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I. INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This project is about more than just preserving what is great about our buildings and landscape. It is about how our beautiful, historic buildings can be made to best support a liberal arts education in the 21st century. – H. Kim Bottomly, Fall 2012

As Wellesley began to prepare for the 2025 sesquicentennial of its first classes, the College leadership asked five distinct working groups – representing various academic and student life initiatives – to reimagine the ways in which the College's facilities could support its programs and activities in the decades ahead. Working groups were charged with envisioning the future of programs in Arts and Media, the Humanities, Science and the Environment, Student Residential Experience, and Wellness and Sports. Together, these initiatives forecast a more sustainable, collaborative, and connected campus. This document, the Wellesley 2025 Consolidated Program Plan (W2025), includes near-term actions in support of this long-term vision – actions that might reasonably be supported, funded, and completed within the next twelve to fifteen years.

W2025 is based on the products of the Working Groups and grounded in principles established by the 1998 Campus Master Plan (Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates) and the 2007 Comprehensive Facilities Plan (Eva Klein and Associates, Harvey H Kaiser Associates, Symmes Maini McKee Associates). The Campus Master Plan provided guidelines for the renewal of Wellesley's landscape and principles for future growth; the Comprehensive Facilities Plan described the condition of the College's buildings and recommended improvements.

A. W2025 GOALS AND PRINCIPLES

Wellesley College’s primary goals for W2025 are to:

- Enable academic initiatives and improvements to student life, and provide opportunities for collaboration and community building at a variety of scales.
- Meet current and anticipated program needs, with enough flexibility to accommodate evolution of programs and pedagogies.
- Facilitate stewardship of Wellesley’s rich inheritance of buildings and landscape, and – in particular – secure the longevity of its existing buildings.
- Build on and enhance sustainability initiatives throughout the campus.
- Improve accessibility throughout campus.
- Consider the campus as the embodiment of a forward-thinking college with a rich history and meaningful traditions, emphasizing both preservation and innovation.

B. PROGRAMMATIC GOALS

The long-term visions of the Working Groups were described in the work products of each Working Group planner. Taken together, these represent the College’s long-term program plan of which W2025 is the first increment. Program aims are summarized below; the full reports should be consulted by the committee members and consultants charged with implementing each W2025 component.

Briefly, program goals include:

- In Arts and Media, addressing some very basic safety issues, but also creating the individual and group spaces needed for advanced academic inquiry in studio art and music (including music group rehearsal spaces); inclusion of new technologies; greater integration of the arts, and of the arts and other academic disciplines like neurosciences.
- In Humanities, creating collaborative work space for both students and faculty; right-sizing and creating suites of classrooms that can be used across disciplines; creating more academic space in the existing Founders-Green complex to unite departments and enable more intentional academic adjacencies.
- In Science and the Environment, accommodating growing areas of inquiry such as neurosciences and environmental studies; creating physical opportunities to re-think introductory level classes by providing more hands-on, project-oriented opportunities; making science more visible (even within the building); and maintaining and strengthening the integration of the sciences (as well as collaborations with other arts, social sciences and humanities).
- In Student Residential Experience, improving building conditions and achieving greater equity across campus, including "right-sizing rooms"; creating nested communities at various scales (floor, building, neighborhood, campus); and allowing students from different years to live in close proximity while allowing different styles of living (including suites) in upper years. Improving and consolidating dining operations to support the neighborhood concept is also a goal.
- In Wellness and Sports, integrating Stone Center Counseling Services, Physical Education, Recreation, and Athletics (PERA), and Health Services in a center for wellness as a bridge between student and academic life; creating better, more accessible connections to the rest of campus; and addressing the need for more indoor sports space.

C. PURPOSE OF CONSOLIDATED PLANNING

The consolidated planning process was undertaken to:

- Create one coherent, unified, and flexible plan for Wellesley’s physical development over the next twelve to fifteen years, and general principles for change beyond that time frame.
- Identify and address areas of overlap, and gaps, between each of the five program plans.
- Articulate the College’s goals for sustainability, accessibility, and preservation as part of the overall plan.
- Help the College align priorities and budgets.
- Document the planning process to allow reasoned decision-making, and to communicate intentions, choices and trade-offs to stakeholders.

