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Context for the Plan

The 2015 Campus Master Plan is the institution’s first comprehensive master plan in over 20 years. Building on existing innovations, the plan follows aligns with a parallel and ongoing strategic and academic planning initiative. These plans emphasize:

• An academic experience focused on entrepreneurial learning in and out of the classroom
• An emphasis on quality rather than quantity amongst stable enrollment targets
• A vibrant residential community that provides unique educational and engagement opportunities
• A future vision that addresses institutional and state priorities and supports Indiana’s economy
• Re-use, renovation, and reallocation amongst dwindling public funding resources

In response to these challenges and opportunities, the 2015 Campus Master Plan creates transparent trans-disciplinary opportunities for growth built on the institution’s commitment to 21st century learning programs that incorporate research, curricular innovation and community outreach. As a forward-looking document, the plan proposes three academic commons as collaborative nodes to break down physical disciplinary silos that have developed around the traditional quadrangle. These commons provide opportunities to colocate Ball State’s health sciences and clinical offerings, encourage collaboration between architecture, business and journalism, and utilize the arts, theater and faculty space to energize campus open space. A re-imagined connected system of open spaces anchored by a new east mall is envisioned as a framework upon which programmatic change and collegiate exchange will occur. These open spaces are supported by existing and proposed residential neighborhoods that increasingly engage the university’s urban village and local community, providing enhanced partnership opportunities at campus edges.
Vision Statement

The 2015 Campus Master Plan plan is rooted in, and contributes to the Ball State University vision, mission and values. The confluence of previous plans and the 2015 Campus Master Plan have led to recommendations that will advance higher education in the 21st century.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan seeks to advance the Ball State University Strategic Plan through the process-oriented and consensus-based planning process described on the following pages.
Purpose of a Master Plan

At its very essence, a campus master plan is a collection of powerful ideas. These ideas establish a flexible framework for coordinating physical change on a campus. The quality of the physical environment has a tremendous influence on the image of an institution, and as such, the master plan serves as a foundation for shaping the campus fabric in support of its academic mission and vision.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan is a composite document of principles, goals, objectives, ideas, and recommendations, and the graphics that support and illustrate these concepts. As a long-range tool that can adapt and flexibly respond to future change, the plan outlines a vision for future change and parameters to strategically manage development opportunities and implement initiatives within short-, mid-, and long-term time horizons. The 2015 Campus Master Plan (is):

- Develops a comprehensive framework
- Establishes a long-range vision
- Aligns strategic, academic, and physical goals
- Driven by principles
- Flexible and opportunity based
- Participatory
- Phased and implementable
The following concepts define the foundation upon which the 2015 Campus Master Plan is based:

• The 2015 Campus Master Plan establishes a framework that defines how the physical campus can be improved and/or expanded. Because it establishes general parameters, adjustments can be accommodated without affecting its core principles.

• The 2015 Campus Master Plan is a long-range plan. Many of the concepts illustrated in the plan are multi-decade ideas, requiring numerous projects to achieve. Some ideas may never come to fruition. Most master plans require update/maintenance every 5-10 years.

• The 2015 Campus Master Plan does not mandate change. Rather, the plan defines opportunities to accommodate change believed desirable and necessary.

• The 2015 Campus Master Plan identifies drivers that are impacted by future change. By emphasizing an integrated approach, facility improvements, utility enhancements, transportation initiatives, and pedestrian amenities can be methodically coordinated.

• The 2015 Campus Master Plan identifies campus-wide and college level space needs based on a conservative assumption of modest enrollment growth. The plan does not identify specific department or school-level programmatic needs. The plan does not define specific building uses, but does define building locations, capacities, design considerations, and general use descriptions.

• The 2015 Campus Master Plan is not an implementation plan; it identifies opportunities the institution may choose to pursue as future needs become more clearly defined.
Planning Process

A consensus-based approach to the 2015 Campus Master Plan included seven on-campus milestone visits over 10-months and was divided into five primary phases, including:

- Discovery
- Analysis
- Idea Generation
- Refinement
- Documentation

Each milestone visit included meetings with the Executive Committee (President’s cabinet), Campus Advisory Committee (including a cross section of campus constituents), and Community Advisory Committee (including a cross section of community constituents), focus groups (as needed) and several open houses.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan included opportunities to engage both in-person and online constituents. The committee structure outlined above guided the direction of planning recommendations.

Additional input incorporated into 2015 Campus Master Plan are the product of over 5,500 unique online participants via the Virtual Town Hall website (masterplan.bsu.edu) that generated over 30,000 page views.
Building Consensus

views, and countless valuable comments. An additional 2,800 students and faculty also provided commentary and feedback via an online survey specifically focused on residence life.

Feedback via the Virtual Town Hall website was continuous and representative of a cross section of faculty and students. A few of the top trending themes from the website that have been incorporated in the 2015 Campus Master Plan include:

- “Improve learning spaces”
- “Develop a new Science Building”
- “Expand resources for the Theater and Dance Department”
- “Improve bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure”
- “Prioritize convenient transportation and connections to town”
- “Improve campus landscape and maintenance”
- “Encourage additional sustainability initiatives”
The 2015 Campus Master Plan document is representative of the planning process and is chronological in nature, with each chapter building on its predecessor. The chapters previewed in this overview chapter include:

**Chapter 2: The Campus Today**

This chapter provides a baseline understanding of existing campus facilities, historical development, campus context and campus systems. Chapter 2 also provides a physical analysis of campus.

**Chapter 3: A Vision for the Future**

Chapter 3 provides an overview of plan drivers leading to a framework plan for future development. This chapter also introduces the major concepts of the plan and discusses primary opportunities for changes to the physical fabric of the university.

**Chapter 4: Campus Facility, Open Space and Mobility Initiatives**

Chapter 4 outlines opportunities for systematic change to the Ball State campus.

**Chapter 5: Phasing**

Chapter 5 provides a phaseable road map for implementation of action-oriented priorities as part of initial, secondary, and future opportunities. Included in this chapter is a discussion of flexibility and prioritization.

**Chapter 6: Design Guidelines**

Chapter 6 describes a sustainable and non-prescriptive approach to design guidelines at the campus-wide level for site and architecture. This chapter also includes neighborhood-level guidelines for change.

**Appendices**

The 2015 Campus Master Plan includes Technical Reports for Academic Space Needs and Utilization Analysis, and Student Housing, Dining, Campus Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics. These documents are included as a separate volume to the primary Campus Master Plan report.
The analysis of Ball State’s campus history, context and systems depicted in this chapter establish a starting point for ideas depicted in the following chapters of this report.

The physical campus systems analyzed in this chapter provide a comprehensive understanding of existing campus framework and observations regarding opportunities for change. These systems are compared to proposed campus systems in Chapter 4 of this report as a benchmark for progress.

This chapter covers several topics that set the foundation for the 2015 Campus Master Plan, including:

- Existing Campus Conditions ........................................ 20
- Campus Evolution .......................................................... 24
- Campus Structure ........................................................... 36
- Campus Character ............................................................ 40
- Mobility ........................................................................ 46
- Community Connections ............................................. 58
- Sustainability .................................................................. 60
With a 2015 on-campus enrollment of approximately 16,602 students, Ball State offers 6 associates, 170 bachelors, 88 masters, 4 specialist, and 16 doctoral degrees in seven academic colleges. The 2015 Campus Master Plan focuses on Ball State’s 731-acre main campus in the heart of Muncie, Indiana, which includes 120 academic, administrative, auxiliary, and residential buildings valued at more than $2 billion and totaling 7,152,282 Gross Square Feet (GSF). The university also has just over 400 additional acres of research property. Three parking garages total 532,792 additional GSF. Eleven residence hall complexes and two apartment communities comprise 7,632 traditional beds and 524 apartment units.

### Existing Campus Conditions

**Key**
- AS: McKinley, 400 N
- AY: Academy House
- AD: Frank A. Bracken Administration Bldg
- AL: Alumni Center
- AT: Applied Technology Building
- AX: Architecture Annex
- AB: Architecture Building (CAP)
- AC: Arts and Communications Bldg.
- AJ: Art and Journalism Building
- BC: Ball Communications
- BG: Ball Gymnasium
- PR: Bracken House
- BL: Bracken Library
- BB: Burkhardt Building
- BA: Ball Honors House
- BU: Burris School
- CA: Carmichael Hall
- PE: Center for Peace & Conflict Studies
- LB: David Letterman Communication & Media Building
- CX: Child Study Center (Main ofc infant/toddlers)
- CS: Child Study Center (Preschool)
- CL: Cooper Life Science Building
- CL: Brown Planetarium
- CN: Cooper Nursing Building
- CP: Cooper Physical Science Building
- CS: Child Study Center
- CX: Child Study Annex

### Existing Academic Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>YR Built</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>McKinley, 400 N</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>3,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>Academy House</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>8,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Frank A. Bracken Administration Bldg</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>54,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Alumni Center</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>50,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Applied Technology Building</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>93,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX</td>
<td>Architecture Annex</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Architecture Building (CAP)</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>146,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Arts and Communications Bldg.</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>47,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Art and Journalism Building</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>207,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Ball Communications</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>84,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Ball Gymnasium</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>83,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Bracken House</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>13,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>Bracken Library</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>321,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Burkhardt Building</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>61,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Ball Honors House</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>7,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Burris School</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>130,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Carmichael Hall</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>22,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Center for Peace &amp; Conflict Studies</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>David Letterman Communication &amp; Media Building</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>87,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Child Study Center (Main ofc infant/toddlers)</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Child Study Center (Preschool)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Cooper Life Science Building</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>113,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Brown Planetarium</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>7,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Cooper Nursing Building</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>47,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Cooper Physical Science Building</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>130,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Child Study Center</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX</td>
<td>Child Study Annex</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>EB &amp; Bertha Ball Center</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>15,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Fine Arts Building</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>74,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Research/Contracts &amp; Grants Ofc</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Marilyn K. Glick Center for Glass</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>Greenhouse Orchid</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse Training</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>19,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Health/Phys Activities Building</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>87,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Heath Farm</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Heath Farm</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Heath Farm</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Heath Farm</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Heath Farm</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Heating Plant/Boiler House</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>18,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Public Safety/Police</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Indy Center (Leased Space)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Lucina Hall</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>60,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>EF Ball Med Technology</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>16,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Maria Bingham Medical Education (Leased Space)</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>13,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Multicultural Center</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>6,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Urban Design Studio (Leased Space)</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>Hargreaves Music Building</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>45,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Music Instruction Building</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>86,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>North Grounds Bldg</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>13,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>North Service Building</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ</td>
<td>North Quad Building</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>126,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Psychological Science Annex</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Pruis Hall</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>18,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>House &amp; Pub Sfty/Garage</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>6,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Robert P. Bell Building</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>106,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Recreation Center/Academic Portion</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>57,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Shafer Bell Tower</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/SV</td>
<td>Showalter/Service Stores</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>66,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>South Grounds</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>South Service Bldg.</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Teachers College Building</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>125,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Telephone and Postal Services</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>4,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tower Bldg WIPB-TV</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Tower WIPB/HDTV</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>CAP Design Build Lab</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>4,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>University Theatre</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>83,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ</td>
<td>West Quad</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>57,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Whitinger Business Bldg</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>93,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Fisher (Outreach) Center (Leased Space)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Cornerstone Lease-Ctr for Vital Aging (Leased Space)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Media Insight Center (Lease)</td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Warehouse (Kuhner + CNC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>1301 W. Riverside Art Annex</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Total Academic Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,124,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Auxiliary Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Gross Square Footage (GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP Visiting Prof 1206-Bee</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Visiting Prof 1313-Car (Vacant)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Visiting Prof 1400-Car</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Visiting Prof 1406-Car (Vacant)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU Emens Auditorium</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>82,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Student Center, L.A. Pittenger</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>171,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC Kitselman Conference Center</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>12,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Scheumann Stadium (Football)</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>53,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Fisher Football Training Complex</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC Recreation Center</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>230,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR Worthen Arena (HPAB II)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>193,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Visiting Prof 1412-Rex (Vacant)</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Visiting Prof 808-Warwick</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>3,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Prof 910-Warwick</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Auxiliary Buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>791,215</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Rentals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>22,127</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Parking Garages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>532,792</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Existing Residential Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Gross Square Footage (GSF)</th>
<th>Beds/Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN Anthony Apartments</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>88,082</td>
<td>131U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH DeHority Hall</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>131,072</td>
<td>550B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Elliott Hall</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>51,627</td>
<td>119B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW Elliott Wagner Dining</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>13,228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA Johnson Halls A (Botsford Swinford)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>164,176</td>
<td>572B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB Johnson Halls B (Schmidt Wilson)</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>153,379</td>
<td>505B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI Thomas J. Kinghorn Hall</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>190,480</td>
<td>600B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA LaFollette Halls (Brayton, Clevenger, Edwards, Hurst, Knotts, Mysch, Shales, Shively, Woody)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>531,792</td>
<td>1,720B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO Noyers Hall (Baker, Howick, Klipple, Williams)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>238,320</td>
<td>756B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK Park Hall</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>194,600</td>
<td>502B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Studebaker East (Hurlbut, Menk)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>97,406</td>
<td>439B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR Scheidler Apartments</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>345,300</td>
<td>293U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Studebaker West (Davidson, Painter, Palmer, Whitcraft)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>242,080</td>
<td>963B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA Wagoner Halls (Burkart, Jeep)</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>75,680</td>
<td>316B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO Woodworth Halls (Brady, Crosley, Rogers, Wood)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>164,626</td>
<td>590B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Residential Buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,681,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,632B</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Campus Buildings

- **2,681,848 Beds/Units**
- **7,152,282 Square Feet**
Campus Evolution

Ball State’s tradition of innovation and entrepreneurship is rooted in the late 19th century, when Muncie business leaders envisioned a local college to help boost the city’s development. Among the visionaries were Frank C. Ball and his brothers, young New York industrialists who moved to Muncie looking to expand their glass container business. A small, private teacher training school opened in 1899.

After the community’s efforts to sustain the college failed, the Ball brothers purchased the land and buildings of the defunct institution and donated them to the State of Indiana. This gift became the Indiana State Normal School Eastern Division, which opened in 1918 to meet Indiana’s need for more and better teachers.

In recognition of the Ball family’s generosity, the Indiana General Assembly changed the school’s name to Ball Teachers College in 1922 and then Ball State Teachers College in 1929. The winged statue Beneficence stands on the campus as a tribute to the family.

By the 1960s, the regional teachers college had begun to attract faculty from outside the Midwest, and students sought majors in areas such as business, architecture, and other emerging disciplines. Enrollment and funding surged with national trends, and new facilities and degree offerings were added.

In 1965, the Indiana General Assembly renamed the college Ball State University, acknowledging its growth in enrollment and facilities, the variety and quality of its educational programs and services, and the anticipation of the broader role it would play in the state’s future.

While Ball State’s physical campus is generally defined by its arboretum character and red brick buildings, the physical campus environment has evolved in response to internal and external factors paralleling higher education growth patterns and as an innovative response to contemporary architecture and planning principles of the time. A retrospective look at the characteristics that formed the campus’s sense of place in various time periods have informed general master
planning principles and campus design guidelines for future campus growth. The following era’s (depicted on the following pages) represent stylistic departures in the way campus buildings and spaces where formed:

- Austere Beginnings (1918)
- Pre-World War II (1918-1946)
- Post-World War II (1946-1964)
- Campus Expansion and Energy Crisis (1964-1980)
- Post Modern and Neo-Eclectic Infill (1980-Present)
Austere Beginnings (1918)
Ball State University has developed not unlike a number of other American institutions established early in the twentieth century. The university’s austere beginnings took the form of a single building teachers training school that represented both a campus as a building and a building as a campus. Sited on the edge of a beautiful wooded area and intentionally sited away from the industrial center of Muncie, the Administration Building became not only the first campus icon, but also the cornerstone of a great campus quadrangle. Defined by its distinctive yellow brick, the Administration Building remains uniquely identifiable, occupying a prominent location as the campus has continued to grow over the decades.
Pre-World War II (1918–1946)
The campus quadrangle anchored by the Administration Building was transformed under the dedicated guidance and generosity of the Ball family and Muncie community into a complex of facilities surrounding a beautiful open space in the years leading up to World War II. Architecturally, the campus quadrangle (affectionately referred to as the Old Quad) maintained a consisted Collegiate/Tudor Gothic character represented by:

- Ornate articulation of walls
- Depth, shadow and variety
- Elevated ground planes
- Celebrated entries
- Walls expressive as structure

As an early campus, the Old Quad became a classically scaled example of a mixed-use collegiate quadrangle, complete with Art and Science academic buildings (Fine Arts Building and Burkhardt Building), a library and assembly hall (North Quad), a gym (Ball Gymnasium), and men's and women's residence halls (Elliot and Lucina Halls). These buildings addressed a central open space, encouraging intentional interaction and collaboration.
Post-World War II (1946–1964)
The idyllic but serious setting for learning that began in the Old Quad expanded dramatically at Ball State in the post World War II era to meet increasing demand for students, including demand generated by returned soldiers taking advantage of the 1944-enacted Servicemen’s Readjustment Act (G.I. Bill).

The campus grew to the north and south, crossing Riverside Avenue and University Avenue for the first time. Architecturally, this period of growth at Ball State is representative of Modernism, with simple volumes and massing, limited decoration, planar walls, separation of structure and skin, punched windows without patterns or repetition and modest entries.

Construction during the post-war period prioritized development of housing and student life buildings that create large volumes occupying space rather than creating shared campus spaces. An emphasis was placed on educating and housing large quantities of students in the most efficient ways.
Campus Expansion AND Energy Crisis (1964–1980)
From the mid-1960’s into the 1980’s, campus growth continued to surge, with the institution providing facilities and degrees beyond the Teachers College and establishing a breadth fitting for a university.

The speed and scale of response necessary during those boom years resulted in a sprawling campus that continued to grow north towards McGalliard Road.

Architecturally, a Brutalistic style was predominately employed during this timeframe, characterized by large, monolithic volumes, deep overhangs and recesses, and limited or protected windows - in line with national trends and a general response to the ongoing energy crisis.

