students (full- & part-time): 26 African American: 16%,  
Hispanic: 26%, Other Minorities: 6%, White: 51%

**Faculty:**
Full-time: 148, Part-time: 344  
Student-to-faculty ratio: 16:1

**Top 5 majors (Enrollment-Fall):**
Pre-Health Sciences, Liberal Arts/General Studies, Law Enforcement, Liberal Arts Transfer, Nursing

**5- UMass Center at Springfield:**

**Fast Facts:**
- Established in 2014  
- Located in a leased space in Tower Square in downtown Springfield  
- Current enrollment is approximately 300 students,  

The following are quotes and highlights obtained from a press release on the opening of the UMass Center in Springfield published on the UMass Amherst website\(^{106}\):

- **Opening:** Former Gov. Deval L. Patrick said: “This new Center will provide vital education and skills training resources in downtown Springfield, and open up new educational and job opportunities for the residents of Springfield and beyond.”


• **Site and size**: Tower Square, an office tower owned by Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., is at the heart of Springfield’s downtown district and is two blocks from City Hall and the MassMutual Center—a 26,000 square-foot facility.

• **Institutional Plans**: The new center will significantly expand the university’s presence in western Massachusetts and unlock a range of degree opportunities to students of all ages that will be tailored to meet the region’s workforce needs.

• “Skilled workers, especially in growing industries like IT and advanced manufacturing, are critical to Springfield’s economic development,” said State Housing and Economic Development Secretary Greg Bialecki. “The new UMass Center at Springfield will partner with MassMutual, Baystate Health Systems and Springfield residents to expand opportunity in the city.”

• The center will be comprised of 10 large, instructional rooms, including three nursing classrooms, one computer lab, two conference rooms, seven small meeting rooms, and space for student counseling and public events and meetings.

• Caret and Chairman of the UMass Board of Trustees Henry Thomas committed to open the center with classes offered by faculty from the four undergraduate UMass campuses, in partnership with Holyoke Community College and Springfield Technical Community College, among other institutions.

• "We’re thrilled to be part of helping to make the UMass Center at Springfield a reality, as we view it as a key contributor to economic growth in the region," said Chairman, President and CEO of MassMutual Roger Crandall. "Having such a renowned institution as UMass establish a presence in the city is a great way for businesses to tap into potential future talent, which will enable both the city and business community to grow and become stronger together."

• **Academic Programs**: There will be 40 course offerings across 10 academic programs, including: nursing, education, liberal arts, masters of business administration, cyber security/network security, landscape architecture and planning, architecture, addiction counseling, University Without Walls (a bachelor's degree program for nontraditional learners) and seven training programs offered by the community colleges. The university has already opened a Welcome Center on the first floor of Tower Square where prospective students can find information about the fall courses.

The UMass Center at Springfield is a new academic institution that was only added to the higher educational landscape of the city in 2014. This is why the facts, numbers, enrollment, even academic programs, institutional mission, and future plans for growth are still under-developed. While the inception of the UMass Center worked
as an inspiration (or even a basis) for this thesis question, it was not considered a defining element in developing, envisioning, or testing the growth of the university campus (education district) being pursued.

**Regional Higher Education Institutions**

In addition to these institutions, there are approximately 10 public and private institutions of higher education within a 20-mile radius of Springfield. These include:

- UMass Amherst
- Holyoke Community College
- Asnuntuck Community College (Enfield, CT)
- Westfield State University
- Elms College
- Bay Path College
- Mt. Holyoke College
- Smith College
- Hampshire College
- Amherst College
UMass Current Projects and Collaboration Efforts in Springfield:

UMass programs in the Springfield area “represent several different schools/colleges/units, such as Commonwealth College, Education, Engineering, Management, Natural Sciences, Nursing, Public Health and Health Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Extension, among others.”

![Image of UMass Locations in the Region]

Source: Donahue Institute

---

The following is a detailed list of these projects obtained from the Donahue study on satellite centers:108

- The Design Center provides a physical presence for UMass Amherst in downtown Springfield and promotes collaboration between the city and the university.

- MA Small Business Development Center – A federal-state partnership providing one-to-one free comprehensive and confidential services focusing on business growth and strategies, financing and loan assistance, and strategic analysis.