This document is the result of this process.
D. CONSOLIDATED PLANNING APPROACH AND PROCESS

1. Foundations

The W2025 Consolidated Program Plan brings together many sketches of recent and concurrent planning for Wellesley's future. Its foundation includes plans for:

- **Landscape.** The 1998 Campus Master Plan (Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates) has guided development and renewal of the campus landscape for the past 15 years, and its underlying principles remain fundamental to the College’s understanding of its campus.

- **Building condition and capacity.** 2007 Comprehensive Facilities Plan (Eva Klein and Associates, Harvey H Kaiser Associates, Symmes Maini McKee Associates). This assessment contributed to the College's identification of the five areas of study and to the premise at the outset of the programming process, and included options representing a range of assumptions. Based on these, they created programmatic test fits, which were estimated and reconciled by the College's cost consultants.

- **Budgeting and financing.** The College set overall budgets for W2025 based on a range of expectations about amounts it could raise, borrow, and fund through its operating budget. Construction cost escalation ranges forecast by the College’s cost consultants added another layer of variability to the model. The College’s expected budget range for W2025 is between $325 million and $550 million, expressed in current (i.e., not escalated) dollars.

- **Program.** In the words of President Bottomly, the Working Groups "dreamed big to clarify the College’s programmatic goals and aspirations." Working Group planners led the programming process, and included options representing a range of assumptions. Based on these, they created programmatic test fits, which were estimated and reconciled by the College's cost consultants.

2. Participation

**Consultation.** More than 75 individuals from the Wellesley community were consulted in the plan consolidation. Conversations with Working Group planners and subsequent discussions with each Working Group helped us understand their developing plans and priorities. Discussions with others across the campus – including individuals or groups related to Admissions, Library and Technology Services, Disability Services, Sustainability, Transportation, Stormwater Management, and Civil Engineering – gave the plan insight into campus-wide issues.

**Steering and decision-making.** The backbone of the consolidated planning process was a series of over 20 meetings with the W2025 Steering Committee, punctuated by presentations and discussions with the W2025 Trustee Committee and Senior Staff. On April 18, 2013, Wellesley’s Board of Trustees approved the consolidated program plan.
3. Challenges and Opportunities of Consolidation

The scale and breadth of the various plans provided some fundamental challenges to consolidation. For example:

- Taken together, the project cost of the Working Group’s full program plans were estimated, in 2012 dollars, to be around $1.38 billion; even the “no-growth” options, at $904.5 million, would greatly exceed the College’s targeted budget range of $825 million to $550 million.

- Working Group program plans challenged the 2007 Comprehensive Facilities Plan’s conclusion that the College’s existing buildings would continue to have enough appropriate space to meet long-term programmatic needs. Implementing all groups’ full program plans could add more than 370,000 square feet – about 14% of the College’s existing building area – diverting resources from improving existing buildings in need of renewal and creating new long-term operational commitments.

Components from the five Working Group plans were combined in various ways, and these synthesized options were evaluated according to principles established by the Steering Committee (Section I.E.). With the help of the W2025 Trustee Committee, the band of options was narrowed and refined.

In parallel, the Steering Committee charged the Working Groups and their planners with exploring ways to help reconcile competing mandates. Their creativity and flexibility helped enable a consolidated plan for W2025 that includes some relatively modest building additions but focuses primarily on renewal of existing facilities. Even so, by defining a “big vision” and identifying the size and locations of potential future additions, Working Group plans provide important information and guidance for building renovations, enabling the design of W2025 projects to facilitate, not preclude, realization of long-term programmatic aims.