Though growth was intentional and very little was ever developed without a master plan in mind, there remained some qualitative and experiential differences between the historic old campus and the rapidly expanding campus.
Post Modern AND Neo-Eclectic Infill (1980–Present)
Much of the development on Ball State’s Campus from the 1980’s into the present has been crafted to respond in some way to the differences between the historic character of the Collegiate/Tudor Gothic style of the Old Quad and the Modernism/Brutalistic response in the post-ward campus. New buildings have continued filling in gaps, responding to evolving modes of transportation, responding to evolving pedagogical demands, refining architecture and site, in search of a sense of place that, however necessarily different from that first cluster of buildings and lawn, still represents a uniquely Ball State identity.

The Post-Modern, Neo-Eclectic style largely implemented on campus over the last 30 years represents a return of ornament and reference. The campus architecture attempts to reconnect with historical core in a self-referential but not duplicative manner.

Moving forward, the 2015 Campus Master Plan projects a vision for unifying the campus, and seeks to make the campus expressive of the university’s principles of value through continuing to embrace design trends relevant to its era. Despite the varied architectural and planning styles embraced by the campus over the years, common attributes and attitudes have established an almost genetic cohesion that communicates campus lineage, recognizes its history, and embraces its diversity but connects the campus as a whole.
Campus Structure

Land Use

Ball State’s campus consists of several distinct land use zones following a primarily traditional zoning pattern. In general, academic uses are centered along McKinley Avenue, the figurative academic main street of campus, with residential, athletic, and support uses occupying the perimeter of campus.

While the Old Quad is represented as primarily academic in the facing diagram, much of the academic activity occurs along Riverside Avenue and McKinley Avenue. The southern half of the Old Quad functions as primarily academic support.

Ball State currently supports two major student-oriented gathering spaces, one designed as a traditional student center south of University Avenue and a second at the junction of the Art and Journalism Building and Library, closer to the academic “heart” of campus.

University Green, McKinley Avenue, and expansion of the Old Quad east to form a new East Quad provide the highest potential for building upon existing campus strengths and activating spaces in the geographical center of campus.

The campus will continue to reinforce its existing academic and residential neighborhoods. The 2015 Campus Master Plan identifies opportunities to provide recreation uses in closer proximity to academic and residential uses. Future initiatives should also consider continuing to explore opportunities to create mixed-use zones to enhance 24/7 vitality and improve overall campus walkability.
Building Use by College

Ball State’s academic colleges are primarily located in separate buildings, including CAP, CCIM, HN, TC, and MCOB. Colleges not located in a single building include the CAST, CFA and CSH, with CAST representing the most widely distributed.

Some college adjacencies are apparent and intentional, including the connection between media and the arts west of McKinley Avenue and the general centralization of fine and performing arts along the Riverside Avenue corridor as part of the cultural trail.

Future initiatives should consider further breaking down the siloed nature of campus by encouraging opportunities for more transparent multi-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary learning opportunities, including adding informal gathering/collaboration space for faculty, students and staff. Additional considerations should be given to a collocation of the sciences and better alignment of the health professions.
Open Space

Ball State’s campus is defined by two well-defined campus quadrangles that vary in scale but function successfully as places of identifiable image, character and collaboration in response to their surrounding uses. The Old Quad is more passive in nature, defined by mature vegetation, meandering paths and Collegiate/Tudor Gothic architecture. The University Green is more open, utilizing slight topography to define sweeping walkways between major academic and support uses.

Ball State’s campus is also uniquely characterized by distinctive and intentional “front lawn” setbacks along the major vehicular routes that traverse the campus.

Natural woodland and wetland/stream areas define the edge of the academic core to the north, east and west. Recreation and athletic spaces are predominately located remotely to the north.

Future initiatives should consider providing further definition to undefined open spaces in the core of campus, and introduction of campus mall typologies to provide better pedestrian connectivity along both north-south and east-west corridors.
Building Age

Buildings on Ball State’s campus have typically been representative of a point in time or relevant to the physical development of the institution. The progression of architecture in respect to age can be seen quite literally on Ball State’s campus with early buildings generally located around the Old Quad intended to express a legitimacy as a place of learning in the early years of the institution. Buildings generally developed between 1946-1980 represent reflections of certain attitudes and technologies of their time, but also illustrate shifts in the size of the student body, of teaching methodologies, and curriculum as the campus continued to grow north through 1980. Infill development since 1980 has attempted to reconnect with the Old Quad in scale and form.
Building Style

The Academic Classicism of the Administration Building or Collegiate/Tudor Gothic represented by other buildings located around the Old Quad form a common language that intentionally define campus space and an iconic campus neighborhood. Later examples of Modernism and Post-Modernism north of Riverside Avenue are evident as buildings on campus were designed and sited to occupy space as a product of efficiently delivering educational opportunities to growing campus populations. Neo-Traditional buildings have continued to infill campus spaces in an attempt to reconnect with historical core in a self-referential but not duplicative manner.
Materiality

Many of the buildings on Ball State’s campus exhibit a kind of vernacularism that crosses boundaries and sets them in a specific context based on form and materiality that speak to robustness and fortitude and represent a style unique to Ball State and Muncie. Red and brown brick with limestone material palettes generally tie varying campus architectural styles together. There are outliers to this material palette, including the iconic yellow brick of the Administration Building, use of limestone as a primary material as exemplified by Pruis Hall, and a distinctly different red brick utilized on several buildings surrounding University Green. Glass as a primary material has also been used at several locations on campus, most notably the Architecture Building and Art and Journalism Building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RED/BROWN BRICK &amp; LIMESTONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED BRICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW BRICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMESTONE OR PRECAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARILY GLASS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
01. Bracken Administration Building  
Yellow Brick, Limestone

02. Lucina Hall  
Red Brick, Limestone

03. Elliot Hall  
Limestone

04. Burris Laboratory School  
Red Brick, Limestone

05. West Quadrangle Building  
Red Brick, Glass

06. Ball Gymnasium  
Red Brick, Precast, Limestone

07. Cooper Science Complex  
Red Brick, Limestone

08. Fine Arts Building  
Red Brick, Limestone

09. North Quadrangle Building  
Red Brick, Limestone

10. Burkhardt Building  
Red Brick, Precast, Limestone

11. L.A. Pittenger Student Center  
Red Brick, Limestone

12. Wagoner Complex  
Red Brick, Limestone

13. Music Instruction Building  
Red Brick, Limestone

14. Applied Technology Building  
Red Brick, Limestone

15. Teacher's College Building  
Limestone, EFIS, Red Brick, Glass

16. Arts & Communications Building  
Red Brick, Limestone

17. Woodworth Complex  
Red Brick, Limestone, Glass

18. Dehorsity Complex  
Red Brick, Glass, Limestone

19. Park Hall  
Red Brick, Limestone, Glass

20. Studebaker West Complex  
Red Brick, Limestone

21. Studebaker East Complex  
Red Brick, Glass, Limestone

22. Thomas J. Kinghorn Hall  
Red Brick, Limestone

23. Noyer Complex  
Red Brick, Limestone

24. Pruis Hall  
Limestone

25. Bracken Library  
Red Brick

26. Whiting Business Building  
Red Brick

27. Architecture Building  
Red Brick, Glass

28. Art and Journalism Building  
Red Brick, Glass, Limestone

29. Ball Communication Building  
Red Brick, Limestone

30. Lettermann Communication & Media  
Red Brick, Limestone, Glass, Metal Panel

31. Robert Bell Building  
Red Brick

32. Student Recreation & Wellness  
Red Brick, Limestone, Glass

33. LaFollette Complex  
Red Brick, Limestone

34. Johnson Complex  
Red Brick, Limestone
Pedestrian Circulation

The Ball State campus has a rich network of pedestrian walks in the campus core areas of the Old Quad and University Green. McKinley Avenue is the predominant pedestrian spine on campus and clearly characterized as the vibrant 100% corridor through the heart of campus. It is the place to see and be seen and represents the path(s) of least resistance using front doors as drivers of pedestrian traffic and providing indoor and outdoor connections. Despite a highly designed pedestrian and vehicular environment along McKinley Avenue, numerous opportunities for conflicts exist due to the large volume of traffic that traverses this corridor daily. The 2015 Campus Master Plan explores opportunities to consider different operational uses of existing public realm spaces, including the potential removal or repurposing of existing roads for improved green space and/or circulation.

Additional pedestrian paths generally connect residence halls to core campus uses, including a north-south path paralleling McKinley Avenue to the west and affectionately referred to as the “Cow Path”. East-west pedestrian connections are sparse and generally lack definition despite high concentration of housing located on the eastern edge of campus. Opportunities to improve these connections would help to better define pedestrian space and reduce the potential for pedestrian-vehicle conflicts near Emens Parking Garage. An additional north-south pedestrian route east of McKinley Avenue could relieve pressure from that corridor while providing a more intentional connection between campus and the Village.
Bicycle Circulation

Bicycle usage on Ball State’s campus has noticeably increased in recent years. There are no designated bike lanes or paths on campus; bicyclists instead must contend with both vehicles and pedestrians on the campus roadways and walks. Bicycle rack placement lacks structure, leading to additional confusion and over emphasis on the need to locate bicycle parking at many major building entries. This approach has led to a controlled chaos as there is a perception that bicycles are currently allowed everywhere. The issue is compounded along McKinley Avenue, where high pedestrian and vehicle traffic volumes create additional conflict potential for bicyclists riding on both the sidewalks and the road.

Additional bike routes and intentional, centralized bicycle racks are needed to support increased bicycle use on campus as an alternative to vehicular circulation.

Recent and planned efforts by the city of Muncie have emphasized new bike lanes along University Avenue, Riverside Avenue and Neely Avenue, with additional plans to extend connections to the White River, Minnetrista, Cardinal Greenway and downtown Muncie. Ball State should pursue opportunities to extend connections to these community resources and embrace the burgeoning bicycle culture as a wonderful opportunity to encourage sustainable transportation within a city and campus that has a very bikeable scale. Additionally, Ball State should look to enhance connectivity for both bicyclists and pedestrians to the Muncie Arts and Culture Trail.
Transit

Ball State's campus is served by a primary campus shuttle route that runs along McKinley Avenue and connects remote parking resources north and south of the core campus in addition to athletic and apartment housing north of Bethel Avenue. The campus also runs seasonal extended routes east of McKinley Avenue into student-oriented neighborhoods east of New York Avenue.

The Muncie Indiana Transit System (MITS) has 14 routes that originate in downtown Muncie and branch out in a hub-and-spoke arrangement to various community destinations. Because a portion of MITS funding is subsidized by student ridership, several MITS routes overlap with Ball State's shuttle routes, creating further pedestrian-vehicle conflicts along McKinley Avenue. Route 16, connecting downtown Muncie to Walmart traverses McKinley Avenue and generates over 350,000 annual rides, accounting for nearly half of all MITS uses. Routes 1, 2, 4 and 14 also utilize McKinley Avenue.

Opportunities to reduce redundant bus transit on McKinley Avenue should be pursued to improve congestion and ensure McKinley Avenue remains a vibrant pedestrian corridor.
Vehicular Circulation

Ball State’s campus is served by a roadway network and hierarchy of streets that include city arterials, campus circulators, local campus streets, and streets that serve as both city and campus circulation corridors. McGalliard Road, Tillotson Avenue and Bethel Avenue all sustain average daily traffic (ADT) counts over 15,000 cars. As the only north-south connector between Tillotson Avenue and New York Avenue, McKinley Avenue boasts an ADT of 15,349 as a city owned right-of-way that traverses the heart of Ball State’s campus. As a local connector, McKinley Avenue dead ends at Bethel Avenue and White River Boulevard, primarily serving access to major parking lots north and south of the campus core. The portion of McKinley Avenue between Neely Avenue and Riverside Avenue is used for throughput traffic only, as no parking is accessed via this stretch and use of bus pull-outs for drop-offs is discouraged. Previous attempts to close McKinley Avenue to vehicle traffic were unsuccessful. As part of the master planning process, the advisory committees expressed a desire to encourage safe vehicle traffic along the entire length of McKinley Avenue to maintain clarity of campus access and visibility, especially for campus visitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking

Ball State currently maintains 9,500 parking spaces in surface and structured parking lots across campus. Ball State’s parking ratio of total campus population compared to total parking spaces equals 2.17, lower than the National Suburban Campus Average of 2.80 (Source: 3rd Edition. Parking Generation. Institute of Transportation Engineers 2004), and lower than comparative institutions in the region.

As part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan, parking utilization data was collected via Ball State Parking Services and Ball State Urban Planning Students. Peak utilization of parking resources occurs between 11:00am and 1:00pm on Tuesdays. Assuming parking lots are full at 90% utilization, a slight surplus of parking resources were identified at peak utilization times. Lots showing the highest lack of utilization include C1 (Commuter), C7/G14 (Stadium), H2 (Residence), R2, R7, R8, and S1-A /S1-B (Ball Field parking). A full parking utilization analysis should be conducted following the 2015 Campus Master Plan; however, based on this initial analysis, it is clear that the total quantity of parking spaces on campus (supply) is sufficient for Ball State’s population (demand); however, the location of spaces may not always align with where individuals want to park.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan also analyzed the location and quantity of parking resources in relation to users including on-campus residential beds, faculty and staff office spaces and event venues. The analysis identified a general shortfall of parking spaces within a 3- to 5-minute walk of the campus core, but emphasizes intentional location of parking on the perimeter of campus within easy 7- to 10-minute walks of most campus destinations.

Considerations should be given to removing parking resources that drive primary vehicular routes through core pedestrian areas, including Emens Parking Garage and Campus Drive through the Old Quad.
Aligning Parking Users and Location

A detailed study as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan analyzed location and quantity of existing parking resources in relation to quantity of office spaces and quantity of residential beds on campus. Balancing proximity of parking with maintaining a beautiful, walkable campus core was one of the primary issues of the 2015 Campus Master Plan.

This study identified general parking balance within 5- to 7-minute walking radii for faculty and staff, because office users in the Old Quad rely heavily on south campus parking resources, and office users in the University Green area rely on northern parking resources. Remote parking resources at Schuemann Stadium for freshman and sophomores allow for relative balance of residential parking in proximity to residence halls for upper class students.

Future considerations regarding parking alignment should consider establishment of parking zones to ensure balance within acceptable walking radii.

---

**LEGEND**

- **PARKING GARAGE**
- **SURFACE PARKING LOT**
- **#** # OF PARKING SPACES
- **#** # OF FACULTY/STAFF OFFICES
- **#** # OF RESIDENTIAL BEDS
- *** PRIMARY EVENT VENUE**
Ball State is unique amongst many college campus towns in that it did not grow up with its surrounding community, the campus was established well after the establishment of Muncie as an industrial town. The campus was intentionally sited at a distance from the industrial core of the city. Despite that nuance, the core of Ball State’s campus is 1.5 miles from the center of downtown Muncie, and several existing initiatives are currently underway to support better connection including the Muncie Arts and Cultural Trail and additional shared efforts to emphasize the shared destinies of Muncie and Ball State.

There is a desire from Ball State leadership to better realize shared assets of town and gown to provide opportunities for improved quality of life, access to urban amenities and lifestyle, improved recruitment potential and encourage students to stay in town following graduation.

Opportunities to improve connectivity between Muncie and Ball State include:

- Improve link between IU Health Ball Memorial Hospital and wellness initiatives on campus and in town.
- Better support of Cardinal athletics.

A hallmark of the 2015 Campus Master Plan was the transparent inclusion of a robust group of community advisors as part of the planning process. Community Advisory Committee members provided invaluable insight to the 2015 Campus Master Plan and are listed on page 3 of this report.
Sustainability

A Commitment to Sustainability

Ball State has a long, responsive, and distinguished record of sustainability and has developed a significant reputation. We believe colleges and universities must exercise leadership in their communities and throughout society by providing the knowledge, research, practice, and informed graduates to create a positive and sustainable future.

The Ball State community takes great pride in our university’s international reputation in sustainability. In fact, our strategic plan, The Centennial Commitment (18 by 18), specifically identifies our intent to leverage sustainability as a key branding element of Ball State University.

Ball State believes in protecting and enhancing the environment of not only the campus but also the surrounding community. We seek to have responsible practices in every area of our university, including but not limited to all operations and programs.

Ball State’s Climate Action Plan

Beginning in 2006 Ball State became one of twelve founding members to create the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (ACUPCC). With Ball State participation, the ACUPCC asked college and university presidents to commit on behalf of their institution to do the following:

• Integrate sustainability into the curriculum and make it part of the educational experience.
• Complete an inventory of campus-wide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.
• Take immediate steps to reduce GHG emissions.
• Within two years, set a target date and interim milestones for becoming climate neutral.
• Draft a Climate Action Plan (CAP) that documents the carbon neutrality target date and interim milestones, accompanied by a plan developed by the institution to achieve each target.
• Make the CAP, GHG inventory, and progress reports publicly available.

For purposes of the ACUPCC, climate neutrality is defined as having no net GHG emissions, achieved by
significantly reducing GHG emissions, combined with the use of carbon offsets or other measures to mitigate any remaining emissions. At the time of this master plan report, 684 institutions of higher learning around the country have signed ACUPCC, and the pledge has gained momentum amongst colleges and universities as a new standard for a GHG reduction target.

In September 2008, a Ball State Climate Action Task Force (CATF) was appointed to implement many of the requirements of the ACUPCC – charged with bringing forward recommendations to help Ball State achieve carbon neutrality. CATF reviewed the campus GHG inventory, gathered emissions information, and brainstormed to create a workable approach towards fulfilling the goals of the ACUPCC, and after a full year the results of their efforts were published in Ball State’s CAP.

The campus GHG emissions for 2008 were inventoried and established a baseline. As part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan, GHG emissions were also inventoried for the most recent FY. Emissions are organized into three categories, or “scopes”. A total GHG inventory for a campus includes emissions from direct sources such as on-campus energy production (Scope 1 emissions), purchased energy from off-site sources (Scope 2 emissions), and from indirect sources such as the emissions associated with on-campus transportation and energy expended from commuting to and from campus (Scope 3 emissions). Scope 1 and 2 emissions are largely associated with the energy to operate campus buildings, while Scope 3 pertains to campus transportation approaches. In 2008, nearly 40% of Ball State’s emissions were from Scope 1 sources, largely the burning of coal to provide heating to its buildings. Over 50% of the campus emissions were Scope 2, all associated with purchased electricity, largely to power and cool campus buildings. Ball State’s electricity is generated within the Reliability First Council (RFC) West grid sub-region. Within this region, in 2008, coal was the largest fuel source, accounting for over 73% of the fuel mix. The national average fuel mix uses less than 50% coal.

