CANADIAN CAMPUSES IN THE GREATER COMMUNITY CONTEXT

RHIANNON GILBART

B00595167
Bachelor of Community Design Honours Thesis
School of Planning, Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
Advisor: Dr Jill Grant
April 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my advisor, Dr. Jill Grant, for her outstanding advice, patience and guidance through out this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Patricia Manuel, my thesis proposal and seminar professor, for her fresh perspective and feedback. I would like to thank Jake Papineau for his insightful comments, encouragement and engaging discussions. Finally, I would like to thank my mom for always supporting me and helping me to work through obstacles.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Universities are inherently connected to the surrounding community culturally, socially and physically. The relationship between a university and the surrounding community is referred to as the town-gown relationship. I studied campus plans from thirty-one universities from across Canada to determine how they recognize and acknowledge the surrounding community. I systematically analyzed the campus plans to determine trends in Canadian campus planning and to develop a greater understanding of the relationship as reflected in policy between Canadian universities and the surrounding community. Existing literature studying the town-gown relationship and campus planning through history focuses on the United States and Europe. There is a similar gap in literature regarding Canadian campus plans in general.

I collected campus plans based on a proportional representation of Canadian universities and employed a three step coding strategy to analyze the plans. In the first step, I extracted all quotes that included recognition of the surrounding community and input the quotes into a framework that acted as a data base for each plan. The extent to which the campus plan recognized the surrounding community impacted my ability to analyze and draw conclusions based on each campus plan so the plans were classified as recognizing the community as a "Significant" factor or a "Minor" factor. These were based on both the structure and amount of community recognition within the plan.

In the second step of the coding strategy, I coded the frameworks for overarching themes, differences, patterns and similarities. From this I determined the predominant trend, New Urbanism, in community recognition in campus planning. The principles of New Urbanism are very influential and are heavily reflected in the campus plans. These trends included the codes "Compact Growth," "Active Transportation," "Connectivity and Mixed-Use," and "Gateways."

In the final step of the coding strategy, I applied an overall code to each campus plan that recognized the major structure, patterns and differences between the plans. Three codes emerged that defined the trends in how campus plans recognize the surrounding community. I refer to these as models of campus plans. They include "Independent," "Distinct Neighbour" and "Integrated." The models are based on the structure and trends of community recognition within the campus plan. A correlation between the physical structure

or location of the university and the model of community recognition did emerge, but was not a defining feature of the models.

My study found that the themes that dominate urban planning also influence university campus plans. By implementing New Urbanism, Canadian universities seek to develop campuses and connections that reinforce the physical impact of the university and increase the number of people interacting with the university. New Urbanism encourages campus territory to become more defined and more pleasurable to visit so that a unique, superior experience is associated with the university. The three models of campus plans implement New Urbanism in different ways but, they all encourage greater collaboration and interaction to increase the visibility of the university.

All universities focused on bringing the public and surrounding community onto the campus more often than acknowledging the impact that students or general university uses have on the community. The next step in understanding the Canadian town-gown relationship is to analyze community plans to determine coordination opportunities or possibilities for discordance. The community and university must coordinate efforts to truly achieve and benefit from the principles of New Urbanism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

For many people, discussing university brings to mind images of ivy covered buildings, lab benches or crowded dormitories. The university can be recognized by the buildings it is made of and the campus that those buildings create. Ideally, university campuses are designed to foster knowledge gathering, collaboration and sharing. Campuses provide a location for students and faculty to work together both formally and informally. For many people, the campus symbolizes the shared experience of attending university. Although the faculty, students and courses may change, the location, most of the buildings and streets will remain the same over long periods of time.

A university campus can sometimes be referred to as a bubble or an incubator, but these words describe a closed environment. No university is self-sufficient so no campus is truly isolated. Every campus depends on or impacts the surrounding community in some way whether economically, socially or culturally. The physical or spatial interaction between a university and surrounding community can be fundamental to defining the relationship between the two groups. Some campuses have pushed out the surrounding community to make room for inexpensive and convenient student housing while others invite the community in to use university facilities like research labs, gyms or concert halls. There is currently little research available regarding an official reaction, encouragement or guidance on the physical relationship of Canadian universities and the surrounding community. Campus plans are the most likely source of official recognition of this relationship. The content or structure for campus plans is not standardized, but they generally document both specific building developments and overall campus configuration. Planning should take into consideration all stakeholders. Campus plans should consider the community and should reflect the university values and interaction with the community.