As W2025 is implemented, communication among groups could result in creative partnerships and incentives for shared space. For example, both sciences and the arts have programmatic needs for flexible, media-rich space; representatives of both groups should be involved in the planning of such space, wherever it occurs, to allow its most intense, collaborative use.
E. PRINCIPLES FOR CONSOLIDATION

The long-term programmatic visions defined by the Working Groups included plans that far exceed Wellesley’s near-term financial and operational capacities. Principles for prioritizing projects— and for prioritizing within projects — include a project’s ability to:

- Remedy substandard conditions affecting teaching, research, or student life.
- Correct code or other regulatory deficiencies.
- Offer significant opportunity to improve academic life.
- Offer significant opportunity to improve student life.
- Allow the development of desirable new academic programs.
- Allow the development of desirable new student life programs.
- Benefit a significant number of students (or even the entire College community).
- Be economically achieved — i.e., provide “bang for the buck.”
- Attract funding.
- Facilitate operational savings within a reasonable payback period.
- Enhance sustainability and provide environmental or health benefits.
- Help continue to attract, support and retain an excellent and diverse student body population.
- Help continue to attract, support, and retain a world-class faculty of teacher scholars.

W2025 balances the need for facility renewal with the need for programmatic renewal, and identifies project priorities for the next 12 to 15 years.

F. KEY COMPONENTS

The projects included in W2025 balance these programmatic goals with the need for physical renewal of campus buildings. By following the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Massachusetts Architectural Accessibility Board (MAAB) regulations in all renovation and construction processes, W2025 will also improve accessibility in key areas of campus.

Because the funding available depends on many variables, the Consolidated Program Plan includes a Base Plan, including the College’s most urgently needed projects, and cumulative additions resulting in an Expanded Plan and a Comprehensive Plan. The Base Plan represents the work the College believes could be accomplished in its most conservative financial models. The Comprehensive Plan represents the goal for the W2025 increment of the College’s long-term programmatic plan. Moreover, the Comprehensive Plan includes some flexibility to allow for future decisions to be made based on the best information available at that time.

Key components of the Base, Expanded, and Comprehensive W2025 Consolidated Program Plans are indicated on the diagrams on pages I-7 through I-11, and more fully described in Section III. Overarching considerations for preservation, sustainability, and accessibility are included in Section II; enabling projects and other implementation issues for each component are outlined in Section IV.
Base Plan

Cumulative Additions to Base Plan

Expanded Plan

Comprehensive Plan

Integrated Approach

Key:
- $365.4M budget
- $450M budget
- $550M budget

Note: All models include 5% Utility Infrastructure and 3% Other Enabling Projects (including Landscape) allowances.

* Munger renovation does not include relocation of Claffin Bakery
** Other Known Needs (e.g., Repurpose Stone-Davis Dining, Academic Commons in Clapp Library)

W2025 Projects
Consolidated Plans
1. **Base Plan**

The **Base Plan** is based on the College’s most conservative financial projections and includes:

- **Renewal of Pendleton West**, including a complete overhaul of existing space and a 12,000 gross square foot addition for both visual and musical arts, incorporating classroom, studio and rehearsal spaces to accommodate emerging and traditional media.

- **Conversion of now-vacant space in Schneider Center and Physical Plant** to accommodate student services and administrative uses, bringing together departments that serve students in Schneider while allowing more space in Founders and Green to be dedicated to Humanities.

- **Renovation of the 1977 L-wing**, infrastructure repairs to **Sage Hall**, strategic infrastructure improvements to the **E-wing**, and the replacement of the permanent greenhouses will begin to provide the Science Center with flexibility for new disciplines and pedagogies, while encouraging and supporting collaboration, and enhancing sustainability.

- **Renewal of Munger**, including an 11,900-square foot addition for an expanded and improved dining facility; full renovation of **Beebe**, including updated underground infrastructure that serves all residence halls in Hazard Quad; and a full renovation of **Cazenove**, with the exception of the link to Pomeroy.

- **Renewal of the Bates dining hall.**

- **Major renovations to the Field House.**

- **Allowances for:**
  - Improvements to **Founders and Green**, including minor reconfiguration of spaces made available by administrative moves to Schneider and the Physical Plant. This would allow, for example, the consolidation of the East Asian Languages and Literature Department in one location, and the first phase of a third-floor humanities commons. Deficiencies in the heating and cooling systems in Founders would also be addressed. (A more extensive renovation of Founders and the south wing of Green is included in the Comprehensive Plan.)
  