In the years that followed the 2008 GHG inventory, two major shifts have positively impacted
Ball State's carbon emissions. First, the fuel mix of electricity produced within the RFC West grid sub-region has shifted to rely less on coal. Currently, coal accounts for 58.7% (down from 73%) of the overall fuel mix for purchased electricity. This change means that a kWh of purchased electricity has a lower carbon impact. The second major shift is the elimination of coal as a fuel source within the campus heating plant. Between 2008 and 2015 Ball State's total Scope 1 and 2 emissions have been reduced by nearly 50%.

Ball State's CAP explored the potential and outlined an approach to achieve climate neutrality by 2050. This aggressive goal was supported by the simultaneous decision to decommission the campus’ four coal-fired boilers, and instead supply the campus-wide district heating and cooling from high performance ground source heat pumps networked to 3,600 geothermal wells. This one bold move alone, combined with on-going conservation measures, was predicted to result in a nearly 50% reduction in the campus GHG emissions. It has completely eliminated the need for purchased coal as of March 2014. As electricity generation moves away from coal, embracing lower emission fuel sources and an increased portfolio of renewable energy sources will continue to diminish Ball State’s emission. But the geothermal plan alone will not be enough to reach climate neutrality by 2050. A path forward towards climate neutrality over the next 40 years was structured to coincide with Ball State’s 5-year Strategic Planning Cycle, establishing interim milestones between the current time and 2050. The plan is conceived as a living document, and will evolve as interim milestones are reached and unknown forces influence the goal for climate neutrality. The first interim milestone within the plan targets a campus-wide GHG emissions of 70,000 Metric Tons of Greenhouse Gasses (MT eCO2) by year 2020. The plan recognizes that there are “low-hanging fruit” opportunities, when combined with the enormous impact of the district-wide geothermal plant, so the 2020 target anticipates dramatic
reductions in campus emissions.

Given the significant role the operation of buildings plays on campus emissions, the 2015 Campus Master Plan has the ability to impact emissions and recommend approaches that support Ball State’s climate neutrality goals. The CAP identifies nine tactical areas to address reductions in campus emissions. These include:

1. Real-time communication, monitoring and reporting
2. Energy management through the geothermal district heating and cooling network
3. Energy conservation within information technology
4. Transportation efficiency
5. Building efficiency
6. Energy conservation policy
7. On-site solar photovoltaic (PV) production
8. Off-site wind energy electrical production
9. Off-site PV electrical energy production

While not all of these tactical areas have direct correlations to the 2015 Campus Master Plan, many of these ideas can be supported by the plan’s recommendations, most notably:

- Energy monitoring – the 2015 Campus Master Plan can draw on the historical energy data collected for campus buildings to inform an approach for determining candidates for renovation or demolition.
- Transportation efficiency – the 2015 Campus Master Plan can, through design, enhance the use of public transportation, and bicycles on campus, by creating stronger linkages to alternative transportation infrastructure and creating convenient, safe opportunities for non-car travel on campus.
- Energy conservation policy – the 2015 Campus Master Plan can make recommendations for achievable energy targets for all new projects.
- Building efficiency – the 2015 Campus Master Plan can establish design guidelines to inform the process for creating high-performance buildings as the plan is implemented.
- On-site and off-site renewable energy production - the 2015 Campus Master Plan can investigate the potential for both photovoltaics and wind energy solutions both on- and off-campus.
Embodied Energy Versus Operational Energy

One of the premises in considering the performance of existing campus buildings is that in some instances demolishing and replacing buildings whose performance is sub-par might result in fewer GHG emissions over the next 40 years. This premise does raise the issue of embodied energy (or embodied carbon) – a measure of the amount of energy required to extract, manufacturer, transport, and construct the materials that comprise a building. Most buildings on campus are designed to withstand the test of time, so keeping and renovating our existing building stock will result in fewer emissions associated with embodied energy. The embodied energy of a building can be compared to the amount of energy required to operate a building over its 50 year service life, a useful exercise in determining whether it is better to demolish a poorly performing building and replace it with a new, energy efficient building. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (Recipients of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize) “For typical standards of building construction, the embodied energy is equivalent to only a few years of operating energy, although there are cases in which the embodied energy can be much higher. Thus, over a 50-year time span, reducing the operating energy is normally more important than reducing the embodied energy.” (http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg3/en/ch6s6-4-14.html, IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007, Section 6.4.14: Trade-offs between embodied energy and operating energy.)

It is difficult to generalize on this topic because the factors that influence this equation vary greatly based on the condition and location of the building, and most studies on this topic are European examples. However, one can conclude that if an existing building is an underperformer and its constraints limits its ability to be renovated into a high-performance building, then the net carbon emissions of both embodied and operational energy use would be significantly less if it is replaced by a new, high-performance building.

Often the structural system of a building represents nearly one third of its overall embodied energy. Ball State has several examples where existing dormitories were demolished keeping only their structure. This approach reduces significantly the embodied energy of the renovation without limiting the potential for a high performance completed renovation. Embodied energy should always be considered in planning decisions. In the event where the best solution is demolition and replacement, there are several approaches to minimize the adverse impacts of embodied energy while maximizing
the reductions in operational energy. These include:

1. Identify opportunities to salvage elements from the existing building, ideally to be incorporated in the new construction.
2. Establishing high goals for demolition waste management, diverted demolition waste from landfills by recycling it. In most instances, projects should target a 75% diversion rate or more.
3. Maximize the operational energy performance of the replacement project.

The chart to the right illustrates that over a 50 year service life of a classroom building, replacing the existing building with a new building designed to exceed the model energy code by 30% will consume significantly less energy than if the existing building was simply renovated to consume half the energy of an average classroom building in the US. This example uses CBECS data to estimate the average energy of a classroom building, energy modeling to predict the operational energy use of an ASHRAE 90.1 v2007 compliant classroom building, and the assumption that the initial embodied energy of a building represents 5.71% of its overall energy footprint over a 50 year life (based on “Life-Cycle Energy Use in Office Buildings”, Raymond J. Cole & Paul C. Kernan, 1996)
This chapter describes the intent, approach, drivers, guiding principles and a framework for future change as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan concepts and recommendations. Assumptions for academic and program growth parameters that drive the physical expansion illustrated in the plan provide a context for future change. Ball State’s campus is defined by a unique set of neighborhoods that support campus activities and enhance the experience of the overall grounds. This chapter details the proposed character of eight primary zones on the Ball State campus and describes how they can reinforce and enhance the overall identity of campus though continued growth. This chapter describes the intended character and big ideas of each zone.
Master Plan Drivers

The 2015 Campus Master Plan is directly linked to external influences, current and ongoing academic and physical planning initiatives, and goals for the future of higher education at Ball State and within the State of Indiana. Master plan drivers within this context and described on the following pages include:

- Enrollment Drivers
- Academic Drivers
- Residential Drivers
- Athletic and Recreation Drivers
- Community Drivers
- Sustainability Drivers
**Enrollment Drivers**

Recommendations embedded in the 2015 Campus Master Plan are based on the conservative assumption of a modest enrollment growth at Ball State to approximately 17,500 students by 2021. These projections represent a 500 student increase for main campus students and were developed by the Office for Enrollment, Marketing, and Communications. These projections assume a potential increase in freshman admission standards, and potential increase in transfer and graduate enrollments.

Beyond these headcount projections, modest continued changes in the composition of the student body is anticipated, including:

- Potential increase of international enrollments
- Potential increase in out of state enrollments
- Potential increase in the proportion of the student body engaged in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) and allied health programs

* On-Campus Enrollment Projections, Subject to Enrollment Management Plan Updates
Academic Drivers

The 2015 Campus Master Plan included a detailed Academic Space Utilization Study and Space Needs Analysis by college completed in conjunction with Paulien & Associates. The study identifies an overall deficit of nearly 150,000 Assignable Square Feet (ASF) of academic space by 2023. The quantitative analysis of Ball State’s academic space by space category and by college has been prepared as a 400-page document that is included as an appendix to this report. Macro-level academic demand recommendations include:

- Increase and improve classroom space and incorporate forward thinking design practices commensurate with contemporary pedagogies
- Increase and improve teaching lab and research space to foster entrepreneurial initiatives
- Increase the amount of study space and learning commons areas to increase opportunities for student-faculty collaboration
- Right-size academic and administrative office space as renovations occur.
Residential Drivers

The 2015 Campus Master Plan included a partnership with Brailsford & Dunlavey (B&D) to conduct a series of focus groups, administrator interviews, competitive context analysis, off-campus housing analysis, a student survey, and a demand analysis to formulate recommendations for student housing, dining, campus recreation and intercollegiate athletics at Ball State. The 250-page document is incorporated as an appendix to this report. Macro-level findings and recommendations include:

- Surplus of traditional beds, deficit of suites
- Consider renovation and demolition to align supply and demand
- Reinforce existing residential neighborhoods
- Improve apartment and student family offerings and move from north to south edge of campus
- Build in resiliency and flexibility if enrollment numbers change in the future
Athletic and Recreation Drivers

Ball State has made significant recent improvements to athletic facilities on campus. The university recently completed a capital campaign, Cardinal Commitment, to include new facilities and enhancements to existing facilities. Recommendations for future athletic growth include:

- Multi-purpose indoor practice space
- Increased athletic support space, including:
  - Academic advising space
  - Athletic training space
  - Strength and conditioning facilities

In regards to recreation space, with approximately 11.2 square feet (SF) of indoor recreation space per student, Ball State exceeds the average of its peers (10.1 SF/student), and national planning guidelines (8.5-10.5 SF/student). Aquatic space on Ball State's campus is shared with athletics and outdated.

Improvements to outdoor recreation fields are needed. The majority of fields are not proximate to the core of campus and lack adequate support facilities and amenities.
Community Drivers

The 2015 Campus Master Plan included extensive participation from city of Muncie community members, including a robust community advisory group that met to review master planning recommendations and ensure alignment with community initiatives. The dialogue centered on several primary themes to create a more connected university and community, including:

- Enhance multi-modal linkages
- Consider additional programmatic connectivity and partnership opportunities
- Improve campus and community edges and gateways
- Encourage Village development as an important campus-community connector
- Improve event access and enhance a welcoming atmosphere for visitors at Ball State

Walnut Avenue, Downtown Muncie

Fine Arts Terrace and Old Quad
Sustainability Drivers

Ball State is a widely recognized pioneer in sustainable campus leadership. As a founding member of the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE), American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment (ACUPCC), Ball State has led the conversation about sustainable campuses, for hundreds to follow. The cornerstone of this involvement is a commitment to the goal of achieving climate neutrality (no GHG emissions) by the year 2050.

Demonstrating a commitment to innovation and long-range thinking, Ball State recently completed the nation’s largest ground-source, closed-loop district geothermal energy system, replacing four aging coal-fired boilers. This system will cut Ball State’s GHG emissions nearly in half.

In keeping with Ball State’s innovation and commitment to environmental stewardship, sustainability principles have guided the master plan. Meetings with campus leadership, faculty, facilities, students, and environmental leaders, a framework for sustainability principles within the master plan was formulated. A “Sustainability Working Group” has been established to review Second Natures new Climate Commitment.

The group made a recommendation and the President accepted it to become a signatory to the “Second Nature Climate Leadership Commitment: An Integrated Commitment including Carbon Neutrality and Resilience”. In this context, the Campus Master Plan seeks to:

- Maximize opportunities for the planned changes to the campus that support Ball State’s ambitious goals towards carbon neutrality by 2050
- Envision development that provides a balance of academic, residential, and amenities to create walkable communities within the campus fabric, while strengthening the campus core
- Provide safe routes for bicycles on campus and to connect with existing and planned bicycle routes throughout Muncie, to reduce reliance on the automobile
- Identify an approach to support sustainable water quality and quantity measures on campus to improve campus watershed health
- Maintain campus connection to natural systems and foster an appreciation for the campus’ natural setting

These principles are embedded within the Campus Master plan, having shaped the campus planning concepts that will direct the next evolution of the campus and its community.
Guiding Principles

A series of guiding principles were established early in the planning process with input from the Executive Committee, Advisory Committees, focus groups, open houses and via the Virtual Town Hall website to guide future development by conveying the intent, goals, and long-term values of Ball State. These enduring principles were established early in the process to guide decision-making, and are intended to provide guidance during future decisions to provide flexibility in the plan and ensure that the University’s mission is maintained. Principles assume an understanding of the established Plan Drivers outlined previously.

The guiding principles include key themes of fostering a culture of trans-disciplinary collaboration and learning, preserving and enhancing the physical campus, and using the campus to promote Ball State’s goals of sustainability and connecting to the surrounding community.

Guiding principles for the 2015 Campus Master Plan include:

1. Design learning spaces that are in support of the university’s academic plan
2. Design spaces that foster transdisciplinary cooperation
3. Preserve and re-invigorate the campus core
4. Preserve and enhance the best architecture, planning and landscapes on campus
5. Move towards carbon neutrality and water balance
6. Advance human-scaled campus
7. Prioritize modality alignment, walkability and accessibility
8. Enhance attractive campus space that emphasizes student experience
9. Improve connection with shared community resources
10. Ensure functional campus development through the highest and best use of land
11. Maintain flexibility in the plan to accommodate unforeseen opportunities
12. Consider initial costs, life cycle costs and return on investment
A Framework for Change

Foundational Themes

The 2015 Campus Master Plan is built on an understanding of 21st century pedagogies that emphasize unique, high-impact learning experiences that result in real-world solutions. These contemporary pedagogies align with Ball State’s strategic initiatives and should guide opportunities for physical change on campus. Trans-disciplinary or holistic approaches that transcend boundaries of conventional disciplines are foundational to master plan recommendations. Trans-disciplinary suggests allowing multiple disciplines to be arranged around a central theme or project, encouraging incentives might be inherent in the work itself, including:

• Shared interests, common objectives
• Solutions that have real impact in the world
• Connections with non-academic partners

A Physical Model for 21st Century Learning

A simplified historical model of an early academic campus distributed functions or disciplines around a core or quadrangle. This historical model is representative of the foundation for Ball State’s Old Quad. In the early years at Ball State, the act of learning involved interaction with various disciplines in order to create a balanced education – physical and intellectual activity that energized the core, connected the disciplines and helped form a sense of place. As disciplinary content has become more and more specialized at institutions across the country, and incentives have driven faculty from teaching to research, colleges have retreated into themselves, creating knowledge silos which have great depth but little connectivity to each other or to the practical world. Ball State has, in many ways, exceeded this national “norm”, and the trans-disciplinary learning, when applied to encourage physical change on Ball State’s campus can manifest in the form of an innovation center, or more likely at Ball State, creation of academic commons nodes dispersed throughout the academic campus.
A Connected System of Open Spaces

With trans-disciplinary learning as the foundation for physical change, a connected system of open spaces on campus should be enhanced on campus to form a framework upon which future programmatic change can occur.

Programmatic Armature for Change

The connected system of open spaces augment the location of three academic commons nodes on Ball State’s campus, each anchored by an existing or proposed primary open space. These academic commons will provide the opportunity for trans-disciplinary opportunities as the center piece of Ball State’s existing and proposed academic neighborhoods.

Complete Living and Learning Neighborhoods

Ball State’s academic neighborhoods, trans-disciplinary learning academic commons, and connected system of open spaces are supported by existing and proposed residential neighborhoods in close proximity to encourage unique living-learning opportunities on campus now and in the future.
Master Plan Vision

Built on a framework for physical change as part of the plan concept, the 2015 Campus Master Plan provides opportunities to redefine the fabric of campus through strategic renovation, new buildings and infill development. A vision for the future includes considerations for campus mobility systems that are better integrated into a future health and wellness culture on campus and improved community connections. The major recommendations of the plan can be summarized in eight primary recommendations for change, including:

1. Develop Academic East Quad
2. Establish New East Mall
3. Activate University Green
4. Preserve and Enhance the Old Quad
5. Engage the Village
6. Enhance North Residential
7. Consolidate Recreation
8. Enhance Athletics

The illustrative plan (on the facing page) represents an optimal campus configuration for Ball State at full build-out in the long-term. The illustrative plan proposes the placement of new features such as opportunities for new buildings (in dark red), renovated buildings (in light red), roadways, new open spaces (in dark green), parking and other facilities in relationship to existing campus facilities (in white and light green). While intentionally flexible to provide opportunities to accommodate unforeseen change in the future, the elements of the plan are deliberately located to be consistent with the planning concepts as described on the previous pages. Taken collectively, the plan concept, illustrative plan, campus systems and phasing plans described in the following chapters are intended to aide in future decision making.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan is not predicated on the acquisition of additional property; however, as a long-range vision document, the 2015 Campus Master Plan does suggest opportunities for property acquisition. Future campus opportunities shown on property not currently owned by Ball State can all be accommodated on property owned by Ball State if necessary.

The following pages outline opportunities for change within the eight campus zones depicted on the facing page. Improvements to campus mobility and community connections are described in further detail in Chapter 4: Campus Systems.
Develop Academic East Quad

A new East Quad will be established adjacent to the Music Instruction Building and McKinley Avenue Parking Garage. This key location is at an important juncture between the historic heart of the campus centered on the Old Quad, the Village commercial district, and a planned new East Mall that provides a new open space, pedestrian and bicycle connection between the Village and the Student Recreation and Wellness Center and University Green. The East Quad will provide a new eastern gateway to the campus and establish a stronger presence along Riverside Avenue. Additionally, the development reinforces the Old Quad and strengthens the physical connection between the University and the city of Muncie.