- Pioneer Valley Life Sciences Institute – This partnership was created by the University of Massachusetts Amherst and Baystate Medical Center, the western campus of the Tufts University School of Medicine, to provide a novel translational research environment for interdisciplinary teams of life scientists, physical scientists, engineers, and physicians.

- STCC/UMass Partnership – The mission of the Scibelli Enterprise Center is job and wealth creation in the city and surrounding region. It advances this mission by providing comprehensive support services, resources, and a stable environment to early stage and young businesses that want to grow in Western Massachusetts.

- Western MA Public Health Training Center, Springfield – U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ (HSS) Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) project to create a Public Health Training Center in Western Massachusetts.

- WFCR – In exploring new locations for New England Public Radio, it became apparent that moving a large part of the station to downtown Springfield would reap many benefits for all involved.

- At present, the campus is exploring the co-location and expansion of some of these programs and services to a potential site(s) in Court Square. Court Square is the intended site of the new WFCR station.

108 Ibid.
### Table 4-7 A List of UMass Amherst Satellites/Programs/Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts Locations with Full-time Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural Sciences - Design Center</td>
<td>The center provides a physical presence for UMass Amherst in downtown Springfield and promotes real collaboration between the city and the university.</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Small Business Development Center</td>
<td>A federal-state partnership providing one to one free comprehensive and confidential services focusing on business growth and strategies, financing and loan assistance and strategic analysis.</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Valley Life Sciences Institute</td>
<td>The Pioneer Valley Life Sciences Institute was created by the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and Baystate Medical Center, the western campus of the Tufts University School of Medicine, to provide a novel translational research environment for interdisciplinary teams of life scientists, physical scientists, engineers, and physicians.</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STCC/UMass Partnership</td>
<td>The mission of the Scibelli Enterprise Center is job and wealth creation in the city and surrounding region. It advances this mission by providing comprehensive support services, resources, and a stable environment to early stage and young businesses that want to grow in Western Massachusetts.</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western MA Public Health Training Center - Springfield</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) to create a Public Health Training Center in Western Massachusetts.</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFCR</td>
<td>In exploring new locations for New England Public Radio, it became apparent that moving a large part of the station to downtown Springfield would reap many benefits for all involved.</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Amherst Extension Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Extension Nutrition Education Program Office</td>
<td>Providing nutrition education to low-income individuals and families in Springfield.</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: J. Lynn Griesemer, *University of Massachusetts: Serving the Commonwealth*

*Virtually and through Present and Future Satellite Centers, 2012, 26.*
The data below is obtained from the Donahue study on satellite centers:109

- Based on Census 2010 data, the total population within a 20-mile radius of Springfield is 832,561: predominantly white at 80.1%, (including white Hispanics); Blacks and Asians comprise 8.3% and 2.7% respectively; Hispanics of all races comprise 13.9% of the population.
- The total population within a 10-mile radius of Springfield is 481,025. Whites (including white Hispanics) comprise 75.9% of the population, Blacks 9.4%, and Asians 2.1%. Hispanics of all races comprise 20.8% of the population.
- Census 2010 data shows that within the Springfield/Holyoke area, the number of potential college-bound/aged students breaks out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>within 10-mile radius</th>
<th>within 20-mile radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>36,607 (7.6%)</td>
<td>65,345 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>33,536 (7.0%)</td>
<td>61,249 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>30,690 (6.4%)</td>
<td>49,459 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In addition, there are a sizeable number of non-traditional age students who could potentially benefit from a satellite campus in downtown Springfield or Holyoke:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>within 10-mile radius</th>
<th>within 20-mile radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>28,212 (5.9%)</td>
<td>46,009 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>28,795 (6.0%)</td>
<td>49,131 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>32,588 (6.8%)</td>
<td>57,441 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Income levels are projected to increase modestly by 2015. Current census data (2010) show income detail for Springfield area residents as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>within 10-mile radius</th>
<th>within 20-mile radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$51,710</td>
<td>$60,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$62,181</td>
<td>$72,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family</td>
<td>$63,347</td>
<td>$71,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family</td>
<td>$71,632</td>
<td>$82,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Of the population in the city of Springfield 25 or older, 33.9% have a high school diploma or equivalent as their highest level of educational attainment, and 16.9% have a bachelor’s degree or above as their highest level of educational attainment. Of the population in Hampden County 25 or older, 32.8% have a high school diploma or equivalent as their highest level of educational attainment, and 23.8% have a bachelor’s degree or above as their highest level of educational attainment.