  - Improvements at **Stone and Simpson** for Health and Counseling Services. (In the Comprehensive plan, these functions would move to a new location, and this space would be repurposed.)

  - Quality-of-life and programmatic improvements at various locations throughout the student residential system, in buildings that won’t receive major renovations in early phases of W2025, to improve the student experience campus-wide.

  - Other campus program needs, potentially including, for example, an Academic Commons in Clapp Library.

  - Utility infrastructure and other enabling projects.
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2. **Expanded Plan**

The *Expanded Plan*, based on somewhat less conservative financial projections than the Base Plan, includes all projects listed in the *Base Plan*, plus:

- Renewal of *Tower Court East and West*, including renovation of the Tower Court dining hall.
- Additional allowances for other, more modest needs, and for utility infrastructure and other enabling projects.
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EXPANDED PLAN MAP

Wellesley 2025 Consolidated Program Plan
VSBA, LLC
May 8, 2013
G. NEXT STEPS

The College has proposed an ambitious implementation schedule for the completion of the plan, with completion of the Expanded Plan projects in 2020. Indeed, Wellesley has already begun implementation: the renovation of Schneider has already begun, architects have been selected to begin work on the Field House, and a design committee is being formed for work on Pendleton West. Planning is underway to select designers for Munger’s renovation and dining and for Stone and Simpson improvements.

"With a framework set for the W2025 projects, the College can now begin the important work necessary to renew and reinvest in our buildings — our lovely, iconic, essential spaces — enabling us to achieve our educational goals."

— H. Kim Bottomly

President Bottomly noted in her April 2013 memo to the Wellesley community that, "by 2017-18, we expect to have a clearer sense of our future financing and fundraising capacity," and that, "at that time, we will be able to decide which projects are the most feasible."
NOTE: Topographic Map Background is drawn in 10’ increments.

KEY

- BODIES OF WATER
- MARSH
- RENOVATION
- PARTIAL RENOVATION
- NO SCOPE
- NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Comprehensive Plan could include some of the indicated projects.
Wellesley’s campus includes buildings of many eras and styles, each rooted in its particular time. Uses have shifted as programs and pedagogies have changed: Pendleton, for example, once home to the sciences, now houses social sciences and fine arts. The College has also razed buildings when they no longer suited its needs: Farnsworth Art Building and the timber Norumbega dormitory were demolished to make way for the Jewett Art Center, and the Mary Hemenway gymnasium was demolished for construction of the Keohane Sports Center in 1985.

W2025 aims to extend the usefulness and longevity of some of the many loved and architecturally significant buildings on Wellesley’s campus. Key structures within the scope of W2025 include:

- Selected buildings in the Academic Quad, “a perfectly scaled, intimate campus crossroad,”5 formed by:
  - The Academic Center (Day & Klauder, architects, and Ralph Adams Cram, supervising architect for overall scheme): Founders (Day & Klauder, architects and Ralph Adams Cram, supervising architect, 1917-1918). Green (Day & Klauder, 1929-1931) and Pendleton (Day & Klauder 1934-1936). These graceful buildings are integral to the Wellesley’s physical identity, and are the work of some of the most widely known architects of their time. In 1921, The Architecture Review devoted most of an issue to these buildings, describing the partially-built complex as “both virile and scholarly” and praising its combination of informality and order. 4
  - Jewett Art Center (Paul Rudolph, 1956-1958). Although near-term changes to Jewett are minor and in secondary spaces, the building’s significance cannot be overstated. One of Rudolph’s earlier works, it’s widely known for its sensitive response to a more traditional context – a Modern “tour de force of integration with an existing style.”6 This building, according to one architectural writer, displays a “remarkable, robust refinement...almost unexpected in a master known later for more brutal work.”7 It requires the highest degree of sensitivity, inside and out.
  - Tower Court (Coolidge and Carlson, 1914-1915, portico added as later addition). This, one of Wellesley’s most cherished buildings, was built on College Hill soon after College Hall was destroyed by fire; its architects and general form were selected by the donor. 8 Although the building’s massing and relationship to the landscape were the subject of much debate even before its construction, the building – particularly its interior gathering spaces – “already boded to be a landmark of Arts and Crafts style.”9 The building includes some of the “most intact Arts and Crafts interiors in the Boston area.”
  - Beebe (1908) and Cazenove (1904-1905) are part of Hazard Quadrangle (Julius A. Schweinfurth, architect). Olmsted chose as the site for the residence halls “the high plateau near the West Woods.”10 Historian Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz views Hazard Quadrangle as an important milestone in College history: “[T]he Quadrangle ... represents a significant step in Wellesley’s development as a women’s college... [I]t carried no distinctive feminine associations. Built on a public road and offering entry into college grounds, the residence halls announced the college to the outside rather than offering seclusion within the grounds. The energetic towers capped by green copper convey collegiate grandeur, while the internal courtyard suggests the dignity of college life...”11
  - The Science Center (Perry, Dean, Stahl and Rogers, 1974-1978; Perry Dean Rogers expansion, 1991).12 “[T]he Science Center is well known and much admired within the architectural community. The Boston Society of Architects gave it an extraordinary award in 1988 for being the best building of the whole of the previous decade in the Boston area.” 13 The juxtaposition of old and new is an important factor in this esteem: “[T]he contrasting materials and styles of old and new construction in the atrium are briskly juxtaposed...The design principle is collage...”14
  - Munger Hall (William T. Aldrich, 1933). Munger, originally built for students with financial need, is the most recent and least ornate of the residence halls included for major building-wide renovation in the W2025 plan. Because it includes a large addition on a tight site along a public road – visible to passers-by as well as College constituents – its design will have impact on both the campus and the street.
  - Stone and Simpson (Simpson Cottage, Van Brunt and Howe, 1882; Simpson Addition Shepley, Rutan and Coolidge, 1908; 1941). Simpson Cottage was purpose-built in the Tudor style as the campus infirmary. The 1941 brick addition is more utilitarian in character; although the 1998 Master Plan recommends its demolition, it continues to be useful.
  - Schneider Hall (Angell and Swift, 1904). This lovely but much-altered building was an addition to Billings; its renovation is currently underway.
  - The Keohane Sports Complex, designed by Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer, was completed in 1986. The building incorporates a 1928 Recreation Building designed by William T. Aldrich, Wellesley College Board member and architect for Munger Hall; however, “[t]ucked in the northeast corner of the building the old brick walls, parapet gables, and stone copings are barely visible...”15 An earlier gymnasium on the site – Mary Hemenway Hall – was demolished in the 1980s for construction of the new complex. 16
2. **W2025 Considerations**

A deep and nuanced understanding of the College’s buildings – individually and as an ensemble – and preservation of their most significant qualities are necessary precursors to additions and renovations that engage in meaningful ways with the existing campus. The College recognizes the need for further discussion on preservation priorities, in general and related to particular projects. Overall considerations include:

- **Developing internal processes.** As design processes are developed, Wellesley should decide how the College’s preservation interests will be defined and represented as the plan is implemented.
- **Selecting architects.** Design teams for projects with large preservation components – that is, most W2025 projects – should demonstrate the technical expertise such projects demand, sensitivity to historic campus contexts, and the creativity to bring new life and accommodate new uses in existing buildings.
- **Setting project-specific preservation criteria.** Early in the design process, the design team and College should articulate prioritized preservation goals for each project. The formulation of these goals should extend beyond the immediate user groups, as campus buildings and landscapes are parts of Wellesley’s shared heritage. The significance of some of these cultural resources – Jewett Art Center or the interiors of Tower Court, for example – extend beyond campus.
- **Maintaining sound preservation practices in significant buildings.** By preserving original character-defining materials wherever feasible and – where it is not feasible – closely replicating the appearance of original elements (window profiles and muntin patterns, for example).
- **Considering the landscape and buildings together.** The careful negotiation of land form and building massing is an important component of Wellesley’s campus heritage.