Potential programmatic opportunities could include new academic and performance buildings, and the possibility to create a new academic commons. The historically significant Ball Honors House will be preserved with new open space created to the south and an enhanced town/gown edge along Ashland Avenue. The underutilized McKinley Avenue Parking Garage will accommodate increased parking demand in the area.
New East Mall looking north
Establish New East Mall

The East Mall is proposed as a new pedestrian and bicycle corridor to provide an iconic campus connector between the new East Quad, and the Student Recreation and Wellness Center, and alleviate congestion on McKinley Avenue. A cycle track/bicycle path will create a designated space for bicycles that is separate from pedestrians to increase safety for both users. This path may also continue south along Martin Street as part of the Muncie Arts and Cultural Trail that connects to the White River and the city of Muncie.

Service will be accessed on new shared-use paths that allow for pedestrian circulation. In order to accomplish this, long-range consideration should be given to replace Emens Parking Garage, creating opportunities for a new central open space on campus and reducing vehicular conflicts.

There is also an opportunity in the long-range to significantly renovate Noyer, replacing the existing residence hall wings and bringing the dining hall up to contemporary standards. This approach would allow for the addition of a future academic footprint to the southern wing, that would have frontage on the new open space and East Mall.

The Theater and Dance department has a shortage of space, and requires upgraded facilities. These issues can be alleviated through an addition and renovation to the University Theater and the Arts and Communication Building. A simple landscape design that includes a lawn median bordered by large canopy trees will create a sense of enclosure and pedestrian scale to increase comfort and aesthetics along the East Mall. Pedestrian amenities such as benches, lighting, wayfinding, trees and landscape will be added, and there are additional opportunities to incorporate sculpture and art into the landscape.
Activate University Green

The University Green open space will be enhanced to create a greater sense of place, increase usability, and invigorate the space with activity in the geographic center of campus. This iconic open space must fulfill its role as a gathering space for the campus community and a ceremonial heart to the new academic core of campus. A revised site design for the University Green landscape will realign pathways with natural, logical and more direct pedestrian circulation, and create a greater clarity to space organization that includes active, passive, and formal spaces. The landscape will be organized and framed by new canopy trees that help to create a pedestrian scale and sense of enclosure. A potential future academic commons in one of several locations (see alternatives) could help invigorate the green, as well as create opportunities for future collaboration spaces or expansion. Additionally, Bracken Library and the College of Architecture and Planning are both candidates for future renovations to further improve opportunities for multi- and trans-disciplinary collaboration in this area.
Preserve and Enhance the Old Quad

The Old Quad is one of the most beautiful places on Ball State’s campus and should be preserved as an iconic collegiate campus space. Two key changes aim to reinvigorate the quad with energy and reinstate it as the historic heart of the campus.

First, portions of Cooper could be renovated or demolished and replaced with future academic uses and a potential commons that could act as a cultural hub and contain meeting rooms and flexible spaces for both student and faculty use. This location capitalizes on synergies with nearby cultural resources such as the Museum of Art, the Charles W. Brown Planetarium, Christy Woods, Reinard Orchid Greenhouse and the Marilyn K. Glick Center for Glass, as well as creates a new destination along the Muncie Arts and Culture Trail, drawing more people to this special campus landscape.

Secondly, additional improvements to the Old Quad can be achieved through the removal of Campus Drive along the southern edge of Old Quad’s open space. This will allow for improved pedestrian and bicycle connections and safety, especially as circulation increases with additional residential development to the south, as well as improved aesthetics in this iconic open space. Additionally, new designated pedestrian and bike paths are recommended to tie the Cow Path to destinations and also provide shared service and emergency access.
Engage the Village

The Ball State campus interfaces with the Muncie community most intimately at the Village. In an effort to better connect Ball State and city of Muncie, as well as continue to revitalize this area with more activity and vibrancy, the 2015 Campus Master Plan recommends new on-campus housing developments near the important intersection of McKinley Avenue and University Avenue. New university-owned apartments focused on recruitment and retention of graduate students and upperclassmen will be developed across from Elliott Hall and Wagoner Complex, bringing new life and activity to this part of campus and further activating the Old Quad with pedestrian traffic. Additional apartments will be developed along McKinley Avenue across from the Student Center. This development will fill a need for apartment-style residential housing with an urban, walkable lifestyle close to campus and the community as a replacement to Scheidler and Anthony Apartments.
Enhance North Residential

The North Residential neighborhood will be strengthened with new housing and dining options that replace the LaFollette Complex and aim to reinforce the sense of community. A new residence and dining hall in the area allows for the demolition of the LaFollette Complex. Future phase academic buildings and open space could create opportunities to improve this important campus gateway. New buildings will be oriented to create space and define the built edge along McKinley Avenue to create a sense of arrival. This new urban design configuration will facilitate a close-knit community with open views that visually connect the buildings to the remainder of campus. Several new open spaces including large open lawns, and smaller, courtyard quadrangles will be created to provide ample space for recreation and respite. The large open space on the former LaFollette site will create a new destination. At the intersection of McKinley Avenue and West Petty Road, there are long-range opportunities to site a future academic building that defines the edges of this important intersection and gateway. This future footprint could include a dining component that capitalizes on its location with outdoor dining along McKinley Avenue and adjacent to the new green space.
Consolidate Recreation

As part of an improved health and wellness culture at Ball State, recreation amenities will be consolidated near the highly visible Bethel Avenue campus edge to create a sense of gateway and university identity. Migrating these resources from remote locations like Heath Farm will increase their utilization and accessibility, as well as allow them to contribute to the vibrancy and identity of campus life.

The current site of the Anthony Apartments will be transformed into several recreation fields, a recreation support building, and associated parking to improve this important campus gateway with vibrancy and activity. These recreation fields will be within walking distance of the North Residential Neighborhood as well as the significant parking resources in that area.

The northeast recreation site aims to create a University presence at the intersection of New York and Bethel Avenues. Site walls, street trees, and banner light poles will all provide a sense of arrival at this community gateway and increase the visibility of Ball State at an improved Bethel Avenue-New York Avenue five-way intersection.

An improved health and wellness culture may also consider improvements to Ball State’s existing health center as campus population continues to grow.
Enhance Athletics

Athletics are a vital part of the heart and soul of Ball State, and their influence on the campus is an important part of the campus’ identity. Ball State recently completed a capital campaign to address a dedicated Court Sports Practice facility, a renovated Ball Park Complex, a Football Team Complex, a Golf Practice Facility, and enhancements to existing facilities.

In order to continue to provide facilities and support to student athletes, and remain competitive within the Mid-American Conference (MAC), several additional athletic facilities are recommended: an indoor practice facility/fieldhouse, new support facilities at Briner Complex, and an additional support facilities in the campus core to include an academic advising center, athletic training center, and a strength and conditioning center. A large additional parking lot is recommended to replace the Bethel Recreation Fields as they are consolidated closer to the campus core. Lastly, a new comprehensive Aquatics Complex is proposed on the current site of Lewellen Pool, and will be a shared resource between Campus Recreation and the Athletics Department.
This chapter describes the master plan recommendations for campus wide systems, those projects and improvements that are integrated into a large system or are not place specific. These recommendations address academic and support systems, residential systems, athletics and recreation and mobility systems. This chapter describes Ball State's campus systems beginning with foundational systems upon which other systems are built. The list of campus systems described in this chapter include:

- Academic and Support
- Residential Housing
- Athletics and Recreation
- Open Space
- Pedestrian Circulation
- Bike Circulation
- Transit
- Vehicular Circulation
- Parking
- Alternate for McKinley Avenue
Academic and Support

Existing and future campus systems are depicted on the following pages via graphic and written representation of initiatives. The 2015 Campus Master Plan provides flexible opportunity zones and capacities to meet space needs analysis quantities depicted in detail in the appendices.

Future Opportunities

Ball State is considering adding approximately 825,000 GSF of new research, laboratory, clinical, and classroom space amongst considerations for approximately 325,000 GSF of demolition or major renovation. The Cooper Building will be further evaluated for major renovation or demolition and new academic space will be constructed at a key campus location. The plan provides opportunities for new academic commons in the Cooper Area, East Quad and University Green. Additional space for the Theater and Dance programs is planned as an addition to University Theater along the East Mall.

Additional future academic opportunities include a new building in the East Quad and at the important juncture of Petty Road and McKinley Avenue. The demolition of the CAP Lab Building and adjacent parking lot will allow for development of valuable real estate along the academic corridor centered on McKinley Avenue. The Emens Parking Garage site will provide a long-term opportunity for a new academic building if desired.
INITIAL OPPORTUNITIES

1. UNIVERSITY GREEN
   - ACADEMIC COMMONS
   - GSF: 75,000

2. RENOVATION AND ADDITION TO UNIVERSITY THEATER
   - GSF: 25,000

3. OLD QUAD ACADEMIC COMMONS
   - GSF: 75,000

4. POTENTIAL MIXED USE FACILITY
   - GSF: 100,000

5. ACADEMIC BUILDING(S)
   - GSF: 550,000

RENOVATION / DEMOLITION CANDIDATES:

6. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
   - GSF: 325,000

Existing and Future Academic and Support Buildings
Residential Housing

Future Opportunities

Initial residential development opportunities are centered on the demolition and replacement of the LaFollette Complex. LaFollette’s demolition requires that new beds and a new dining hall be built to serve the North Residential neighborhood. New residence halls constructed in this neighborhood are intended to mimic the human scale of Kinghorn and Park Halls and will frame courtyards and open spaces that allow for student collaboration, informal meeting and recreation.

Anthony and Scheidler Apartments will also be demolished in the mid- to long-term and university apartments will be rebuilt in a more central location near the Village and the Student Center. This relocation of apartments will provide a more urban, walkable lifestyle and promote resident engagement in campus life. Additionally, new residence halls geared towards upperclassmen are planned adjacent to the Student Center to connect students to the Village and help activate the Old Quad.

Additional residential opportunities include a new residence hall in the North Neighborhood, and redevelopment of the residence hall wings of Noyer Complex to reinforce the East Mall.

LEGEND

- **EXISTING RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS TO REMAIN (5,450 BEDS)**
- **FUTURE RESIDENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES (1,750 BEDS + 500 UNITS)**
Athletics and Recreation

Future Opportunities

Initial athletics opportunities adjacent to Scheumann Stadium includes Ball Diamond improvements, a new Football Team Complex, and a new Fieldhouse to create a consolidated athletics frontage along Bethel Avenue. Additional improvements are being considered to renovate Worthen Arena for potential rightsizing of event seating and an addition to the building for a new practice facility. A new Aquatics Complex is being considered on the current site of the Lewellen Pool, and will support both athletic and recreational swimming and diving use.

Initial recreation opportunities includes relocating outdoor recreation closer to campus at a new Recreation Field Complex on the former site of Anthony Apartments. This will allow for a new parking lot adjacent to Scheumann Stadium and will bring recreation fields closer to campus and residence hall populations, as well as create a gateway experience at the campus entrance.

Future recreation improvements include a new Recreation Field Complex at the corner of Bethel and New York Avenues to consolidate recreation fields from Heath Farm to an on-campus location that better serves students and residence hall populations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  BASEBALL DIAMOND IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  FOOTBALL TEAM COMPLEX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  FIELDHOUSE</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  CONSOLIDATED RECREATION AT ANTHONY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  NEW AQUATICS COMPLEX</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  WORTHEN PRACTICE FACILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  WORTHEN RENOVATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing and Future Athletics and Recreation Facilities
Open Space

Open space at Ball State should become a unifying element that provides continuity and an identifiable sense of place amongst varying building styles. The 2015 Campus Master Plan recommends a hierarchy of open space typologies that outline typical guidelines by category. Several of the typologies build upon Ball State’s existing open space precedents (quadrangles and front lawns), while courtyard, campus mall and natural area typologies may require a new approach as described below.

Quadrangles
- Provide open space for gathering and recreation
- Define areas of shade and sun
- Include a sense of enclosure with an ideal width to height ratio of 4:1
- Create defined edges with consistent build-to lines, yet permeable with multiple entries

Front Lawns
- Provide a visual buffer between building and street
- Suggest aesthetic function not intended for active use
- Primarily ornamental landscape

Courtyards
- Defined by a sense of enclosure
- Provide limited points of entry
- Develop an intimate scale
- Provide places of respite
- Primary material is hardscape

Campus Malls
- Define a linear open space corridor for pedestrians and non-motorized transportation
- Pedestrian-scaled
- Provide a sense of enclosure with ideal height to width ratio of 2:1
- Usually include a formal/axial arrangement

Natural Areas
- Include low maintenance areas
- Require selective clearing and management to control invasive species
- Utilize natural, native, or drought-tolerant yet visually appealing vegetation

LEGEND
- QUADRANGLES
- FRONT LAWNS
- COURTYARDS
- CAMPUS MALLS
- NATURAL AREAS
- RECREATION
- ATHLETICS
- PRIMARY GATHERING SPACES
Pedestrian Circulation

Campus Master Plan priorities emphasize pedestrian movement over other transportation methods. The campus should enhance the connected pedestrian network, establish a hierarchy of pedestrian walkways with consistent materials to help to define and articulate open spaces, and enhance campus wayfinding.

Opportunities for improvement to the pedestrian network include a vibrant yet congested McKinley Avenue and a series of unpleasant experiences near the Emens Parking Garage. A new north-south East Mall that connects the Student Recreation and Wellness Center to the new East Quad, will help to abate congestion along McKinley Avenue. Improvements to the Cow Path will create an enhanced pedestrian and bicycle corridor with extended pavement width and new lighting and amenities.

Other pedestrian improvements as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan include replacing Emens Parking Garage in place to create better cross-campus connections and reduce the potential for pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. A pedestrian corridor is recommended to connect east-west between the new East Mall and the Old Quad. This pedestrian corridor will require quality detailing around Pruis Hall, the Library and University Theater, and should consider signalization at McKinley Avenue to ensure pedestrian safety.

Pedestrian walkways in the Old Quad are in need of upgraded pavement and a separation between pedestrians and bicyclists. The pavement along primary pedestrian paths should be replaced and a few designated bike routes through the Old Quad should be created to improve safety and functionality. Secondary paths should connect primary paths with building entrances and other destinations.
Bicycle Circulation

Use of bicycles as a primary circulation mode is a growing trend on Ball State’s campus and currently represents a significant point of conflict amongst other modes on campus. Currently without a designated zone, bicyclist often find themselves in conflict with pedestrians and vehicles. To be effective, a future bicycle network must be connected, safe, clear and extensive.

A key component of creating a more sustainable campus is encouraging cycling on campus as an alternative to commuting to campus and circulating around campus via a personal automobile. Bicycle commuting and circulation are important contributors to reducing the negative impacts from automobile trips and parking, including impervious surfaces, emissions, and the heat island effect.

The 2015 Campus Master Plan recommends an interconnected system of both on- and off-street bike routes to alleviate conflicts. Off-street bike paths and cycle tracks are proposed along the Cow Path, East Mall, and an east-west connection from Studebaker West to the Cow Path. These paths shall be a minimum width of 5 feet for each direction of travel, and shall be designated for bicycle use with special striping, symbols and signage.

On-street bike lanes are proposed on all surrounding major streets, with the exception of McKinley Avenue between Riverside and Neely Avenues, where the vehicular congestion and transit routes make bicycle travel unfeasible. Bike lanes should be a minimum width of 5 feet, and should be buffered from traffic, either by striping or physical barriers, where possible. Opportunities to partner with the city to develop on-street bike lanes should be pursued.

Bicycle parking is recommended along designated routes, rather than adjacent to buildings, to promote bicycles to stay in designated spaces and de-clutter building entrances. Bicycle parking should include maximized security by allowing the bicycle to be attached in two places, and by locating bicycle parking in highly visible, well-lit locations. Cover from the elements should also be used when available, and bicycle lockers should be considered where appropriate.
Looking north along the Cow Path towards new Residence Halls. Long-term opportunities include visually connecting the path to a new Aquatics Complex and Academic Building at McKinley and Pettit.
Cow path

The pedestrian path affectionately referred to as the “Cow Path” at Ball State currently follows a generally north-south alignment along the western edge of campus. The pedestrian route is highly utilized because of the direct connection it provides between north residential halls and academic uses at Cooper and in the Old Quad.

While highly functional, the Cow Path lacks character, and often feels like the campus’ service ally as it passes by loading docks at LaFollette Hall and the Arts and Journalism Building.

Future considerations to improve the Cow Path include providing two-way cycle tracks and a designated pedestrian zone. Benches, lights, bicycle parking and additional pedestrian amenities should be provided to visually connect the Cow Path to the character of campus.

Long-term opportunities for improvement include connecting the renovated Cow Path to a new open space on the existing site of LaFollette Residence Hall and opportunities to activate a connection to new academic, residential and recreation uses.
Transit

Ball State's transit system is comprised of a Shuttle Service and the local MITS buses. In order to reduce congestion on McKinley Avenue and better serve residence hall residents on the east side of campus, all bus routes on McKinley Avenue between Riverside and Neely Avenues, should be shifted to New York Avenue.

As part of this proposal, users will access McKinley Avenue as pedestrians via bus stops at Neely Avenue and Riverside Avenue. The walking distance between these two bus stops is an estimated 5-minute walk, meaning that all destinations along this section of the McKinley Avenue corridor will be no more than a 3-minute walk to a bus stop.

This new route alignment will better connect the future East Quad development. Once the Recreation Field Complex at Bethel and New York Avenues is complete, considerations should be given to extending a second route to this new destination.

Recommendations embedded in the 2015 Campus Master Plan regarding transit include coordination with MITS and city planning representatives. Future changes to the Ball State's transit system must include continued coordination with MITS and the city of Muncie.
Campus Facility, Open Space and Mobility Initiatives
Vehicular Circulation

The 2015 Campus Master Plan builds upon existing vehicular circulation on campus and maintains primary routes through campus and to perimeter parking resources while maintaining pedestrian cores that prioritize reduced conflicts with vehicles. Campus roads should generally support multiple modes, including automobiles, transit vehicles, delivery vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Campus street design for internal campus streets should emphasize the predominance of pedestrians over automobiles.