109 Ibid., 80.
• Total crime indices by block groups and census tracks indicate significant crime levels in the immediate vicinity of downtown Springfield (particularly in the North End). For the most part, outlying areas (10–20 miles outside of downtown) show significantly lower levels of crime.

The data below are obtained from a market research study prepared in January 2013 by the UMass Donahue Institute titled “UMass Satellite Center: Market Analysis for Springfield.”

**Academic Demand for an Educational Institution in Springfield:**

• A combination of indicators related to occupational levels, job projections, local interest, and educational demand point to several academic areas for consideration in a Springfield-based Satellite Center.

• Tempering the discussion is the fact that short-term job growth in the Springfield region is projected to be modest in aggregate as well as at the individual occupational level.

• The occupations in the region projected to have stronger prospects for local job growth while offering moderate to high entry level wages and of interest to employers and students are:
  1. Nursing (registered nurses/nurse practitioners; licensed practical and vocational nurses);
  2. PreK–12 teaching;

• It is anticipated that Hotel and Tourism Management will experience increased demand as a casino begins operations in western Massachusetts. Employer and incumbent worker demand also indicates strong interest in degree completion programs and MBA’s with concentrations in health care and finance (including actuarial).

• Critical to all occupations are bilingual capabilities and multicultural sensitivity. A significant demand for precision machining is being addressed through vocational/technical schools and community colleges. However the university has an opportunity to contribute to this important sector through applied research and innovation. Other interests include urban research in education; economic and community development; leadership; and health.

**Transfer Patterns:**

• In academic year 2011–2012, the majority (83%) of applicants to UMass Amherst were from in-state public institutions.

---


111 Donahue, “Market Analysis.”
• Enrollments from in-state two-year institutions are strong – 60+% of in-state transfer enrollees are from two-year institutions.
• Holyoke Community College and Springfield Technical Community College together provided 83% of all applicants from Springfield area institutions and 84% of all enrolled transfers from Springfield institutions.
• A total of 340 students transferred to UMass Amherst from these two institutions last year.
CHAPTER 5
SPRINGFIELD EDUCATION DISTRICT MASTER PLANNING

Setting a Collaborative Process of Planning

This phase of the thesis required work on multiple levels: first, conducting meetings for communication with all identified partners and incorporating feedback into the research; second, developing the outline for planning the education district with various components in a complex process; third, revising and updating the work regularly accordingly along the process; and fourth, developing the design and planning details of these components. The development of the research required going through all these four levels of work multiple times for update, elaboration, and revision.

Involving the partners is quite central to this thesis. The main point is to have all the identified partners, the university, the city, and local groups, help to set the agenda, identify the institutional mission, and provide the long-term vision. What started as a goal to plan a university campus in Springfield, later developed, with the positive participation of stakeholders, into the envisioning of an urban education district in Downtown Springfield.

Engaging the Partners into the Research

It is a challenge to satisfy the goal of building active partnerships between the UMass system, the City of Springfield, private developers, other nonprofit groups, and the local community. There is no magic formula that will bring all these groups together without a convincing purpose or real inducements. This thesis attempts to prove or at least to highlight the existence of great benefits for all that would result from collaborating in planning districts for higher educational institutions in redeveloping urban centers.
There are some current ongoing partnership efforts between the UMass system and multiple local groups (Please review chapter 4, UMass Current Project Collaborations in Springfield, for details). In fact, this thesis work, and the research associated with it, was inspired by one of those efforts, the inception of the UMass Center at Springfield in 2014. However, collectively, all these efforts to date are partial, scattered, and lack a unified long-term vision. This is different from the objective of this thesis, where the goal is to have a real impact on urban revitalization efforts in the city. Acknowledging this challenge is important, but the research conducted in this study and its completion could help reduce these challenges. The goal is to show through data, best practice case studies, graphic analysis, and program proposals for the academic institution, evidence and examples that could encourage all parties to adopt stronger partnership strategies in achieving the propositions of this thesis or similar ones.