I have studied campus plans from thirty-one universities from across Canada to determine how they recognize and acknowledge the surrounding community. I systematically analyzed campus master plans to determine trends in Canadian campus planning and to develop a greater understanding of the relationship as reflected in policy between Canadian universities and the surrounding community.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to complete a systematic analysis of campus plans in order to explore the reflection of the relationship between Canadian universities and the greater community in planning decisions and documents. This study aims to determine how often and in what context campus plans acknowledge the surrounding community context. The trends and patterns of community recognition in campus plans should reveal trends in the relationship between the campus and the greater community.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

How do Canadian campus plans talk about the university's surrounding community?

What do the trends in community recognition in campus plans reveal about Canadian town-gown relationships?

BACKGROUND

Town and Gown Relationships

The relationship and interaction between a university and adjacent community is referred to as a town-gown relationship. The structure and impact of the town-gown relationship has evolved through time in response to changes in the role and organization of universities. There is currently a gap in research regarding the general trends of town-gown relations at Canadian universities but research regarding European and American universities is relevant for a general understanding of town-gown relationships.

Brockliss (2000) asserts that town-gown relationships have evolved through three stages: the period from 1200-1800, post 1800, and the modern-day campus. The first stage spans from the creation of universities until the 1800s, a period when a university was an isolated enclave within a city (Brockliss, 2000). Universities were for elite men who could afford to travel to such institutions and study subjects like philosophy and Latin. Students sometimes slept or ate off campus and the city enjoyed the economic activity brought by the

school, but there was no further interaction between the university and community on a social or cultural level (Brockliss, 2000).

The second stage signifies a shift in town-gown relations in the 1800s when universities began teaching practical subjects, such as engineering, that attracted a larger proportion of the local population to enroll (Brockliss, 2000). Satellite locations became popular as universities required upgrading, but did not have room to expand at historical or current sites (Brockliss, 2000). The discrete location of the university began to merge with and blend into the urban landscape, losing architectural distinctiveness (Brockliss, 2000).

The third stage of town-gown relationships marks the development of isolated campuses. Isolated campuses emerged as universities were founded outside of cities, in less developed regions during the industrial revolution (Brockliss, 2000). A fear of dirty industrial cities and urban temptations led to the removal of the university from urban cores in order to protect the morals of students (Brockliss, 2000). In this stage, isolated campuses were also created as ideological experiments, like Thomas Jefferson's academic village, or as economic investments, as large tracts of rural fringe land were cheaper than property in the urban core (Larkham, 2000). The isolated campus structure, located on the edge of very small towns, was easily implemented in North America because of the availability of land (Brockliss, 2000). These universities attempted to cut off the town-gown relationship and to create a self-sufficient and isolated academic environment.

Today, it is very rare for a campus to be isolated completely from a city, a true "college town" (Larkham, 2000). College towns remain well known because some of the largest universities in the United States are located in primarily rural settings surrounded by communities with the primary purpose to support the university (Brockliss, 2000). In other countries, with less space or with smaller populations, many universities that began as rural campuses have since been surrounded by the urban growth of adjacent communities. This would suggest a fourth stage: the re-integration or re-introduction of the town-gown relationship. Bromley asserts that, today town-gown relations often reflect "the difficulties of contrasting generations, cultures and property rights" (2006, p. 12). He argues that a university population includes the paradox of professional scholars alongside young adults living alone for the first time. Communities may feel that traditional academics and wealthy high-tech innovators are elitist and detached from inner-city or low-economic concerns

(Bromley, 2006). On the other hand, young students often maintain a late night party culture that conflicts with the needs of families with small children, the elderly, and low-income workers. "Studentification" is the common term used to describe neighbourhoods being taken over by students (Bromley, 2006). Homeowners fear that a higher proportion of rental properties will reduce their own property value. They resent having loud residents who are unfamiliar with local regulations, such as parking and trash disposal (Bromley, 2006). To counter this, universities have commissioned economic impact studies to verify their positive economic influence on the local region and thus improve relationships with politicians and business leaders (Bromley, 2006). Brockliss (2000) mentions that the American athletic culture and strong support for student athletic events has considerably improved the relationship between cities and universities. The bond created by supporting athletic teams has reduced the barriers between the university and the community. In Canada, the small community fan base for university athletics has not had the same impact on the town-gown relationship.