Given the pedestrian-oriented nature of campus, several existing streets on campus pass through busy pedestrian areas, including Campus Drive and the drives that connect to Emens Parking Garage. The 2015 Campus Master Plan recommends removing these streets but still providing limited access for service, to mitigate potential pedestrian conflicts to the highest extent possible. Service can be provided via shared use paths: curbless paved routes used primarily as pedestrian walks, but that can accommodate service vehicles during off-peak hours and emergency vehicles as needed. These curbless access paths will look and feel like pedestrian spaces, adding to the beauty of campus and reducing the potential for pedestrian-vehicle conflicts in the heart of campus. Additional considerations for vehicle routes on campus include:

- Enhance vehicular routes with improved streetscape amenities in line with existing campus character
- Advance vehicular gateways at all primary vehicle intersections at campus edges
- Prioritize pedestrian zones with limited vehicle access
- Improve crosswalk and pedestrian amenities where major pedestrian routes intersect primary vehicular routes
- Encourage slower speed limits where vehicle routes must remain through the core pedestrian areas of campus
Parking

Parking Strategy
Parking at Ball State serves multiple users including commuting students, residential students, faculty, staff, and visitors. Currently, the total quantity of parking spaces is sufficient for Ball State’s population; however, the location of spaces may not always align with desired parking locations. Parking goals for the 2015 Campus Master Plan were developed through a consensus oriented-process with the advisory committees:

• Provide adequate parking for academic peak hours
• Exceed accessibility goals
• Encourage parking on the perimeter
• Create a welcoming, visitor-friendly atmosphere
• Prioritize faculty and staff proximity
• Parking proximity for students living in residence halls and apartments will improve with class standing and unit type

Provide Adequate Parking for Academic Peak Hours
Accommodating parking quantities to serve the campus at peak utilization hours (Tuesday at 10am) will allow for adequate parking supply to serve off-hours evening and event parking. Consider modifying operational management strategies as necessary.

Exceed Accessibility Goals
Meet the campus-wide requirements for quantity of ADA barrier-free parking spaces, and exceed accessibility requirements in the campus core.

Encourage Parking on the Perimeter
Encourage parking on the perimeter of campus where land is less valuable for core campus functions and to reduce the potential for pedestrian/vehicular conflicts in the campus core. Provide convenient shuttle service and connections to bike routes.
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Create a Welcoming, Visitor-Friendly Atmosphere

Maintain a visitor friendly campus with appropriate wayfinding to direct visitors to parking that is appropriate for the purpose of their visit. Sufficient signage should also connect visitors from their parking space to their destination.

- **First-time visitors.** Provide signage/wayfinding and parking proximate to the Admissions Building.
- **Event visitors.** Provide access to parking within walking distance of events so that a shuttle is not necessary under normal circumstances. Design pedestrian routes between parking and event destination to enhance safety, accessibility and experience.
- **Clinical visitors.** Provide parking adjacent to the building or as near to the building as possible. The parking experience should be simple and clear, and not add anxiety to a clinic visit.
- **Short-term visitors.** Provide metered parking adjacent to buildings requiring short-term visits. Maintain a 45-minute time or less limit near the campus core.

Prioritize Faculty and Staff Proximity

Access to parking resources should be prioritized for faculty and staff. Ball State should strive to make the majority of faculty/staff parking available within a 5-7 minute walk of offices. Prime locations may require a price premium.

Parking for Students Improves with Class Standing

Designate a percentage of premium spaces adjacent to residence halls to students equivalent to 15% of Sophomores and 80-90% of Juniors and Seniors. Provide the remainder of student resident parking spaces at the campus perimeter with shuttle service.
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PARKING OPTIONS

1. CONSTRUCT NEW PARKING STRUCTURE IN PLACE (PREFERRED). REQUIRES REMOVAL OF EMENS PARKING STRUCTURE.
2. CONSTRUCT NEW PARKING STRUCTURE EAST ON CHURCH PROPERTY.
Parking Implementation

The 2015 Campus Master Plan recommends maintaining the total quantity of parking spaces on campus amongst modest future enrollment increases. However, as a sustainability driven campus, parking should only be built if needed, and when built, it should consider pervious pavement and bioswale strategies to reduce stormwater runoff. Transportation demand management (TDM) strategies to reduce the parking footprint on campus, including incentivizing bicycle use, transit, car sharing, and car pooling, are recommended as high priorities.

Several parking resources are recommended as candidates for removal due to various factors including a higher and best use of the land, safety issues, connectivity, and aesthetics. The Emens Parking Garage should be removed because of its age and condition and replaced in place. By replacing and redesigning a new Emens Parking Garage, vehicles will no longer need to access this part of campus from the west and south and thus the streets can be removed and replaced with curbless shared use paths. These shared use paths will allow service and emergency vehicles to have access as needed, but will greatly reduce the number of vehicles in this part of campus.

Parking lots to be removed for future building opportunities include the parking lot south of LaFollette Complex. Displaced parking from this change can be accommodated via on-street parking along the service drive or in the new parking structure south of the Arts and Journalism Building. The parking lot adjacent to the Architecture Building will be reduced in size to accommodate the new East Mall connection to the Student Recreation and Wellness Center. This displaced parking can be accommodated in the existing commuter lots next to Worthen Arena.

Several commuter lots near the Student Center will be removed as new student housing is constructed. The displaced parking can be shifted to the Student Center Parking Garage which is not currently utilized to its full capacity. New surface parking lot resources are recommended at the future consolidated recreation complexes (on the former site of Anthony Apartments and at the corner of Bethel and New York Avenues), as well as on the current site of the Recreation Field Complex north of Bethel Avenue. These parking resources support the goal of creating a pedestrian-focused campus core, with additional parking resources at the perimeter of campus and convenient access to transit and bicycle facilities to reduce congestion in the core of campus.

Align Parking Users and Location

Special attention has been given to ensure proximity to parking as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan.
**PARKING ALIGNMENT ZONES**

- **TOTAL FACULTY/STAFF (F/S) SPACES:** 2,730
- **TOTAL RESIDENTIAL SPACES:** 2,175
- **TOTAL COMMUTER SPACES:** 4,235
- **TOTAL VISITOR / ADA SPACES:** 495
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 9,635

(250 SPACE INCREASE)

- **100 F/S | SPACES:** 80
- **600 RES. | SPACES:** 450
- **COMMUTER:** 150
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 35
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 715

- **325 F/S | SPACES:** 260
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 25
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 285

- **200 F/S | SPACES:** 180
- **COMMUTER/OTHER:** 3,085
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 40
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 2,927

- **600 F/S | SPACES:** 540
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 50
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 590

- **150 F/S | SPACES:** 100
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 50
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 150

- **405 F/S | SPACES:** 290
- **300 RES. | SPACES:** 225
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 25
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 540

- **1,100 RES. | SPACES:** 250
- **COMMUTER:** 50
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 100
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 400

- **1,400 F/S | SPACES:** 1,200
- **1,100 RES. | SPACES:** 350
- **COMMUTER:** 750
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 100
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 2,400

- **100 F/S | SPACES:** 80
- **4,400 RES. | SPACES:** 900
- **COMMUTER:** 200
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 70
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 1,250

- **200 F/S | SPACES:** 180
- **COMMUTER/OTHER:** 3,085
- **VISITOR/ADA:** 40
- **TOTAL SPACES:** 2,927
The long-term value of the 2015 Campus Master Plan will be its power to establish capital priorities and optimize limited and valuable resources. This phasing strategy distills several of the overarching plan recommendations and themes into a series of specific and action-oriented priorities for campus. The priorities are generally arranged in chronological order, grouped in near-term, mid-term and long-term subsets. Prioritization sequencing must remain flexible, thus priorities can happen out of order as opportunities arise. Priorities for the 2015 Campus Master Plan are described in detail in earlier chapters of the plan and listed on the following pages organized by phase.

Near-Term .................................................................126
Mid-Term ..................................................................128
Long-Term.................................................................130
Near-Term

In summary, near-term opportunities as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan include:

- New Academic Buildings
- New East Mall
- Potential Mixed Use Facilities
- Athletic Improvements
- Bicycle Infrastructure
- New Residence Halls
- Core Campus Renovations

To provide further defensibility for the phasing and implementation strategy, near-term priorities should be tested with strategic prioritization criterion, including:

- Does the priority benefit one of Ball State’s signature programs?
- Is the priority fundable?
- Is the priority part of Ball State’s strategic vision?
- Is the priority on current capital lists?
- Does the priority occur in a key campus location?
- How does the priority relate to deferred maintenance?

In addition to on-campus opportunities for growth, the 2015 Campus Master Plan provides accommodations for future acquisition opportunities to meet future needs when appropriate opportunities present themselves, however the plan is not predicated on acquisition of land not currently owned by Ball State.

OPPORTUNITIES

1.1 WORTHEN PRACTICE FACILITY
1.2 APPLIED TECHNOLOGY RENOVATION (DECEMBER 2015)
1.4 NEW ACADEMIC BUILDING
1.5 COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING RENOVATION
1.6 EMENS IMPROVEMENTS
1.7 UNIFIED MEDIA LAB PHASE II (AJ) (DECEMBER 2014)
1.8 WEST QUAD 3RD + 4TH FLOOR REMODEL (JULY 2014)
1.9 POTENTIAL MIXED USE FACILITY
1.10 BALL DIAMOND IMPROVEMENTS (SEPTEMBER 2015)
1.12 VENDERLY FOOTBALL CENTER (UNDER CONSTRUCTION)
1.13 EAST MALL IMPROVEMENTS PHASE I
1.14 DEDICATED MULTI-MODAL AND BICYCLE PATH ON COW PATH
1.15 MULTI-MODAL BICYCLE CONNECTION NORTH TO ATHLETICS
1.16 JOHNSON B RENOVATION (UNDER CONSTRUCTION)
1.17 NEW RESIDENCE HALL
1.18 JOHNSON A RENOVATION (MAY 2015)
1.19 NEW RESIDENCE HALL
In summary, mid-term opportunities as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan include:

- University Green Improvements and New Academic Commons
- Renovation/Replacement of Cooper and Old Quad Academic Commons
- Old Quad Landscape Improvements
- Engagement of the Village with University Apartments
- Addition/Renovation to University Theater
- Consolidated Recreation
- Core Campus Renovations

### OPPORTUNITIES

2.1 ACADEMIC COMMONS ON UNIVERSITY GREEN
2.2 ACADEMIC COMMONS ON OLD QUAD
2.3 EAST MALL SITE IMPROVEMENTS PHASE II
2.4 UNIVERSITY GREEN SITE IMPROVEMENTS
2.5 LIBRARY RENOVATIONS
2.6 RENOVATIONS AND BACKFILL OF SPACE MIGRATED TO HEALTH PROFESSIONS
2.7 VILLAGE RESIDENCE HALL
2.8 CONSOLIDATED RECREATION AT ANTHONY
2.9 AQUATICS RENOVATION/REPLACEMENT
2.10 OLD QUAD LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS
2.11 RENOVATION + ADDITION TO UNIVERSITY THEATER
2.12 NEW ACADEMIC BUILDING
2.13 FIELDHOUSE
2.14 EMENS PARKING GARAGE REPLACEMENT
2.15 VILLAGE APARTMENTS
Long-Term

In summary, long-term opportunities as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan include:

- Future Academic Building Opportunity
- Core Residential Renovation
- New Gateway at Bethel/New York
- Worthen Renovations
- New Apartment Options
- Repurpose Scheidler Apartments

OPPORTUNITIES

3.1 NOYER RENOVATION / REPLACEMENT
3.2 WOODWORTH RENOVATION
3.3 STUDEBAKER WEST RENOVATION
3.4 BETHEL RECREATION FIELDS
3.5 WORTHEN RENOVATION
3.6 NEW APARTMENTS
3.7 MCKINLEY GREEN SPACE PHASE II
3.8 SCHEIDLER APARTMENTS REPURPOSE
Design guidelines for the 2015 Campus Master Plan further define physical planning goals for Ball State and provide design direction for implementation of the plan. The design guidelines balance recommendations for site, architecture and sustainable practices. The design guidelines provide recommendations and campus-wide and neighborhood specific scales.

Sustainable principles are integrated throughout this chapter. Where appropriate, these recommendations are highlighted in green and noted with this icon. A sustainable guidelines section of this chapter focuses on energy conservation, sustainable stormwater and renewable energy opportunities.

Organized topically, the guidelines provide a framework upon which future consultants can build. The topical guidelines include the following:

- Introduction ............................................................... 134
- Architecture Guidelines ............................................... 137
- Architectural Attributes ............................................... 138
- Architectural Attitudes ................................................ 146
- Sustainability Guidelines ............................................. 154
- Site Guidelines ............................................................ 165
- Neighborhood Guidelines ........................................... 178
- Old Quad Neighborhood ............................................ 180
- Campus Core Neighborhoods ..................................... 186
- Residential Neighborhoods ......................................... 196
- Athletic and Recreation Neighborhoods ...................... 204
Ball State has developed not unlike a number of other American institutions established early in the twentieth century. Austere beginnings in the form of a single building teachers training school transformed under the dedicated guidance and generosity of the Ball family and Muncie community into a complex of facilities surrounding a beautiful quadrangle - a campus.

That idyllic but serious setting for learning expanded dramatically in the post World War II era to meet increasing demand, including that generated by returned soldiers taking advantage of the G.I. Bill. From the mid-1960’s into the 1980’s, campus growth continued to surge, with the institution providing facilities and degrees beyond the teachers college and establishing a breadth fitting for a university.

The speed and scale of response necessary during those boom years resulted in a sprawling campus form; however, and though very little was ever developed without a master plan in mind, there remained some qualitative and experiential differences between old and new. Much of the development from the 80’s into the present has been crafted to respond in some way to those differences, filling in gaps, responding to evolving modes of transportation, responding to evolving pedagogical demands, refining architecture and site, in search of a sense of place that, however necessarily different from that first cluster of buildings and lawn, still represents a uniquely Ball State identity.

This 2015 Campus Master Plan projects a vision for unifying the campus, a spatial framework that addresses scale, mobility, cohesion and character, and seeks to make the campus expressive of the university’s principles of value.

If the 2015 Campus Master Plan conveys the message of this vision, in many ways the design guidelines establish the vocabulary - a language of the built environment comprising buildings and site. Much of the campus is built, so this is not an exercise in imagining something radically new or of a radically new scale. The Centennial Commitment suggests differentiation through entrepreneurship and quality so these guidelines are intended to cull from the full spectrum of university development those characteristics that resonate as qualitative contributions, and codify them.

This is not to suggest an entirely prescriptive approach to design or style; the campus has traditionally embraced work relevant to its era. However, there have
arisen over the years a number of design attributes and attitudes that have established an almost genetic cohesion. The campus communicates its lineage; it is a built environment that recognizes its history, embraces its diversity but holds together. Like the family for which it was named, the campus supports variety and breadth of perspective but presents features and traits both familiar and familial in nature.

The design guidelines balance recommendations for site, architecture and sustainable practices. The guidelines also provide recommendations and campus-wide and neighborhood specific scales. Thus, the guidelines have been formatted in two ways:

- **Typology.** The campus environment is a balance of Architecture and Site. They must be harmonious. Their craft and particulars are specific, however, and are thus for clarity separated here into two distinct sections, with attributes and attitudes described for each. Sustainability is integrated into both.

- **Scale.** Much of the guidelines apply to the greater campus; however, there is some degree of specificity needed to recognize idiosyncrasies of neighborhoods. These guidelines start generally and then increase in detail, up to and including focus areas and initiatives at a neighborhood level.
Architecture on campus has typically been representative of its time or relevant to the development of the institution. The Academic Classicism of the Administration Building or Collegiate/Tudor Gothic styles of other early buildings around the Old Quad were intended to express a legitimacy as a place of learning. Later examples of Modernism and Post-Modernism are reflections of certain attitudes and technologies of their time, but also illustrate shifts in the size of the student body, of teaching methodologies, and curriculum. Many of the buildings, however, exhibit a kind of vernacularism that crosses boundaries and sets them in this place, in Muncie, at Ball State - form and materiality that speak to robustness and fortitude.

These guidelines are intended to recognize those characteristics which have developed into a Ball State vernacular. They are intended to PRESERVE those that are successful and contributory, and to intelligently GUIDE modifications or additions to the campus fabric.

There will always be room for exceptions, but the university seeks consistency, cohesion, and - in the absence of specific demand for iconic or idiosyncratic architecture - a built environment that endures as recognizably relevant to Ball State.
Architectural Attributes

Primary Facade Materials

**Brick.** Used on campus in various sizes, textures and bonds of brick masonry, and many colors though predominately a range of red to brown. Primary facade material for new work shall be brick, and the color should trend toward the browns and red-browns depending on neighboring buildings. More idiosyncratic reddish colors shall be reserved for Bracken Library, and the Yellow brick with blue accent palette shall be reserved for the Administration Building.

**Limestone.** Typically used as trim, accents and details to articulate entry, windows, roof edges, bases. Limestone shall not be a primary material (Elliott Hall & Pruis Hall are existing exceptions). Primarily smooth-faced texture and panelized though some stacked examples exist. In some cases, precast architectural concrete may be used as an alternate material.

**Metal Panel.** Shall be used sparingly and not as a primary material. Where used, it should be warm gray/zinc, not colored. Flat, architectural panels should be given greater consideration than corrugated or ribbed. Copper has been used on campus and is acceptable as accent or detail but not a primary facade material.

New technologies and manufacturing processes are advancing the sustainability of brick and masonry. Consideration of innovative materials should be given but with greater responsibility to achieve appropriate testing and to ensure product and system longevity.
**Roof Materials and Details**

Roof materials vary across campus. Sloped roof materials include slate shingle, prefinished metal standing seam, zinc standing seam, and asphalt shingle. New work utilizing sloped roof should employ zinc, slate, or prefinished metal standing seam of a warm gray color. To the extent possible, projects should explore integrated or built-in drainage systems but at the very least should carefully detail scuppers, gutters and downspouts so that they appear considered and integral. Asphalt shingle has primarily been reserved for residential halls; it should only be used sparingly and of a warm gray/neutral color as employed on Park Hall and Dehoriy renovation.

Flat membrane roofs on campus often terminate with a profiled metal coping or limestone parapet detail. While this is not a prescriptive requirement, consideration should be given to the roofline in the overall design.

- **Green roofs**, such as the extensive system on the District Energy Station are encouraged where appropriate. While thermal value may be difficult to quantify, the effect on biodiversity, quantity and quality of run-off is positive. Flat roofs should employ white or cool roof products to reduce heat island effect.
Roof Forms - Flat

The majority of Ball State buildings from the 1940’s into the early 2000’s have utilized flat roofs; however, both sloped and flat roof forms have been used on the campus since its beginning, many times on the same building.