The actual process of identifying and building potential partnerships included conducting meetings and interviews with representatives of the two primary partners: the University of Massachusetts and the City of Springfield. Communication with Scott Hanson, Principal Planner, Office of Planning & Economic Development, City of Springfield, and Lynn Griesemer, Associate Vice President for Economic Development, Executive Director of UMass Donahue Institute. Both representatives welcomed the propositions of the thesis and participated in the development of research and the final direction that it actually took. Through multiple meetings with both parties, and other meetings with the director of the UMass Center at Springfield and with the director of Co-Work Springfield, a local non-profit organization in the downtown area, the research was being developed and refined. The meetings overall were very positive and thoughtful. A summary of research to date was presented and a detailed hard copy of the thesis draft was provided, followed by focusing on current challenges of building the partnership and developing the research work.
The most tangible results and defining encounters of these meetings were:

1. Questioning the traditional description of the university proper as “campus,” which inspired the search for the meaning, use, and implication of the term and what it explains with the hope of finding a more relevant description of higher academic institutions that would better explain the development and entities being sought.

2. Questioning the traditional concept of “town-gown” relations, which triggered the search for an alternative, more relevant research framework using key terms such as one used in the title of this thesis, “City-University Partnership.”

3. Receiving and engaging with updates and assessments of my research in the phases of literature review and case study analysis. This interaction was profound and led to changing the focus of the thesis from planning an expansion of the next phase of growth of the UMass Satellite Center at Springfield into planning the “Springfield Education District (SED),” which includes all the partners: academic, governmental, nonprofit, and private businesses. This change allowed for addressing the collaboration and partnership issues more directly. It was also supported by the recent trends in academic and physical planning of higher education institutions in the 21st century, where the classical model of a university campus and its educational activities are changing.

4. Identifying a list of all potential partners, in addition to the City and the UMass Center in Springfield. For a full list of these groups (see map 5-6). Many of these organizations were identified by all parties, showing the level of agreement among all participants. Recommendations included forming a partnership, a consortium of institutions in what could be the “Springfield Educational District,” a list of buildings where local and
regional potential partners are located, mostly around the Main Street corridor, as a preferred site.

5. Using data collected about the City of Springfield, educational attainment, land local and regional higher educational institutions, meetings with all parties led to the selection of relevant academic programs to be included in the planned new academic institutions (see table ... for a detailed program). That also led to the development of a short/long term institutional size, academic programs, student body, and constituents.

6. Additionally, these meetings led to identifying the three main potential sites, all in the downtown metro region, that are suitable for the development and growth of the education district. Members made a tour of the downtown area to get familiar with the sites and to see the historic district with some of its major landmarks, museums, and Mattoon Street corridor. Later on, discussions about the condition of most properties in these sites and a classification of poor, fair, and good was developed, which was later used for the analysis and planning of the education district (see map 5-10).

7. Using the case studies and examples from the literature, in addition to the particular facts related to this case at hand, we proposed an “institutional mission” and a “vision” for the master plan, in terms of general principles and goals (review chapter ... figure ... for details). If this vision is achieved, the proposed education district would become a reality.

**Master-planning (Envisioning)**

Master planning is a major component of my thesis experimentation. The decision was made early on to include a planning/design stage in the work. There was a contested assumption that illustrating this research through graphic and diagrammatic representations
would be a powerful tool that would help partners envision the aims and goals of this thesis. Any effort of planning and schematic design is not supposed to be for the purpose of self-expression, but rather, an appropriate response to the findings of the research, the development and collaboration of the partnership, and the ‘ground truths’ about the site we are addressing. The Master planning process, in that way, is seen as a tool that highlights the research work and demonstrates how successful and workable the thesis proposals can be.

At the beginning of that phase, the collected data, the completed research, and the positive participation of all partners were all integrated to form a foundation for analysis and planning. A decision was made to use GIS—a tool that combines the use of different kinds of data with graphic representations and map production. This is quite significant to establish a link between data collected from different sources and the spatial analysis and planning phases needed for the master plan. Explaining the use of GIS (in general or even how it was used in this research) would require separate research and is not being included here, but it is important to state that it was used in this thesis to a great extent. All GIS data was obtained from the website of the State of the Massachusetts’ Government Office of Geographic Information (MassGIS),\(^\text{112}\) where a great array of “geodata” layers and “shapefiles” are available for public use. Examples of maps produced in this research show the locations of all higher education institutions in the region, along with major roads and town boundaries, in addition to existing structures and other major geographical features, all of which are important to explain the regional context. Other examples include maps at a closer look (large scale) that show street networks, existing parcels, and structures, which are very important for developing maps for site analysis and selection (see maps … for details).