Youtie and Shapira (2008) identify an additional emerging stage of town-gown relationships referred to as "knowledge hubs," where a university is the link between innovation, application of knowledge and commercialization. Case studies reveal that increased integration between the university, community and region through out-reach programs and groups has stimulated the economy and innovation in multiple cases (Youtie and Shapira, 2008). These case studies highlight the importance of plan coordination with surrounding communities and corporations to the future of universities. Hoeger (2007) supports this argument through a case study of "knowledge cities," such as Silicon Valley, that have become innovation hot beds because of their close connectivity to a university. She argues that the increasing openness and interaction between universities and cities is beneficial to all, as it accelerates technological, structural and societal changes (Hoeger, 2007). This evolution in the role of the university inherently ties its future to the surrounding land uses, economic development and decisions of the city.

Campus Planning

Universities are widely considered to foster some of the world's most innovative and cutting edge ideas. Campus plans and development are no exception. Many argue that "a university campus is a laboratory for urban design" (José Luis Sert, quoted in Larkham, 2000 p. 65). However, there is no research on the current practices and theories of campus planning in Canada. Campus planning research that exists is heavily focused on the most prominent American and European universities or on grand, historical campus plans. Existing literature will influence my understanding of Canadian university campus plans, however because of a shorter history and smaller population, the trends of international schools will be reflected in Canada to a lesser degree.

Campus planning is highly influenced by the general planning trends of the era. Many campuses are designed and planned as if they are miniature cities, whether they are isolated or not. This resulted in campus plans from the nineteenth century heavily reflecting the principles of the Beaux Arts or City Beautiful movement (Larkham, 2000). Many of these planned campuses were axial, radial or boasted some sort of grand design to awe visitors, encourage respect and inspire donations. However, a massive spike in university enrolment after World War II saw such principles abandoned in favour of modernist designs with segregated uses (Allen, 2011). Modernism removed the grand architectural spectacles and instead stressed rationality, clustering and designs based on need (Dober, 1963). This period also saw a major realignment towards prioritizing automobiles on campus. We are now once again seeing a major change in university design. The importance of sustainability and being environmentally conscious has become an integral aspect to campus development. This movement has rejected the walls and separation of the modernism movement, instead calling for "glass, transparency and color [sic]" (Rosenwald et al, 2005, p. 20). Planning trends through time have impacted the structure, size and shape of campuses.

Several studies look at how universities have grown throughout time, which is relevant to their impact on the community. Larkham (2000) argues that there are three basic models for the growth of universities. The first, he refers to simply as "the campus" but defines this as "distinct and separate sites" (Larkham, 2000 p. 69). Larkham argues that since prosperous universities are constantly growing or improving they "inevitably become too constrained, and at some point are forced to expand into the surrounding urban structure and

5

to seek new sites to meet their various requirements" (2000, p.69). Larkham refers to urban land acquisition to facilitate growth of the university as the "colonization model" (2000). This model includes campuses that grow in small, detached pieces until they own enough adjacent land for larger scale developments (Larkham, 2000). The final model, "dispersed," includes universities that formed from the amalgamation of multiple colleges or universities and now have separate campuses (Larkham, 2000). These growth situations all have different effects on the community. Detecting predominant trends across Canadian campus plans will provide insight into the impact and interaction of the university and the greater community. In order to recognize these trends, I have reviewed strategies for reading plans.

Reading and Understanding Plans

There is no formal or consistent structure for campus plans. Each plan is developed independently and based on the individual university context. However, campus plans are similar to other types of plans in some structural characteristics and in their intent to guide development. Understanding best practices in reading and evaluating plans is crucial to my project. My understanding of plans will impact the central purpose of my thesis, the systematic analysis of university land use plans.

Although plans may be viewed as a communication device and guideline for the future of a campus or city, evaluating them on this basis alone undermines their true potential and significance (Ryan, 2011; Talen, 1996). There are many different ways to interpret a plan and many features to consider. Ryan (2011) encourages reading a plan "from seemingly superficial aspects like its cover to unarguably central elements such as recommendations" (p. 315) in order to fully understand the plan. He argues that plans act in three particular ways: as ideological artefacts, "vessels for larger intellectual concepts" (p. 315); as cultural artefacts, that reveal information on the culture that produced them and the region that they impact; and, as historical artefacts of the planning profession and the subject region (2011). He does not acknowledge the actual function of plans, to inform and guide development decisions, which suggests that the people actually using the plans do not necessarily read in these styles.