Given the typical scale of modern instructional spaces, most academic buildings on campus have and should continue to utilize flat roofs.

Measures should be taken to avoid long interrupted runs of unarticulated rooflines; however, this is less a prescriptive mandate than an imperative to consider the composition in whole, implicating massing, rooflines, materiality, detailing. Enclosed penthouses are preferred, but when mechanical equipment is exposed, careful placement and tall parapets should be utilized to shield from view.

Roof Forms - Sloped

Recently, Ball State has implemented dramatic initiatives to enhance the on-campus residential experience, building new halls such as Kinghorn and Park, and extensively renovating existing halls such as Dehority, Studebaker East and Johnson-A. Much of this work is intended to provide efficient, sustainable facilities and updated aesthetics but also to express a human scale, visual accessibility and warmth. To achieve that end, these designs address materiality and composition, but they have also utilized sloped roofs, including some that replace formerly flat roofs.

Sloped roof forms are one means by which to address human scale on residential projects; however, they are not required. The totality of the design must be considered, especially scale.

Predominantly sloped roofs should generally be limited to residential buildings, and then only up to approximately 3-4 stories. Where used, the approximate pitch should be 1:1.

Building Integrated Photovoltaics (BIPV’s) and other project-specific on-site renewables are not excluded from consideration, although often campus-scale strategies have greater cumulative impact. If rooftop photovoltaics - either those incorporated into sloped roofs or those ballasted on flat roofs - are explored, their efficacy and benefits, including as a teaching tool, need to be weighed against cost, maintenance, and physical and technological longevity.
Fenestration

The campus generally employs “punched windows” with exceptions of larger areas of curtain wall used to accent important moments in facades, introduce natural light, or enhance visibility at common areas. Ribbon windows are atypical and should be avoided. Metal frame color should be light to warm gray and not lean toward brown. Special color frames are reserved only for existing historic buildings.

Trim around new punched windows, when included, should be limestone, precast concrete, metal panel or differentiating brick elements. Where appropriate for individual comfort, an attempt should be made to include operable units. Incorporate sun-shading, light shelves, or other daylight control as appropriate for orientation/exposure. Use basic energy modeling early during massing and orientation studies to help guide design decisions.

High performance, low-e coated insulating glass shall be employed, but care should be taken to avoid excessive reflectivity. No colored glass.

A high performance building envelope is one of the most effective means for architecture to impact sustainability. Unless otherwise dictated by code, the overall percentage of vision glass should not exceed 40% of the facade. Design teams should target 30-40%, but should be discriminately strategic about access to light and views, differentiating for example the needs of private single occupancy offices from public group spaces, and responding to solar exposure at a facade-specific level.
Ground Levels

Academic building ground floors should encourage activity, visibility and access. In many ways, they are an extension of their surrounding site. Balance porosity, however, with clarity of entry. Residential buildings also benefit from visible and active ground floors but just as importantly should address security and control.

Traditionally programmatic opacity (performance, music, athletics, etc) should be challenged; weigh visibility of program and activity against practicality of use. Consider the benefits of transparency, both in terms of naturally lit interiors where practical or activation of exterior. If opacity at the ground level is unavoidable for major portions of facade, concentrate those transparent portions toward high use campus spaces and circulation.

Service Areas

Locate service areas near each other to minimize service drives. All service areas shall be screened from view, but existing or planned service areas adjacent to key outdoor spaces and pedestrian circulation shall be given special consideration. When balancing convenience and frequency of service, the pedestrian experience shall be given priority.
Level of Detail/Ornamentation

The articulation of facades on campus varies greatly, linked substantially to the era of building. Historical attitudes about coining, trim, entablature, and filligree transitioned for a number of reasons into an espousal of architectural expression devoid of ornament, with degrees in between. New work should explore balance, providing form expressive of or resulting from use, or should exhibit detail as a function of building or envelope performance, for example, exterior screening, shading.

Artifacts

As technology advances so too do the number of devices, hardware and interfaces related to building security, communication and access. These should not be treated as an afterthought but should be organized and collocated as much as possible. Heights of devices are generally dictated by access and reach so care should be taken to locate or arrange architectural features accordingly (for example, devices should not overlap important reveals, relief or material transitions).
Building Signage/Inscriptions

Early buildings on campus exhibit signage incorporated prominently into the architecture – naming in particular engraved or cast into cladding materials, cornerstones set into masonry, coining worked into façade compositions. Some of these practices have continued though inconsistently, while demand for increased building flexibility has led to reasonable restraint when considering permanent inscriptions. Here, continued variety is expected. Cornerstones shall be required and coining encouraged, including modern interpretations. Naming signage materiality and design shall be at the discretion of individual teams and should convey a sense of permanence; however, long-term flexibility should be considered - modification, replacement or repair should not require major facade demolition or rework.

Building Lighting

New work should pair exterior building with site lighting to enhance entry, approach, and outdoor spaces, and to accent facade features, albeit with restraint and responsibility by utilizing full cut-off fixtures and evaluating overall energy consumption. Security is of utmost importance, but teams should also seek to use lighting to support and clarify campus circulation. Fixture materials and design have varied, from ornate copper to modern aluminum, but to the greatest extent possible, uniformity at a neighborhood level is expected.
Celebrate Entrance

Many buildings on campus present an identifying or iconic architectural feature at the main entrance, often a vertical expression of massing, void, fenestration or detail above a well-defined threshold. Some of the early built examples also elevate the building onto a plinth and incorporate steps into the entrance experience, or utilize contrasting wood door materials. In the case of some renovations, new elements along these lines have been employed to address entrance confusion or to establish alignments with exterior site elements or spaces.

The cumulative effect suggests a planning attitude interested in celebrating and clarifying entrances, to differentiate building identities, find relationships with campus spaces, and enhance wayfinding. These are objectives that should be continued.

This neither necessitates nor negates symmetry or any specific stylistic response. Design teams are encouraged to explore unique and project-specific solutions to support this attitude, leveraging a range of architectural tools including but not limited to materiality shifts, attention to detail, massing articulation, windows, or roof forms. Changes in elevation, if present, should seamlessly integrate barrier-free access as a design asset.
Engage Context

Evident on campus is an attitude, transformed over time, about how buildings connect with their context. The early campus composition was such that small buildings framed a primary campus space. The context was contained; circulation between buildings, necessitated by their varied and specific programs, activated and enriched the Old Quad. Campus growth, infill sites, larger buildings and more complex circulation systems led to alternate responses, such as the chain of four buildings along McKinley Avenue between which one can travel without once leaving conditioned space.

Moving forward, the university seeks connectivity that is thoroughly integrated and balanced, where building entrances, access and major interior spaces are considered components of a greater system that includes outdoor spaces, various exterior circulation paths and surfaces, lighting, landscape and building orientation.

Connections may, but need not be literal. Avoid links that are utilitarian or circuitous; connections shall be purposeful, expressive, and experiential. Building connections should align major interior circulation spines, open public spaces, corridors with high visibility of program, provide access to light and clear wayfinding.
Smart Footprints

Buildings located around the Old Quad feature small footprints, appropriate for the instruction of their day, their narrowness allowing for penetration of natural light and clear interior organization. Over time, their intimacy and rigidity have been supplanted in the campus core by larger, more flexible buildings.

New building massings should be developed to respond to current pedagogical needs and long-term adaptability but should also strive for some of the same sensibilities regarding light, visibility, access and comprehensibility that made those initial buildings successful.

Floor plates will vary depending on program, but all things considered, narrow proportions are preferred over wide. Moderate floor plates require attention paid to circulation and location of core elements to ensure interior spaces are active and well-lit. Some programs, particularly in the sciences and research, may require wider buildings. In cases where the widest floor plates are unavoidable, additional measures such as skylights, light wells and innovative massing should be considered to balance programmatic requirements with interior experience and building performance.

Smart massing development is sustainable massing development. Basic preliminary energy modeling should be utilized early and often during the design process to help inform building orientation, floor widths, wall opacity, measures like overhangs, window-specific protection, and self-shading massings.
Lucina Hall

College of Architecture and Planning

David Letterman Communications and Media Building

Art and Journalism
Sensitive Height

New developments should observe a 4-5 story maximum height. Greater verticality in academic buildings can discourage interaction and collaboration unless programmatic or architectural measures are taken to enhance connectivity.

Facades of any height should work with their surrounding context to ensure continuity of campus fabric or sensitivity to neighbors of different scale. In particular, dense university sites adjacent to non-university residential or commercial sites should address this transition sensitively, exhibiting measures like stepped down, broken or otherwise articulated massings, active/porous ground floors, colonnades, covered walks, peristyles, access to greenways and open spaces or other pedestrian-engaging edges.

Avoid tall and unarticulated facades that meet the ground abruptly. Ground levels that do not or cannot invite access or for which programmatic visibility is unwarranted should explore landscape buffers to keep pedestrian circulation away from facades and to visually ground buildings to their sites.

Building densely is often a tenet of sustainable urban design, increasing vibrancy, encouraging walkable environments, and recognizing the value of land as a resource. All new building projects shall evaluate broad campus sustainable objectives against the above height guidelines, which are intended to provide a baseline for campus continuity, not an inflexible directive.
Sustainability Guidelines

Introduction

Environmental sustainability will play a crucial role in the development of Ball State’s campus. The 2015 Campus Master Plan defines a broad holistic approach towards sustainability that unifies fundamental planning recommendations with meaningful qualitative and quantitative sustainable strategies. Sustainable planning principles, carbon reduction strategies, alternative modes of transportation considerations, and innovative building initiatives all come together to inform the development vision for the campus and ensure that growth is forward thinking and environmentally sustainable.

Sustainable recommendations are integrated throughout this document and design guidelines chapter. This section of the report provides specific direction and recommendations regarding:

- Energy Conservation in Buildings
- Energy Conservation in Planning and Transportation
- Sustainable Stormwater
- Opportunities for Renewable Energy

Energy Conservation in Buildings

Ball State has committed that all new campus buildings and renovations to existing buildings will be designed to meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification guidelines. 97% of all projects that earn a LEED rating achieve an energy savings of 12% better than code, or better. But the LEED rating system alone does not assure that aggressive energy targets needed to meet Ball State’s carbon neutrality goal will be met. LEED is an important benchmark because it provides a framework that leads to a broader understanding of sustainable design considerations; however, the master plan recommends that in addition to LEED goals, energy targets should be established for all new construction and renovation projects.

The 2030° Challenge is a program widely adopted by the design and construction industry in response to the measured impacts of climate change. In this regard, it can be viewed as parallel to the ACUPCC program, providing energy targets in a manner consistent with Ball State’s goal of climate neutrality. The Challenge is based on the understanding that all new buildings
and renovations must be designed to reach net-zero energy standards by the year 2030, in keeping with the consensus opinion of climate scientists on the GHG emission limits required to keep future global warming under one degree Celsius (°C) above today’s level. The Challenge recognizes that the building sector cannot reach these targets overnight, and thus incremental targets for energy use are established. Buildings designed in 2010 must reach an energy use target of 60% less than an average (as defined by CBECS) building, and every five years that follow, the energy target advance an additional 10%, so that by year 2030 our designs are on track to be net-zero energy. The incremental nature of the Challenge again parallels the incremental nature of Ball State’s CAP – both measures use 5-year increments as well.

Following the 2030° Challenge, buildings envisioned in the master plan will be in design during the 2015 milestone (70% better than CBECS) and the 2020 milestone (80% better than CBECS). These are aggressive energy targets and project funding might preclude these targets from being reached. Policy needs to align with the reality of project funding. In light of this reality, a policy might instead require the design team to establish a specific EUI goal for a project consistent with the 2030° Challenge and to work towards this target to the extent possible, identifying and documenting cost premiums that preclude reaching the target. This policy would require project teams to, at a minimum, explore the potential for a project to reach these targets and to document what additional budget would be required to reach these targets. By having these discussions, both Ball State and consultant teams will better understand the means to earning these targets, can prioritize energy amongst other project requirements, and potentially explore alternative funding mechanisms to reach these goals.
Energy Conservation in Planning and Transportation

Campus Density

A comfortable density, along with a mix of uses, not only creates a vibrant campus, but also opportunities for a more sustainable campus. Appropriate campus density, when paired with creation of great campus spaces and appropriate pedestrian amenities encourages reduced single-occupant automobile use and prioritizes walkability. At FAR 1.3, the core of Ball State’s campus has one of the highest Floor Area Ratios (FAR) of the campus districts, yet its collection of historic buildings and pockets of open space creates a unique and beautiful college campus. The 2015 Campus Master Plan minimizes new development in surrounding campus neighborhoods and encourages increased density in the East Quad (to achieve a FAR 1.2) and new south residential areas (to achieve a FAR 1.6). New residential and academic buildings are proposed as infill to increase the density in these neighborhoods and include considerations for new quad and courtyard spaces that are modeled after the tradition and scale of great quadrangles at Ball State and other universities.

Campus Density Recommendations includes:

- Complete limited building additions and select new construction within the historic core while maintaining its overall density
- Develop a compact East Quad academic district east of McKinley Avenue in the scale and character of campus core neighborhoods
- Increase the variety of uses and density for the south and north residential areas
- Maintain a consistent building height for the majority of campus (refer to the Architectural Guidelines)
Walkability

Master plan priorities emphasize pedestrian movement over other transportation methods. An enhanced connected pedestrian network with a clear hierarchy of pedestrian walkways that help to define and articulate mixed-use campus areas including academic, dining, residential and recreation within convenient 5-minute walks. Ball State should continue to incentivize reduction of single-occupant vehicle use through prioritizing pedestrian improvements and encouraging use of alternative modes.

Bikeability

Because the scale of Ball State’s campus does not always allow for walking to be the most convenient mode of travel, a key component of creating a more sustainable campus is encouraging cycling on campus as an alternative to commuting to campus and circulating around campus via a personal automobile. Bicycle commuting and circulation are important contributors to reducing the negative impacts from automobile trips and parking, including impervious surfaces, emissions, and the heat island effect.
Sustainable Stormwater

Campuses across the country are creatively incorporating stormwater management techniques into traditional campus environments. Stormwater best management practices (BMPs) attempt to slow down stormwater runoff from large rainfall events, mimic pre-development runoff conditions by managing small stormwater events at or close to where rain falls, and by minimizing impervious surfaces. They reduce impervious ground cover and treat stormwater where it falls instead of pushing it downstream.

As part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan, a patent pending metric, WaterScore, was applied to Ball State’s existing campus to identify a baseline stormwater score. WaterScore measures water quality and quantity on campus with the ultimate goal of achieving pre-settlement metrics, or a WaterScore of 100. As part of this plan, it is reasonable for Ball State to aim towards achieving a WaterScore of 40. In order to achieve, Ball State will need to direct 3,068,500 SF (70.3 acres) of existing impervious surfaces to infiltration or re-use opportunities. This can be achieved through two primary goals:

1. Include sustainable stormwater management goals in 100% of new projects identified in the 2015 Campus Master Plan. Opportunities for sustainable stormwater management (described below) include bioswales, pervious pavement, green roofs and re-use for irrigation.
2) Include sustainable stormwater management goals in 25% of existing campus areas not identified as a new project in the 2015 Campus Master Plan. Every 1.85 acres of impervious surface that is directed towards infiltration or re-use will gain 1 additional WaterScore point. Retrofitting existing parking lots to include pervious pavement and/or bioswales represent significant opportunities to improve the campus WaterScore. Specific existing campus parking lots to be considered for retrofit include:

- Stadium Parking Lot (in addition to existing pervious areas)
- Commuter Parking Lots
- Parking Lot south of Student Center

BMPs for stormwater management should be considered for all projects, including new and existing buildings, roads, sidewalks, and landscaping, or where any significant runoff is expected. As the useful life of existing parking lots ends and they are replaced, pervious paving or infiltration trenches should be included.
New and reconstructed streets should incorporate stormwater BMPs. Addressing stormwater quality issues for existing roads is very challenging. Pervious paving should be considered when roadway pavement is in need of replacement. If sufficient right-of-way is available, infiltration trenches can be built to parallel the roadway corridor and treat stormwater directly as it runs off the paved surfaces.

Any changes to the existing stormwater runoff or the storm sewer system should also employ BMPs for storm water management. Ball State should investigate and pursue the following BMPs.

**Detention Basins**

Detention basins are large volume storage facilities which help to manage large storm events by providing added capacity to a drainage system. Underground chambers are effective under large open areas such as parking lots or recreation fields, while above ground basins can be a visual amenity to the campus while still solving the stormwater needs. A detention basin works by creating a restriction to stormwater flows. The restriction creates the need for an area to store the water that is being detained, but the benefit is realized downstream from the basin by the reduction in the flow rate of the stormwater runoff.

**Cisterns**

Rain water cistern systems collect rain water. The water collected by the cistern can then be used for non-potable uses like landscape irrigation, toilet flushing, and mechanical system make up.

**Infiltration Facilities**

Rain gardens, infiltration planters, bioswales, and constructed wetlands are examples of infiltration facilities that help to filter stormwater from smaller events. By encouraging and assisting infiltration, these facilities enhance water quality, reduce runoff rates, recharge the groundwater system, and create habitat. Infiltration systems collect water from impervious surfaces and allow the water to infiltrate through a soil medium, which greatly increases the removal of pollutants. Infiltrating through the soil medium will allow for filtering that would not normally occur if the stormwater were immediately sent into the storm sewer system. If local soil conditions allow, the stormwater can continue to infiltrate into the existing soils until it reaches the ground water system. If impervious soils are present, a pipe collection system can be included beneath the soil medium to collect the water for transport to a stream or storm sewer. Even though the stormwater will be going into the storm sewer conveyance system, the benefit of the infiltration facility still exists since the runoff has been slowed and cleaned.

**Pervious Pavements**

Pervious pavements allow the infiltration of
stormwater in areas that would normally be impervious. Pervious systems enhance groundwater recharge through increased percolation of rain water into the soil underneath paved areas. Pervious pavements can be applied to walks, parking lots, roads and driveways and can come in the form of pervious asphalt, pervious concrete, or pervious pavers. An additional layer of gravel can be included beneath the pervious pavement to detain the stormwater.