Developing Mission, Vision, and Academic Programs

As a result of the research, which includes input from partners, lessons learned from literature review and the selected best practice case studies, and data analysis of Springfield’s educational/economical profiles, the institutional mission, the principles of a long-term vision, and a tentative academic program and size were developed. While this is sufficient for the purpose of this thesis, revised (more deliberated) statements are highly recommended if this proposal should ever be considered for implementation.

a) Springfield Education District’s Mission

The Springfield Educational District aims to:

• Bring the highest quality higher education, research, and services to citizens, nonprofit and for profit organizations, and government in Springfield, Massachusetts and the surrounding metro region.

• Promote learning and development through personalized education in a technology-enhanced environment that prepares students to be responsible for their own education, pursue professional objectives, and succeed in a very competitive and pluralistic society.

• Serve as a catalyst for generating a knowledge-based economy and opportunities in Springfield and surrounding community through academic, research, mixed-used development, and public engagement in collaborative programs across partners including: campuses of the UMass System, other regional and national higher education institutions, governmental and non-profit organizations, and private enterprise.
b) Springfield Education District’s Vision:

The Springfield Education District will serve as a generator of urban revitalization, a pioneer in community engagement, and a catalyst for economic development in the City of Springfield. The vision includes a special focus on the following:

- **Partnership and Collaboration:** Respecting the local community, government, private enterprise, and non-profit organization through collaboration in all development initiatives and at all phases—in planning, meetings, communication, funding efforts, decision making, and implementation—assuring equity, diversity, and inclusion.

- **Community Development:** Providing the local community with opportunities through engagement, education, employment, and public services.

- **Neighborhood Safety:** Ensuring safety for all residents and visitors on all streets in, and around, the district though proper design and implementation and appropriate police presence.

- **Enhanced urban life:** Attracting urban development projects that complement the academic activities, which include improvements in: infrastructure, public transportation, land use and zoning ordinances, and public open space.

- **Sustainability:** Adopting and encouraging green, sustainable principles in all facilities for efficiency, conservation, recycling, for clean indoor and outdoor air quality, and for protection of the local and global environments.
c) Developing Programs for Springfield Education District

Programming for the education district was based on the following factors: assessment of existing programs available at all colleges that exist in downtown Springfield including the UMass Center; total student enrollment and anticipated growth; appropriate fields of study that would prepare graduates for the local job markets in health care, precision engineering, information technology, tourism and hotel management; the growth collaborative model used by the UMR case study; and feedback from all partners. The program also established the year 2025 as a major milestone for the first phase of the master plan (see tables 5-1 below for details.). Recommendations will be made for 2040 and 2055 as long term phases, but would need further revision in the future. Moreover, in order to fulfill the promise of building a working partnership as stated in the vision, the program also included large areas of space dedicated to the use of potential partnership, governmental, nonprofit, and for-profit groups. That accounted for almost 65% of the total gross area of the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility/Development</th>
<th>Area GSF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A- Academic only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Institutional Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices, meeting, support</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Subdivisions of Schools/Departments - Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare and Nursing,</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management,</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Hospitality Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science,</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering,</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science,</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>51,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Educational Facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and services</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labs, lab support, Computer room, Services</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Lecture halls, Classrooms, TBL-rooms</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Student Life:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Dining and services (can be shared and operated with partners)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Social/Cultural/Religious (can be shared and operated with partners)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Leisure (can be shared and operated with partners)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Athletic Facility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Gym, recreation (can be shared and operated with partners)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Indoor Playgrounds (can be shared and operated with partners)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Student Housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student residential buildings – 300 students</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>404,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B- Partnership (non-academic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility/Development</th>
<th>Area GSF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Government/Institutional/Nonprofit/Community/Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office buildings: office space, conference/discussion rooms,</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop spaces</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Space</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Business/Commercial facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use development</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (business) Space</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Housing development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family housing</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Along with] mixed-use development</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Partnership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,065,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Buildout Total (Facilities)** | 1,469,800 |

C- Outdoor Space Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility/Development</th>
<th>Area GSF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks (for students, professionals, and public)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street network upgrade, sidewalk development</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Outdoor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban Context Analysis, Campus Form, and Site Selection