Mandelbaum (1990) provides an alternative framework for plan interpretation based on reading plans as a "policy claim," a "design opportunity" or a "story." There are many layers of a plan so they should be read with creativity and optimism for a complete understanding (Mandelbaum, 1990). Mandelbaum also argues that planners are currently writing with the expectation that their plans are not being read in their entirety; that audiences read plans in snippets to support their own point or understanding. This may not be true for university plans if they are employed as part of a marketing or branding strategy. University land use plans may showcase high-tech and innovative development with the purpose of attracting students and donors. As well, a plan could act as a progress report for funders to showcase and justify a call for donations. However, Lamont argues that good plans should be "anticlimactic" (357) and should be used as jumping off points. He reminds readers that a plan is not a finished product and instead will be used as a reference. Universities that require funding or the achievement of growth targets for planned developments to proceed use plans as a reference.

Technology and expansion constraints are increasing the interaction between universities and the greater community. Each university and plan will present a unique take on planning, on the roles of the university and the campus within the community, on the definition of concepts and on the future role of universities. Canadian universities and cities need to work together in order to increase effectiveness, efficiencies and to ensure continued success and competition at a global level. The significance of campus-city integration guided my analysis of campus plans.

METHODS

I conducted an exploratory study of university campus plans using qualitative research methods. Although there is existing research on the town-gown relationship, I have recognized a lack of academic planning knowledge documenting Canadian campus plans. A literature search revealed no summaries or analysis of Canadian University land use plans. I assumed that most campus plans will acknowledge the greater urban context in some way. As a student at Dalhousie University, I have lived on a campus and off but have not lived in a

community surrounding a campus when I am not a student. My bias reflects that I have experience from only one side of the town-gown relationship.

Gathering the Plans

I collected 35 campus plans to represent the 98 universities in Canada (Appendix A). My sampling strategy was based on analyzing different kinds of campuses and universities rather than every available plan. Some universities do not have plans. This is the primary limitation of my study. Only plans in English were collected, as I cannot read French. I collected land use or master campus plans but did not include sustainability, transportation or other specialized plans. I used Google and search engines on university websites to identify and gather the plans. I began by collecting campus plans from three universities in each province. This ensured a fair representation of Canada in my study. Manitoba is not represented in my study because no university has completed a campus plan. I considered satellite locations as separate universities if they have separate campus plans because the location and relationship with the community may vary from the main campus. If a province does not have three universities with campus plans then that province was represented by the number of campus plans that did exist. After the initial collection, a scan of all available campus plans revealed that the number of Ontario universities with published campus plans is much higher than any other province. I chose to reflect this proportionally in my study by collecting a higher number of Ontario plans. My sample includes a fair representation of Canadian universities.

Coding

Once the plans were collected, I analyzed the content of each using a three-step coding strategy and framework (Robson, 1993; Silverman, 1993; Saldana, 2012). I chose to code the plans because coding enables data collection and organization and also acts as the first step in analysis.

The first step of my coding strategy was to use *in vivo* coding to create a base data set. *In vivo* coding uses exact phrases or terms from a document as codes. *In vivo* coding created a data set that is not based on my interpretation and allowed me to recognize common phrases and terminology across campus plans. To complete the coding, I read through each plan, selected passages and quotes that recognized the surrounding community and input that

data into a framework. The framework organized data by the section of the campus plans that it came from (e.g. goals, context, implementation) and allowed me to organize observations based on differences, themes and key points (Appendix B). The framework facilitated systematic reading, coding and data organization. Each plan corresponds to one framework and the collection of these frameworks formed my data set.

This step also enabled me to determine the plans that recognized the community as a "Significant" factor (present in a distinct section, or referenced in many sections) or a "Minor" factor (a small part of one or two sections) (White, 2013). I classified the plans according to these two categories to enable a general understanding of the consideration of the town-gown relationship.

The second step of my coding strategy was to analyze each framework using values and descriptive coding and to recognize prevalent planning theories and common trends across the plans. I completed this stage by assigning codes that summarize the idea or purpose of each quote in the framework. This allowed me to recognize the prevalence of certain ideas, particular areas or themes that acknowledge municipal plans or connections to the community beyond the campus. To enable further analysis, I organized the codes into tables based on the categories/themes that arose. It is important to note that this step of coding was only applied to the *in vivo* codes that were collected in the framework based on recognition of the community. This meant that the themes that emerged are specific themes to how and when a campus plan mentions the surrounding community and not general themes in campus planning. At this step in the project, my personal interpretation of the codes introduced biased. I used plan reading techniques to interpret the codes as accurately as possible, but someone else undertaking the same project could have analyzed the plans differently.