B. **SUSTAINABILITY**

1. **Overview**

Over the past decade, the College has made significant progress toward its environmental goals, and it has recently reformedulated its sustainability committee. W2025 projects offer multiple opportunities for environmental concerns to become more fully embedded in Wellesley’s culture campus-wide. Participation in project planning by faculty, students, and staff could help galvanize, focus, and expand sustainability efforts across the academic and operations activities of the College.

Wellesley’s approach has been to think holistically about campus sustainability; this systems approach includes landscape, water, waste reduction and recycling, energy use, and education. The College has set goals for recycling and reduced use of water and energy, for example, and within the past decade has removed 5.7 acres of pavement and restored 8 acres of wetlands.

2. **W2025 Considerations**

The formulation and selection of projects included in the Consolidated Program Plan were informed by sustainable design principles:

- More intensely use existing buildings before considering substantial new construction – to limit the energy needed to operate additional campus area and to preserve energy embodied in the existing construction.
- Renovate vacant and underutilized buildings – like Schneider and the Physical Plant – as part of an overall strategy of reuse and, where appropriate, also to revitalize underused areas of campus.
- Where feasible and within the bounds of good preservation practice, improve existing building envelopes to reduce energy loss and extend building longevity.
- Maintain open areas of campus designated for preservation in the 1998 Campus Master Plan.
- Preserve and protect the campus water supply. In particular, continue to protect zones around existing wells, unless and until other wells or permanent water sources have been implemented. (See Section IV.D.)
- Extend the useful life of buildings by making repairs and updating systems, as advocated by the 2007 Comprehensive Facilities Plan.

The Base Plan and the Expanded Plan include renovation of more than 15% and 19%, respectively, of all existing building area on Wellesley’s campus; new construction included in either the Base Plan or Expanded Plan is less than 1% of the existing campus building area. Percentages for the Comprehensive Plan would vary based on the combination of projects implemented.

New uses, programs and updates to buildings – for example, adding new laboratories, or meeting current ventilation standards in outdated buildings – could offset improvements in energy efficiency. As implementation of the plan progresses, the College will continue to evaluate incremental capital investments to help reduce consumption and waste while achieving operational savings.

The College will aim for a minimum of LEED Silver Certification for capital projects by pursuing project approaches and features that provide tangible environmental and health benefits. Along with other College Facilities professionals, the College Director of Sustainability will be involved at the outset of each project and at key points in the design and construction process, to benefit the project and facilitate communication with the broader Wellesley community about sustainability issues.

C. **ACCESSIBILITY**

1. **Overview**

As a private higher education institution – a Title III Public Accommodation entity under the ADA – Wellesley was required to begin identifying and removing “readily-achievable” barriers beginning on January 26, 1992. The College’s commitment to improving its access to people with disabilities was confirmed in the 1998 Campus Master Plan, and reconfirmed during the consolidated program planning process.

In December 2012, Wellesley created an ADA/504 Committee, replacing the prior Disabilities Service Providers Committee. The new committee’s principal charge is two-fold: to “lead the College in creating a plan regarding readily achievable barrier removal and assessing the progress in the plan,” and to “lead the College in creating and implementing policies and procedures that comply with ADA/504.” The memo creating the committee instructed its members that its “early efforts should focus on the charge to create a strategic plan regarding identification of existing barriers that can be easily removed and a strategic plan for their removal.”

2. **W2025 Considerations**

The capital projects defined in the Consolidated Program Plan are important components of Wellesley College’s accessibility strategy. Meeting Massachusetts Architectural Accessibility Board (MAAB) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations in all renovations and new construction, as required, will help make Wellesley’s campus more welcoming and accessible to individuals with disabilities. In parallel, the College will continue removal of barriers across campus – including those outside the scope of W2025.
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11. Ibid.

12. Although Day & Klauder drawings for Sage Hall exist, Fergusson et al credit Ralph Adams Cram with the design of Sage.
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