Springfield Education District

Preliminary Site Selection and Analysis:

This section of the thesis is illustrative, spatial, and data-driven in nature. It attempts to summarize and encapsulate all the research performed in this thesis, starting with findings of the two major literature review subjects, following direct, relevant lessons learned from case studies, and applying this to the specific case of the City of Springfield and its direct data and analysis as needed. A very complex process of programming and planning was adopted, which included the production of a wide range of maps through GIS, AutoCAD, and other support software. These maps are intended to present a foundational graphic and numerical analysis of the region and City and lead to the selection—and further study—of the Site (downtown Springfield). This analysis included documenting, studying, and evaluating urban form and land use patterns such as: zoning, land use, higher education adjacencies, partnership location, site selection, transportation systems and pedestrian connections, and regional transit systems.

Development Capacity:

The following campus program capacity calculations are performed concurrently while integrating geographic data with graphic representation in the form of site maps. Both the data and the maps are essential components in the process of master-planning of the ‘Springfield Education District’ as per the guidelines identified in the literature.
review and the case studies:

**Build-out analysis, identifying the holding capacity of each site:**

**Definition:** Floor Area Ratio (FAR) compares the total floor area of all buildings within a site to the surface area of that site.

**2025 Projections – at full buildout:** Calculating building capacity: the proposed program suggests the following:

- Total building program (space needs) = 1,500,000 GSF
- Average number of floors = 4 (current urban design guidelines)
- Total buildable sites = 1,500,000 / 4 = 300,000 GSF or (8.6 acres)
- Using a 1.5 FAR, 1,500,000 / 1.5 = 1,000,000 GSF or (23 acres)
- Total outdoor space of 300,000 SF (6.9 acres)

**Total 2025 Education District Area = 23 + 6.9 = 30 acres**

**2040 Projections – at full buildout:** (using 1,300,000 GSF growth every 10 years)

Calculating building capacity:

- Total buildable program = 2,000,000 (new)
- Average number of floors = 4
- Total buildable sites = 2,000,000 / 4 = 500,000 GSF or (11.5 acres) + 8.6 = (20 acres)
- Using a 1.5 FAR, 2,000,000 / 1.5 = 1,333,333 GSF or (30 acres) + 23 = (53 acres)
- Total outdoor space of 400,000 SF (9 acres) + 6.9 = (16 acres)

**Total 2035 Education District Area = 53 + 16 = 69 acres**
2055 Projections – at full buildout: (using 1,300,000 GSF growth every 10 years)

Calculating building capacity:

• Total buildable program = 2,000,000 (new)

• Average number of floors = 4

• Total buildable sites = 2,000,000 / 4 = 500,000 GSF or (11.5 acres) + 20 = (31.5 acres)

• Using a 1.5 FAR, 2,000,000 / 1.5 = 1,333,333 GSF or (30 acres) + 53 = (83 acres)

• Total outdoor space of 400,000 SF (9 acres) + 16 = (25 acres)

Total 2055 Education District Area = 83 + 25 = 108 acres
Figure 5-1 Regional Universities – Comparison (A)
Figure 5-2 Regional Universities – Comparison (B)
Figure 5-3 Regional Universities – Comparison (C)
Map 5-2 Higher Education Adjacencies - Springfield
Map 5-5 Urban Context – Springfield Downtown Analysis
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Map 5-6 Urban Context Analysis – Locations of Potential Partners

Map 3
Locations of Potential Partners
Map 5-8 Urban Context Analysis – Street/Transit Networks

Map 3
Locations of Potential Partners
Map 5-10 Urban Context Analysis – Existing Building Conditions (By City of Springfield)
Map 5-11 Urban Context Analysis – Identifying Potential Sites for Development

Total Developable Sites:

- 124 acres
- 5,400,000 gsf

- 14 acres (600,000 sf)
- 21 acres (900,000 sf)
- 40 acres (1,750,000 sf)
- 13 acres (700,400 sf)
- 7 acres (300,000 sf)
- 23 acres (1,000,000 sf)
- 6 acres (257,000 sf)
Map 5-12 Urban Context Analysis – Phase 1 Development Capacity (2025)
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2025 Projections
- Using a 1.5 FAR, 1,500,000 / 1.5 = 1,000,000 GSF or (23 acres)
- Total outdoor space of 300,000 SF (6.9 acres)
- Total 2025 Education District Area = 23 + 6.9 = 30 acres