**Green Roofs**

Green roofs, while relatively new to the US, have proven effective at managing smaller rain events while slowing runoff for larger rain events at several profile sites in the region. Introducing natural surfaces to what would normally be impervious allows for stormwater from small rain events to be absorbed and used by plants rather than being conveyed into the stormwater system. This scenario more accurately mimics the conditions that would have occurred prior to the development of the site. Because it is difficult to design for entire storage on top of a building, larger storm events will runoff; however, they will be slowed down due to the presence of the plant materials which will benefit the downstream stormwater conveyance system. Green roofs are not yet cost-effective based on stormwater merits alone. Additional benefits of green roofs include increased roof life, creation of habitat, reduction of the urban heat island effect, creation of a visual amenity, and increased building insulation which can reduce heating and cooling costs.
Opportunities for Renewable Energy

On-Site Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Electrical Production. PVs canopies over surface parking/decks can produce: 31,347 MMBTU and would offset campus electricity consumption by 6.13%

PVs on flat roofs and over parking can produce: 45,937 MMBTU and would offset campus electricity consumption by 8.98%
Introduction
The site guidelines reinforce Ball State’s existing campus and relationship to the city of Muncie while encouraging flexibility that will allow Ball State to continue to be recognized as a beautiful and sustainable campus. The site guidelines reflect fundamental qualities of campus planning and urban design and respond to the comprehensive analysis of natural systems completed as part of this plan. The guidelines are not prescriptive in nature, but are also intended to unify Ball State under an approach and philosophy that connects buildings and landscape to continue an integrated, interactive, social and rich campus context.

Site design principles were established as part of the master planning process to guide the development of the plan. These principles for Ball State are intended to:

- Provide opportunities for a appropriate density and diverse mix of uses within convenient 5-minute walks
- Create interactive, collaborative and social spaces
- Utilize diverse plant materials to create cool microclimate conditions, provide opportunities for carbon sequestration and reduce building heating and cooling demands
- Utilize native plant species reflective of Indiana
- Utilize drought tolerant and native landscape and use turf areas deliberately to reinforce high image areas
- Increase site biodiversity
- Manage stormwater where it falls
- Provide for active and passive recreation opportunities in proximity to convenient 5-minute walks

As Ball State continues to grow and develop, it is important that a sustainable site development approach is continued. The campus landscape should be treated as a complete built and natural system. Beyond the extent of the site, it is important that Ball State continues to connect to the regional environment by considering habitat, material, energy, and human connections between Ball State and the surrounding region. Landscape improvements should be consistent and in tune with the region’s local ecosystem. Likewise, water quality, habitat conditions, and the quality of life for people in the surrounding region are all important development considerations.
Campus Impact Zones

In an effort to coordinate and prioritize campus image, and encourage more sustainable practices while balancing demands of site maintenance budgets, the campus has been subdivided by anticipated level of site maintenance required for desired effect. Prioritized impact zones allows Ball State to focus limited financial and staffing resources on highly imaginable and highly visible campus areas. General campus fabric areas should receive a standard level of site maintenance attention that still meets Ball State’s reputation for quality.

Zone 1: First Impression
Campus edges and gateways. These zones require a high level of maintenance, especially at entrances to campus where detail can be seen and appreciated.
- Highly manicured landscape
- Highest maintenance attention and budget
- Allow for highest concentration of flower beds, perennials, and bulbs to add seasonal interest
- Utilize ornamental trees to add color and interest

Zone 2: High Image
Where most pedestrian activity occurs on a daily basis and significant daily and visitor traffic
- Highly manicured landscape
- Very high maintenance attention and budget
- Drought tolerant and native landscape where possible and feasible
- Utilize special paving and site features where necessary

Zone 3: Campus Fabric
Includes general open space on campus with high daily pedestrian activity
- General campus landscape including lawn and canopy trees
- Include select ornamentals in key areas and site features where necessary
- Utilize simple, low-maintenance mass plantings at building foundations

Zone 4: Athletics and Recreation
Actively maintain competition playing fields and adjacent spectator areas
- Some of the most maintenance-intensive areas on campus
- Grass fields require irrigation, frequent mowing, and fertilization
- Include shade trees, ornamentals, and foundation plantings only at edges and pedestrian interface areas

Zone 5: Low Maintenance
Campus edges and existing natural areas with little or no pedestrian activity
- Encourage quality low-maintenance plantings at stormwater management areas and managed forest areas
- Utilize native plant species
- Consider grasses, wildflowers, and no-mow seed mixes that are mowed infrequently and require less maintenance
Campus Gateways

Campus gateways are the primary routes into and out of campus, and should enhance the arrival experience. Visitors, students, and staff should be directed to parking, drop-offs, and/or destinations through a straightforward wayfinding and signage system. In recent years, Ball State has developed quality gateways at McKinley Avenue and Bethel Avenue, Riverside Avenue and Tillotson Avenue, University Avenue and Tillotson Avenue and New York Avenue and Neely Avenue. Multiple campus gateways are proposed at a hierarchy of scale to serve vehicular, combined, and pedestrian arrivals. Campus gateway principles include:

- Create memorable portals and enhance arrival experience
- Improve the public image of the campus as a place that welcomes the community
- Signal a clear point of arrival and improve wayfinding at campus gateways to provide clear direction for visitor parking
- Materials/colors should be uniform and consistent with the existing campus palette of brick and limestone
- Create a hierarchy of gateways to be designed in scale with their surrounding context and their function as either vehicular, combined, or pedestrian gateways

Campus Edges

Much of the perceived character of Ball State’s campus is derived from the quality of its landscape in the core campus areas. Ball State generally lacks a consistent character regarding existing campus setbacks and edges on campus. To maintain and improve the aesthetic value of outer parts of campus, consistent landscape setbacks or build-to lines should be established. Campus edge principles include:

- Create edges that define a consistent and clear campus boundary and convey a distinctive, positive image
- Create edges that feel welcoming to the community and complement the surrounding community context
- Ensure that campus edges promote connectivity to surrounding neighborhoods and non-motorized systems, especially for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Establish consistent setbacks and landscape, lighting, and signage treatment for each edge zone
EXISTING CAMPUS GATEWAYS
FUTURE VEHICULAR CAMPUS GATEWAYS
FUTURE PEDESTRIAN CAMPUS GATEWAYS
FUTURE COMBINED CAMPUS GATEWAYS

LEGEND
- EXISTING CAMPUS GATEWAYS
- HIGH IMAGE EDGES
- COMMUNITY EDGES
- NATURALISTIC EDGES
- BUFFER EDGES
Design Guidelines for Pedestrian Paths

Network

The pedestrian network should be continuous, aligned so that it connects major destinations, and should offer pedestrians a safe, interesting, and relatively direct means of travel across campus.

Pedestrian walks should interconnect with existing and proposed open space and quadrangles, while generally following the natural desire lines between destinations. As origins and destinations shift, pedestrian desire lines will shift. It is impractical to add new walks in all such instances, but where pedestrian volume is greater than the width of the existing walk, additional pavement should be added. Ball State should observe the changing use of sidewalk paths, creating new sidewalk connections on well-worn open space paths and removing sidewalk sections that pedestrians no longer use.

Road Crossings

Pedestrian routes should merge when approaching roads to minimize the quantity of road crossings. Where feasible, pedestrian walks should cross vehicular roads at a right angle with an open view of the street. Standard pavement markings or special street pavement materials should be used to highlight pedestrian movement at major pedestrian crossings.

Exterior Connections

The campus pedestrian network should connect to border sidewalks and the campus should promote and encourage improved pedestrian connections to the Village.

Materiality and Finish

Consistent walkway material is a critical element for achieving visual continuity and campus unity. As a base material, reinforced concrete should be the dominant pedestrian walkway material for durability and ease of maintenance and repair. The finish, scoring, and connection details should be consistent and uniform.

Quality paving materials of complementary color and texture should only be used in special areas, such
as plazas and at major building entrances. These special paver areas should ideally utilize a flexible base system, due to its lower initial cost, proven durability, and ease of accommodating future alterations.

**Linear Landscaping**

Landscape, plant material, and pedestrian-scaled site furnishings should emphasize pedestrian routes, establish scale, and create pleasant microclimates.

**Accessibility**

To the extent possible, all pedestrian walks should be handicapped accessible and should not have steps. Crosswalks and barrier-free ramps that are constructed to meet ADA, state, and local code requirements should be constructed at roadway intersections. ADA codes require that all walks have no more than a 2% cross slope to provide water runoff and prevent ponding water. Metal railings are required at ramps over 5% slope and should be of non-ferrous metals that do not require frequent repainting or replacement.
Parking Design Guidelines

Vehicle parking design should consider the following parking design guidelines:

- Pedestrian access to and from lots should be carefully considered to minimize vehicular pedestrian conflicts. Vehicle parking should not be placed in primary pedestrian corridors and main pedestrian desire paths.
- Where parking lots border pedestrian walks, campus roads, or residential off-campus neighborhoods, the edges of lots should be landscaped to provide a buffer zone and vegetative screening.
- The lot interior should incorporate wide islands with appropriately-scaled plantings to soften the visual effect of the lot. Interior landscape islands should provide shade, reduce heat of large paved areas, and allow storm water infiltration.
- Ball State should consider integrating stormwater treatment through permeable pavement, infiltration trenches, and other stormwater BMPs. Ball State staff is capable of maintaining permeable pavements.
- Due to higher installed cost relative to conventional concrete, their use should be determined on a project-by-project basis against other BMPs.
- Lots should be appropriately lit to increase safety. Lights should be appropriately shielded to minimize glare and light pollution.
- Entryways and vehicular circulation should be easily accessed with safe viewing angles for oncoming traffic, and clear signage should occur at each main entrance.
- Lots should have the appropriate number of service and handicapped spaces to accommodate the surrounding buildings.
- Lots should be double-loaded (two bays of parking served by one drive aisle) for the most efficient parking layout.
- The layout of surface parking lots should allow efficient plowing methods and provide locations to store snow.
- Place bioretention areas in parking lot islands, on lot perimeters, or in lawn areas between sidewalks. Where possible, place bioretention areas around existing inlets. Lot design should direct runoff first to a filter strip to remove coarse sediment.
Campus Plant Materials

The Ball State campus consists of a wonderful mix of landscape and plant materials that create a pleasant campus structure. Future planting considerations at Ball State should continue to create an order and structure to the campus, provide an overall conceptual framework for the development of open spaces, establish a high level of quality in the design of open spaces, and link the campus’s eclectic building styles through common tree, shrub and perennial plantings.

Plant materials on Ball State’s campus will continue to provide:

- Improved comfort
- Spatial accents
- Pedestrian scale
- Environmental and sustainable benefits
- Improved quality of memorable spaces

In general, plant materials on Ball State’s campus should consider typical urban tolerance and resistance characteristics, including:

- Salt (although few plants will tolerate high exposures)
- Variable soil conditions
- Disease
- Low maintenance requirements

Specific planting considerations include:

- Plantings should not mask building entrances, but rather enhance and focus attention to the entrances and other architectural features. Public entrances to buildings should be easily found and accessed.
- Outdoor transition space should be designed between the building approach and indoor lobbies. This transition space should include materials that relate to the materials used in the building interior or on the exterior walls. This space should also provide some protection from rain, sun, and wind.
- Landscape treatment adjacent to buildings and framing open spaces should be simple with a limited plant palette. Planting beds and foundation plantings should be utilized in areas that serve to transition open space areas to individual buildings. Massing and size of planted areas should be in scale with buildings and complement or reinforce the landscape.
of the open space areas and the campus landscape character.

- Plantings should not be located in ways that create hazardous conditions and should not create dark pockets near entrances or along sidewalks at night.
- To maintain safety, heights of shrubs and small trees should be limited to ensure adequate sight availability.
- Large plantings should be located far enough from building walls to allow for air movement.
- Plantings should not completely obstruct views from building windows. Plants located near windows should be near enough to filter glare and bright sunlight, but distant enough from windows to maintain views.
- Plantings on top of structures should be planned and considered in early planning stages to ensure adequate structure and appropriate green space in line with the desired aesthetic of an urban campus.
- In an effort to coordinate and prioritize site maintenance budgets, the campus should confer maintenance zones to provide prioritized site maintenance to key areas and focus limited financial and staffing resources on highly imaginable and highly visible campus areas. General campus fabric areas should receive a standard level of site maintenance attention that still meets Ball State’s reputation for quality.
Site Elements and Furnishings

The goal of site furnishing standards is to develop a palette of furnishings that contribute to a positive visual character and achieve a unified and clearly defined campus within the overarching aesthetic.

Coordinated site furnishings such as pedestrian and street lights, benches, trash/recycling receptacles, and bicycle racks enhance the functionality of campus while also contributing to a sense of orientation and an increased sense of order.

Ball State should enforce site furnishing standards and families of furnishing elements and specific units that should be considered for use throughout campus. Furnishings should complement existing campus furnishings, while continuing to reflect Ball State’s reputation of quality.

The campus should limit its site furnishings to one family where possible. A single family of furnishings works together in terms of their materials, style, detailing, color, and scale so that they establish a unified, cohesive image.

Existing furnishings that are outdated, vandalized, or deteriorated should be replaced as needed with the recommended style until all site furnishings conform with the design guidelines. Implementation of these recommendations will by necessity occur over time through separate physical improvement projects and regular replacement. It is important that Ball State representatives take advantage of opportunities to replace damaged or worn out units with the recommended replacement units so that consistency is maintained.

Site furnishing standards should consider limited site facilities budgets. Selection and installation criteria will minimize maintenance efforts and costs. Limiting site furnishings to a single family will reduce the need to store spare parts and train staff for repairs, thus achieving a higher level of cost effectiveness. To ensure that current site furnishings selections will be long-term investments, site furnishing standards should recommend designs that are not fads and suggest styles and sources that will be available for the long-term.

Typical site furnishing standards will include the following typologies:

- Pedestrian lighting
- Street and parking lot lighting
- Pedestrian paving
- Bicycle racks and bicycle storage
- Benches
- Tables and chairs
- Trash receptacles
Typical considerations for site furnishing by typology include:

- **Installation**: Special considerations regarding where units should be used in the campus setting and their installation
- **Selection**: General design considerations to follow in selecting equipment
- **Source**: Suggested sources and styles

### Tables and Chairs

Landscape Forms Mingle Table

Landscape Forms Plainwell Bench

### Trash Receptacles

Wabash Valley LR 300 Slat

Landscape Forms Plainwell

### Bike Racks
Neighborhood Guidelines

Ball State’s campus is organized by an array of unique academic, residential, and athletic/recreation campus neighborhoods that are unified by a tradition of planning, design, landscapes, and construction. Campus neighborhoods break down the scale of the campus into identifiable pedestrian environments that support the primary activities of living, learning, teaching and recreating. Many of these established neighborhoods are fully defined and conceptually complete, while others are emerging or fragmented. The 2015 Campus Master Plan recommendations are intended to guide the development of all campus neighborhoods such that the effective and successful qualities of the established areas are celebrated and reinforced while encouraging the development of innovative and comparable qualities in underdeveloped areas.

Neighborhood guidelines as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan adhere to attitudes and attributes for site, architecture and sustainability principles outlined as part of the campus-wide design guidelines, but provide a degree of specificity needed to recognize idiosyncrasies of neighborhoods on Ball State’s campus. These guidelines start generally with a description of neighborhood characteristics and design objections and then increase in detail, up to and including initiatives and focus areas at a neighborhood level. Modeling that includes opportunities for sustainable strategies for key building projects identified as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan are also described for each of the primary neighborhoods. Neighborhoods (and sub-neighborhoods) identified as part of the 2015 Campus Master Plan include:

- Old Quad
- Campus Core
  - North
  - South
- Residential
  - East
  - North
  - South
- Athletics and Recreation
  - Core
  - North
- West Campus
Old Quad Neighborhood
Old Quad Characteristics

The Old Quad began as a mixed-use collegiate quadrangle with buildings addressed a central open space, encouraging intentional interaction and collaboration at the heart of campus. As the campus has grown north, the Old Quad has become more passive in nature, defined by mature vegetation, meandering paths and Collegiate/Tudor Gothic architecture.

Architecture

- Includes Ball State’s greatest historical assets
- Generally smaller scale detached buildings with yards
- Fine detailing, human proportions
- Both flat and pitched roof forms
- Brick with limestone trim
- Two-sided buildings that address the quad and street
- Academic and support functions

Site

- Mature and simple landscape palette of canopy trees and lawn allow for clear views and visual connectivity and ease of navigation
- Restrained use of understory trees, shrubs and ground cover as primarily foundation plantings
- Simple pedestrian walkways with quality detailing follow desire paths
- Areas for pedestrian seating and quiet reflection at nodes
Old Quad Objectives

Limited new building projects in the Old Quad neighborhood must be sympathetic to the established context without challenging the neighborhood’s character or quality. Architecture and landscape must be holistically conceived as unified designs that embrace the planning principles of the originally established mixed-use quadrangle. The Old Quad is a near-sacred place on campus and any modifications must be in-line with historic precedents.

Building should be designed in the spirit and character of their time. Facades must express a coherent architectural expression that aesthetically relates to the Collegiate/Tudor Gothic context without imitating it. Building configurations and massing should be mutually developed to ensure balanced designs that express elegance, convey monumentality and conceal bulk. Building façades should celebrate materiality and fenestration accentuated by subtle details. Renovations must respect the integrity of the Old Quad and promote renewal without diminishing character. New functions should be carefully configured and tailored to fit existing structures to ensure effectiveness without programmatic compromise.

Old Quad open spaces must embrace the established planning principles of existing memorable open spaces while promoting innovative and unique academic social settings. Improvements to the Old Quad should be proportioned to a comfortable human scale, and primary building setbacks should be respected and reinforced.