Map
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- Poor or Demolition
- Structures
- Open Space

Developable Sites
Map 5-13 Urban Context Analysis – Phase 2 Development Capacity (2040)

2040 Projections

- Using a 1.5 FAR, 2,000,000 / 1.5 = 1,333,333 GSF or (30 acres) + 23 = (53 acres)
- Total outdoor space of 400,000 SF (9 acres) + 6.9 = (16 acres)
- Total 2035 Education District Area = 53 + 16 = 69 acres

Phase 2
69 acres total
Map 5-14 Urban Context Analysis – Phase 3 Development Capacity (2055)

2055 Projections

- Using a 1.5 FAR, 2,000,000 / 1.5 = 1,333,333 GSF or (30 acres) + 53 = (83 acres)
- Total outdoor space of 400,000 SF (9 acres) + 8 = (25 acres)
- Total 2055 Education District Area = 83 + 25 = 108 acres

Phase 3
108 acres total

Map
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Developable Sites
Map 5-15 Conceptual Site Development
Map 5-16 Urban Context Analysis – Existing Figure Ground
Map 5-18 Conceptual Master-Planning/Site Development Approach
Figure 5-4 Proposed Educational/Mixed-use Facilities Floor Layout

- Roof - Garden
- Upper Floors - Education
- 1st Floor - Education/Mix Use/Professional
- Street Level - Commercial/ Retail
CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Results of research method

The direction and the specialist focus identified from the literature review was the foundation for all the research as it relates to this thesis, and for the City of Springfield. In fact, all the research methods in various sources in the literature were the basis for the method in this thesis. Also the three best practice case studies investigated in this study, in addition to over ten other best practice case studies that were reviewed, gave strong guidance in the development of this thesis. University of Maryland College Park provides an example of the formation of a nonprofit organization and principles for urban redevelopment in the university’s neighborhood. UPenn provides an example of an institution that chooses to lead partners in the effort of urban revitalization, with the focus on similar categories that address the need for secure neighborhoods and the recovery of the housing market and economic development opportunities. UMR focused more on building a working partnership in all phases of the planning process, which spans from setting goals and a vision to the master planning of an education district with uses and facilities owned/operated by partners.

The condition of urban life in Springfield is calling for improvement. The scarce presence of higher educational institutions in the urban center of the city explains the absence of the vitality associated with a knowledge-based economy. The huge undertaking of proposing and planning higher education institutions and the complexity of their processes, goals, and requirements make it necessary to build partnerships and collaborations among all groups: local, governmental, academic institutions, business, and nonprofit organizations. Building
partnerships in planning large scale urban redevelopment projects is gradually becoming a common trend in today’s world. More communication, coordination, and engagement are necessary for a healthier process and outcome. For community redevelopment efforts, sharing the responsibility of identifying problems, studying them, searching for solutions, and executing plans for remedies, should be the spirit of all stakeholders.

**Research Findings Summary**

The spirit and progressive nature of a knowledge-based economy is key to creating a vibrant city center. Encouraging more communication, regular meetings, and performing the right kinds of studies related to urban planning and economic development are all needed. This study recommends an urban education district as a campus model that connects academic and research activities with the city and its urban life and infrastructure, and builds partnerships with local major businesses, nonprofit groups, and the larger community.

There are thousands of college campuses in the U.S., with many models of planning, growth, and operations. The method, process, and goals of planning have changed dramatically throughout the years. It is not relevant, in our case at least, how the traditional campus was designed because of the particular demands of the site, the proposed development objectives, and the complex and changing trends in higher education. Planning an urban campus will encourage further related and unrelated activities that include: housing projects, more professional and commercial development, and more cultural and artistic elements of an urban lifestyle. It will also enhance neighborhood security through the proper development of streets, sidewalks, bicycling infrastructure, and landscaping. The program and size of the proposed education district was realistically calculated based on similar developments, available land, and
recommended growth. However, it is very general and could change drastically as urban conditions evolve over time.

Downtown Springfield has so much to offer, and it thus offers a great context for development. The area, with its historic sites, buildings, museums, and many landmarks, offers a great cultural gateway to academic activities and a broad landscape for urban and economic development. The exiting transit system—i.e., the railroad, regional and local bus lines, direct highway access, and the major street grid—are other great assets. The existing urban infrastructure, however, needs major development, which also supports proposing a large-scale project, a development such as a university campus in the area that would trigger further developments. More zoning and land use regulations could be developed to manage growth, in addition to major improvements to public roads, side parking, green space, bike lanes, and sidewalks. Areas of development also would include ensuring urban sustainability and efficiency, planning for historic conservation efforts as needed, and using the Springfield Union Station, as a focal point, to turn the district into a transit oriented development (TOD).

The identified sites offer a mix of vacant lots for development and existing properties for adaptive reuse. The northern metro region is underdeveloped and could allow for more expansion, which is why this study recommends its selection for development. The nature of the urban campus will require that most buildings, academic and nonacademic, be situated directly on the main streets. The name ‘education district’ implies that education is the primary activity in this area, but also other (related and unrelated) uses and activities are strongly present and encouraged in the district. The site is characterized by historical/cultural adjacency, edges (defined by major highway and railway corridors), and existing vehicular street networks.
Due to time limitations, facilities planning at this stage, even in an abstract way, would be totally tentative and schematic. Only diagrammatic analysis of suggested locations and pattern of growth would be suitable at this stage.

**Recommendation for further research**

The role of universities in urban development and building partnerships between academic institutions and their hosting communities is already a growing research subject.

- I recommend further research on exploring specific methods of engaging partners into the research development, tailored specifically to communication with the leadership, and to provide guidelines for building administrative roles and support.

- More research is needed on the process of campus planning and growth that identifies the various contemporary models of campus planning. This is not to standardize the process but to give some examples that could help urban/campus planners in the future.

- More research that identifies the boundary between academic planning, campus planning, financial planning, their relationships, hierarchy, and influences.

- More use of GIS as a tool in the analysis of data: roads, infrastructure, capacity, adjacency, building conditions, building heights, walking distance, biking, and all the relevant data, as well as to investigate the right types of applied queries that would make the best use of all the data.
Conclusion

This thesis started with a main hypothesis (Proposition I) — that planning higher educational presence (development) in decaying urban centers is an ideal strategy for urban revitalization. While this may appear as an attempt to prove what is obvious, a lot of detailed research was required to provide a justification for this proposition. Proposition (II) continues the thesis intentions with the following: forming a collaborative partnership between universities and the cities that host them and identifying the potential role that universities play in redevelopment. A third proposition (III) completes the thesis proposal: illustrating this partnership through a reciprocal process of master planning is the right strategy for achieving the preceding two propositions. (See figure 6-1).

![Proposition I]

"Planning higher educational institutions (new or existing) in decaying urban centers" is a main strategy for urban revitalization

![Proposition II]

Commitment to creating "city-university partnership" is a prerequisite for success

![Proposition III]

Setting an inclusive "process of master-planning" is needed for illustrating and achieving Propositions I and II

Figure 6-1 Nested Research Propositions

Findings from the literature review, analysis of the best practice case studies and data collected, communication and interaction with representatives of the partnerships, in addition
to developing, programming, and planning an urban university campus (defined here as education district) have all illustrated strong evidence that support and reinforce all the interrelated propositions of this thesis. A feasibility study in the form of master-planning is a strong tool that professional planners and designers use. There is a great benefit to cities and local communities from doing professional studies on their urban environments. Case studies show that cities in collaboration with partners, such as academic institutions and private corporations, do parallel master planning work for each of the contexts being addressed. Some are more specific and detailed than others, for the entire downtown of the city. However, the coordination and communicative nature of the master planning studies is essential for success. While professional master planning is costly, incorporating this within the city’s existing economic development planning could provide the financial backing that would help meet the objectives of these studies. Planning for economic development, while obviously related, is not the focus of this study; for this reason it is highly recommended to encourage more economic development projects in the city.

Bringing in the students with their youthful energy, the faculty and researchers with their practical knowledge, and the professionals and skilled workers with their financial stability, along with the progressive strategy and lifestyle of the knowledge-based economy is the essence of what this thesis is trying to achieve. In the year 2015, one successful model of urban revitalization is achieved through master-planning of higher educational institutions, with partnership opportunities, in decaying urban centers.
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