Specific site and architecture objectives include:
- Selectively add new structures that support the established architecture, site and planning principles
- Respect and relate to the architecture and site aesthetic context
- Maintain the established materials palette
- Revitalize underutilized structures to add vitality to the Old Quad through renovation and adaptive re-use
- Promote environmentally sustainable design principles
Old Quad Initiatives

SITE
1. Create a sense of enclosure and definition along the Old Quad edge
2. Maintain and enhance open lawn and view access between Beneficence and the Fine Arts Building
3. Connect axis to the new East Quad
4. Enhance views into the Old Quad from surrounding streets
5. Push parking to the perimeter.
6. Consider repurposing or replacing the Cooper Science Complex

Architecture
7. Improve entry and interface with Old Quad
8. Address scale and massing relationship of Cooper Science Complex to historic buildings
Old Quad Cooper Science Focus Area

1. Cooper Science modification or replacement to reduce scale to more appropriate relationship with existing buildings.
2. Reinforce/enhance connectivity to existing Planetarium. In a scenario in which Cooper Science is removed and not replaced, the Planetarium will require a new entrance element.
3. Enhance pedestrian connectivity to Old Quad from surrounding areas. Develop spaces in-between buildings as amenities.
4. Provide prominent access from both public/street side and Quad side.
5. Engage quad with purpose; provide transparency and interest to enliven and activate the quad.
Campus Core Neighborhoods
North Core Characteristics

The North Core, or University Green neighborhood, represents the academic heart of Ball State’s campus. The neighborhood is generally organized along McKinley Avenue, with an open quadrangle that utilizes slight topography to define sweeping walkways between major academic and support uses. The neighborhood is primarily defined by buildings in the Brutalist style with several Post-Modern or Neo-Eclectic infill buildings.

Architecture

- Large building massings and monumental character
- Mixture of materials, including large expanses of glazing
- Mixture of styles
- Flat roofs
- Primarily academic functions
- West side building address McKinley Avenue
- East side buildings address each other

Site

- High image and year round color along McKinley Avenue
- McKinley Avenue front yard setback along
- Active and Iconic University Green as setting for Shafer Tower
- Multi-modal connectivity and functional design
North Core Objectives

New architecture and site projects in the North Core neighborhood must reinforce the neighborhood’s relation to McKinley Avenue while respecting and complementing the established design context. Similar to the Old Quad neighborhood, new designs must embody a spirit and character of their time and not imitate established architectural styles. Façades must express a coherent architectural expression that respectfully relates to the diverse Brutalist, Post-Modern and Neo-Eclectic stylistic context.

Limited designated building areas and large building programs necessitate a delicate approach to the immediate context around new structures. New designs must respectfully engage existing buildings without undermining the established aesthetic character or quality. Building massing must promote balanced configurations that express monumentality and minimize perceived bulk.

Open space improvements for the North Core neighborhood focus on the renovation of University Green and creation of a new East Mall to create a series of carefully proportioned and functioning spaces appropriate for the scale of the surrounding buildings.

All new development must support and enhance the pedestrian experience by activating public space with ground level accessibility and transparency. Highly active programmatic functions, should be located to stimulate McKinley Avenue and adjacent gathering spaces where appropriate.

Renovations should promote a new vitality that supports academic and student life initiatives and adaptively reinvents existing spaces and façades where feasible. Specific site and architecture objectives include:

- Enhance McKinley Avenue to promote a pedestrian presence and social interaction
- Complement established architectural context
- Support and engage the pedestrian realm
- Maintain the established durable materials palette
- Revitalize underutilized structures through renovation and adaptive re-use
- Promote environmental sustainable design principles
- Create additional active space for outdoor programming
North Core Initiatives

Site
1. Develop east mall with multi-modal pedestrian corridors with separate bicycle circulation paths
2. Improve/create gateway opportunities
3. Create east-west connectivity
4. Encourage planting to reinforce axial relationship and emphasize views
5. Redevelop University Green with active, passive and iconic spaces
6. Enhance walkways and encourage direct connectivity to destinations

Architecture
7. Scale and massing of new building opportunities to align with existing buildings
8. Orient new building entrance opportunities toward primary open spaces
9. Respond to the Shafer Tower axis
10. McKinley Avenue potential green space
North Core University
Green Focus Area-Alt. A

1. Existing Business School
2. Configure open spaces and Academic Commons entry (or major façade element) on axis with Shafer Tower. Structure University Green not as a single experience but an organization of usable and unique outdoor spaces
3. Redevelop space between Business School and CAP into functional courtyard space, shared uses between buildings.
4. Connect CAP and Business School
5. Develop strong north-south axis connecting Bracken Library, CAP and Academic Commons/Business School
6. New Academic Commons and connection to Bracken Library
East Core Characteristics

The East Core neighborhood is predominantly undeveloped for university uses, and the neighborhood has the potential to become the primary town/gown interface between the campus and the Village. With the McKinley Avenue Parking Garage and Music Instruction Building, the neighborhood functions as a transitional zone between the traditional academic campus and the distinctly different commercial/residential district character.

Architecture

- Large, density similar to Core North
- Step down or transition scale & details at edges
- Balance with Old Quad (significance and presence)

Site

- High image and front lawn setback along McKinley and Riverside Avenues
- Celebrate McKinley Avenue and Old Quad
- Urban edge and town/gown interface
- Open spaces in scale with existing campus spaces
East Core Objectives

New construction in the East Core neighborhood will be significant as part of the Campus Master Plan. The character of development must continue the existing diverse aesthetic context and promote variety and individual architectural expression that balances Old Quad and North Core neighborhoods. New buildings must assimilate into the campus and Village context of their particular site and respect established conditions and setbacks. New designs should complement established academic structures along McKinley Avenue and Riverside Avenue while not competing with them in scale, expression, or sophistication. It will be important to establish a cohesive landscape treatment along the front lawn setbacks on McKinley Avenue and Riverside Avenue. The landscape should be in character with the landscape principles of the Historic Core and University Green, utilizing native species in groupings of canopy and understory trees, and informal shrub masses at building edges. Specific architecture and site objectives include:

- Promote architectural character differences between Old Quad and North Core neighborhoods along McKinley Avenue
- Reinforce building proportions styles established by the Music Instruction Building and McKinley Avenue Parking Garage
- Develop a distinctly unique character for the new East Quad that is in-line with campus-wide principles
- Respect established setbacks and building patterns
- Promote ground-level transparency and street-level engagement
East Core Initiatives

Site
1. Develop town/gown edge and gateway
2. Enhance cross-axis connection to the Old Quad
3. Create appropriately scaled quadrangle with 4:1 width of open space to height of buildings ratio
4. Encourage active gathering spaces and places to see and be seen
5. Encourage view corridors and permeability
6. Reinforce parking on the perimeter

Architecture
7. Scale and massing align with Core North neighborhood
8. Building edges should activate the new quadrangle and East Mall
9. Develop buildings with multiple front doors that address the street and quad/mall
Design Guidelines

1. Health Sciences Potential Siting
2. Project defines edge of new mall
3. Massing & Siting of building creates an East-West connection from Old Quad to new East Quad Courtyard
4. Massing of Health Sciences & other East Quad building form a new Courtyard. Buildings to be multi-sided, addressing both courtyard side and outer edges.
5. Opportunity for Building Element as focal point of new Courtyard. Destination/Entry.
6. Building helps form portal to new Mall.
7. Buildings & Spaces along south and east edges of East Quad are Campus Edges.
8. Connectivity/porous edges

East Core Health Science Focus Area

1. Academic potential siting
2. Project defines edge of new East Mall
3. Massing and siting of building creates an east-west connection from the Old Quad to a new East Quadrangle
4. Massing of Academic and other East Quad buildings form a new quadrangle. Buildings to be multi-sided, addressing both courtyard side and outer edges.
5. Opportunity for building element as focal point of new quadrangle. Includes a destination or entry for the new building
6. Building helps form portal to the new East Mall.
7. Buildings and spaces along south and east edges of East Quad should reinforce campus and connectivity to the Village
8. Connections required via porous edges

Diagram: East Core Focus Area - Health Science Area

Alternative Siting/Massing Ideas
Residential Neighborhoods
North Residential Characteristics

The North Residential neighborhood is primarily a single-use residential district that is home to several large-scale, predominantly freshman and sophomore oriented housing facilities including LaFollette Hall, and the Johnson Complexes. The area is characterized by frontage on McKinley Avenue and proximity to Indoor and outdoor athletic and recreation complexes. The student housing located in this neighborhood is geographically remote from the core campus and relatively isolated. The building façades are composed brick and limestone. Fenestration is dominated by vertically organized punched windows. Open spaces around the student housing are defined by the Duck Pond and McKinley Avenue multi-purpose field and bounded by surface parking on the west and south. Modestly landscaped green spaces surround the existing buildings.
North Residential Objectives

New construction in the North Residential neighborhood will be focused on residential and student life facilities and build upon renovated existing housing infrastructure to define a more dense, livelier, and more diverse community. New housing create a new quadrangle with new dining facilities on the site of a demolished LaFollette Hall and Carmichael Hall and establish a new identity for the area. Building façades along McKinley Avenue must delineate coherent neighborhood edges and celebrate the areas they define. New buildings will complement existing Johnson Hall structures (including recent additions/renovations) while conveying a scale, quality, and aesthetic more consistent with traditional residential areas. The architectural character, material palette, refined detailing, and sophisticated landscaping approach exemplified in Park Hall and Kinghorn Hall will be a model for redevelopment of this area. New structures will present unique architectural personalities and define new open spaces that promote a vibrant, and interactive community with deliberate views back to the core of campus. The scale and character of the new spaces must support social interaction within a comfortable environment.

New structures will encourage mixed-use programs and incorporate student life and dining venues at lower level facing McKinley. These program elements must convey transparency and engage the surrounding environment and streetscape. Building configurations will form quadrangles and promote outdoor, interactive social settings. Connections along the Cow Path and across a new Quadrangle will be direct and in the character of a redeveloped University Green.

Specific objectives include:

- Develop a unique traditional architectural character derived from existing context
- Define new open spaces and promote social interaction
- Promote ground-level transparency and street-level engagement
- Celebrate the McKinley Avenue frontage
- Engage the Duck Pond and Cow Path
East Residential Characteristics

The East Residential neighborhood is defined as the residential neighborhood east of University Green, north of Riverside Avenue and spanning Neely Avenue. This area of campus took shape in the Post-World War II and has been further refined with Park Hall and Kinghorn Hall infill in the last decade. The neighborhood represents a different planning methodology when compared to the Old Quad and Core Campus Neighborhoods, as much of the area is characterized by undefined open space populated with residential buildings that occupy space.

Residential structures vary in height from 4-8 stories. Building configurations rarely work together to define quads or open spaces. A few defined quads exist in this part of campus, but they lack the architectural quality and landscape character of notable quads in the Old Quad and Core Campus. Pedestrian circulation in this neighborhood is defined by an east-west connections that links student housing with the Core North neighborhood and Old Quad west of McKinley Avenue.

East Residential Objectives

New opportunities in the East Residential neighborhood will build on existing infrastructure to encourage a livelier and more diverse community. New building opportunities at Noyer Hall and the Emens Parking Garage will define a reinvented identity for the area that supports a sophisticated, vibrant, and interactive pedestrian-oriented space. The improved identity will build upon the established architectural context and include new aesthetic opportunities balance architectural and site components. Designs must respect and sympathetically relate to existing structures while promoting progressive design approaches. New opportunities must also embrace an improved natural setting and landscape and support efforts to restore original environmental features.

New opportunities at Noyer Hall have the potential to include better defined residential and academic quads modeled on the new North Residential neighborhood prototypes. The scale and character of the new spaces must promote unique spatial personalities and support social interaction while conveying transparency and engaging the surrounding setting. The success of a revitalized East Residential neighborhood will benefit
from the creation of a new appropriately scaled open space on the site of Emens Parking Garage and a number of landscape enhancements, including: restoration of the riparian corridor; increased tree canopy; improved quality of the landscape; and the renovation and definition of existing residential quads. The removal of the parking garage will also aid in alleviating vehicular and pedestrian conflicts in the densely populated residential area. Specific objectives include:

- Define a new open space adjacent to the East Mall and framed by an Emens Garage replacement
- Develop unique architectural character derived from existing context
- Define new open spaces and promote social interaction
- Engage and celebrate environmental features.
- Promote ground-level transparency and quadrangle engagement
- Minimize the visual prominence of structured parking and reinforce open space edges
South Residential Characteristics

The South Residential Neighborhood is currently defined by the Student Center, Student Center Parking Garage and surface parking lots south of University Avenue and West of McKinley Avenue. Existing proximate residential uses are currently isolated and include Elliott Hall and Wagoner Hall (currently housing high school students attending the Indiana Academy). The Campus Master Plan suggests further densifying this area with residential uses as Ball State moves towards further engaging the Village and removing existing apartments at Anthony and Scheidler.

The South Residential neighborhood is proximate to several university assets including the Old Quad and McKinley Avenue. Further densification of this area will increase 24/7 activation of the Student Center, improve utilization of the Student Center Parking Garage and increase opportunities for pedestrian through-traffic south through the Old Quad.

South Residential-Objectives

Development of the South Residential neighborhood should aim to balance existing character of the Old Quad, Student Center and Village by reinforcing the scale, formal composition, and materiality found within the established context.

New initiatives should complement existing University edges along McKinley Avenue and University Avenue by promoting closing gaps in the neighborhood fabric. New development should not compete in scale, quality, or detail with the traditional campus buildings, campus landscape settings and Village character. Promoting the established neighborhood character will maintain the strength of the campus edges and enduring first impressions of Ball State University while establishing a true town/gown interface appropriate for
an institution of Ball State’s stature. Specific objectives include:

- Reinforce the established neighborhood fabric with a unique traditional architectural character derived from existing context
- Promote a denser, more vibrant mixed-use residential community
- Promote ground-level transparency and active street-level engagement with opportunities for commercial and retail amenities
- Encourage greater age diversity and unit type mix with a variety of housing options

- Increase housing variety and options
- Celebrate the McKinley Avenue and University Avenue frontages
- Develop active pedestrian-friendly streetscapes that promote traffic calming and bicycle lanes
- Define new courtyard open spaces that promote social interaction.
- Promote ground-level transparency and street-level engagement.
Athletic and Recreation Neighborhoods
North Athletic and Recreation-Characteristics

The North Athletic and Recreation neighborhood is generally defined by McGalliard Road to the north, and Bethel Avenue to the south. The neighborhood, with Tillotson Avenue to the east and the west, provides high visibility for Ball State’s competitive athletic and recreation programs. Existing facilities in the neighborhood include Schuemann Stadium and the Fisher Training Complex (Football), the Briner Sports Complex (Field Hockey, Track & Field and Soccer), the First Merchants Ballpark Complex (Baseball) and the Ball State Softball Complex. Ball State recreation provides outdoor recreation facilities at the Bethel Intramural Fields in this neighborhood and west of Tillotson Avenue.

The Alumni Center is located in this neighborhood at the northeast corner of Tillotson Avenue and Bethel Avenue. Designed by Pei, Cobb, Freed and Partners, the 50,000 square feet facility is both a symbol of Ball State traditions and a fully equipped conference, reception and event center.

Many daily commuters and first time visitors pass through the north athletic and recreation neighborhood on their way to campus. The area also provides remote parking opportunities primarily for freshman and sophomore students. However, the minimal signage and expanse of surface parking currently dilute the gateway capabilities of this area.
North Athletic and Recreation Objectives

The area east Tillotson Avenue should continue to be a consolidated intercollegiate athletics venue, bringing together many outdoor athletic programs into the same geographic area. Infill opportunities include a multipurpose Fieldhouse with an indoor turf field south of Schuemann Stadium.

As part of the consolidation of outdoor recreation opportunities, the master plan provides provisions for a recreation fields at the southwest corner of Bethel Avenue and New York Avenue and expanded recreation opportunities at the Anthony Intramural Fields south of Bethel Avenue. This will allow for the current Bethel Intramural Fields to be converted to more permanent parking opportunities that can also enhance the tailgating experience. While not included as part of recommendations embedded in this plan, long-term considerations should be given to consolidating indoor and outdoor tennis west of Tillotson Avenue.

The McGalliard Road edge and Bethel Avenue edge east of Tillotson should be enhanced as a high image edge on campus. The Bethel Avenue edge west of Tillotson should be enhanced as a naturalistic edge.

The master plan identifies new Gateway opportunities at McGalliard Road and Everett Road, Bethel Avenue and Everett Road, and McGalliard Avenue and Tillotson Avenue. Specific objectives include:

- Consolidate outdoor athletic facilities into one neighborhood
- Support the existing landscape character and mature trees
- Provide siting for new fieldhouse and parking opportunities
- Improve the overall identity, landscape, and site character of the neighborhood
- Reinforce and redefine the northern edge of campus with edge and gateway improvements
- Accommodate spectators and facilitate access to transit
- Future expansion of outdoor competitive athletic facilities should be located in this area, including opportunities for new building facilities
Core Athletic and Recreation-Characteristics

The core athletic and recreation neighborhood is characterized by a mix of low-rise student apartments and single family residences along the south side of Bethel Avenue. Much of the housing in this area is antiquated and lacks a coherent character that is appropriate as a gateway to campus.

Existing facilities in this area include Anthony Apartments, the Cardinal Creek Tennis Center, the North Grounds Building, and single family homes south of Bethel Avenue and west of New York Avenue along Cardinal Street, Abbott Street and Rex Street.

Cardinal Creek also winds through this neighborhood on the northwest side of campus, forming the duck pond as it crosses under McKinley Avenue. The creek is in a pipe as it traverses south past Worthen Arena, and daylights again on the east side of the Student Recreation and Wellness Center. As an daylight stream and open body of water, the creek and pond form some of the most iconic naturalistic landscapes on campus.
Core Athletic and Recreation Objectives

The long-term vision for this core athletic and recreation neighborhood is a multi-use recreational area that is centrally located for all students and builds upon proximity to the Student Recreation and Wellness Center. This will allow for transformation of the character of the neighborhood into a more naturalized area with consolidated recreation facilities that create a new front door for the institution. Specific objectives include:

- Strengthen the Bethel Avenue edge as a recreational commons and gathering space adjacent convenient to all students
- Create a recreation building north of Cardinal Creek to enhance outdoor programming
- Enhance and restore Cardinal Creek
- Expand and preserve campus woodlands south and west of the new Anthony Intramural Fields and north of the new Bethel and New York fields.
- Maintain and expand rational planning and clear layouts for fields and parking
- Provide new active and passive wellness spaces