In the third step of my coding strategy, I used my understanding of the content of each plan to assign an overall code to the entire plan. These codes summarized the general town-gown relationship structure that was revealed by the frameworks and theme tables. Three main codes emerged which I converted into "models" of campus plans for further analysis and discussion.

Synthesis

My synthesis of the collected data relied on plan reading strategies to determine the significance of the models, common trends and concepts. It also relied on existing literature and background on campus planning to conclude the project and to answer the research questions regarding recognition of the surrounding community in Canadian campus plans.

RESULTS

Extent of Recognition

In general, the plans that recognized the community to a greater degree did so in more detail and with more value. A campus plan "recognized" the community by directly mentioning any group, any plan or any impact not directly connected to the university. Examples of this could include a discussion of mixed use development catering to the surrounding community or a reference to a city by-law. The town-gown relationship was quantified as either a "Minor" or "Significant" factor in each plan based on the complexity and amount of recognition for the community (see Table 1). The number of *in vivo* codes collected, or the number of times a campus recognized the university, influenced this classification.

If a campus plan had an entire section or chapter dedicated to the surrounding community or specifically mentioned or accommodated the community in multiple policies or projects then I classified it as a plan that considered the town-gown relationship a "Significant" factor. For example, University of Waterloo considered the town-gown relationship Significant by including an entire chapter titled "The University and its Neighbours" which discussed the university at both the community and regional levels.

If a campus plan mentioned the community in one or two sections or only referred to off-campus vaguely then I classified it as a plan that considered the town-gown relationship a "Minor" factor. These plans may have included the community in an overarching goal or mentioned the community's transportation system but did not reflect the surrounding community in a greater sense. For example, the only instance of community recognition in University of Lethbridge's campus plan was a single paragraph on "Partnership

Opportunities." University of Victoria's campus plan referred to the surrounding campus vaguely in the principles by stating,

> as the University grows and develops, it affects all stakeholders on campus, and it can also have effects on nearby neighbours and the community as a whole. In turn, the policies of local governments and the regional district can have an impact on the University. (3)

This principle was not supported by policy or design guidelines.

I was able to analyze the campus plans that considered the surrounding community a Significant factor in more detail and draw stronger conclusions about the town-gown relationship than from the plans that considered the surrounding community a Minor factor. The plans that considered the surrounding community a Minor factor were still coded based on over-arching themes and classified as a particular model, but they were not as informative as the campus plans that considered the community a Significant factor.

Table 1: Classification of the Extent of Recognition

Minor Factor	Significant Factor
Bishop's University	Brock University
Laurentian University	Dalhousie University
Memorial University of Newfoundland	McGill University
Mount Royal University	Queen's University
Simon Fraser University	Ryerson University
Saint Mary's University	University of Alberta
Trent University	University of Guelph
University of British Columbia	University of New Brunswick: Fredericton
University of Lethbridge	University of Ottawa
University of New Brunswick: Saint John	University of Prince Edward Island
University of Northern British Columbia	University of Regina
University of Saskatchewan	University of Toronto
University of Saskatchewan: College Quarter	University of Waterloo
University of Victoria	
Western University	

New Urbanism

The most common trends that emerged in the Canadian campus plans can be traced to New Urbanism and smart growth principles. New Urbanism is a movement that evolved in the 1980s and 90s in reaction to sprawling subdivisions and car-centric development (Congress for the New Urbanism, 1993). It focuses on creating healthy and sustainable development at a human and walkable scale (Congress for the New Urbanism, 1993). New Urbanism encourages connectivity and collaboration so it makes sense that it is prominent when discussing the town-gown relationship.

The New Urbanism trend in campus plans is a reflection of the production dates of the plans. The oldest plan was published in 2002 (University of Alberta) and 57% of the plans were published in 2010 or after. The driving forces behind each plan, vision statements and goals, commonly focused on New Urbanism principles, Guelph's vision for example:

> The historic core campus will continue to be the focal point for the evolution and growth of campus. New development will occur through intensification and redevelopment around this core to support a compact campus footprint. Campus amenities and activities will continue to be focused on Reynolds Walk, which will serve as a mixed-use corridor or 'main street' for the entire campus. Expansion and improvement of campus pedestrian walks will ensure a pedestrian supportive environment. (31)

The most common New Urbanism principles reflected in Canadian campus plans are compact growth, walkability, connectivity and mixed-use, and gateways. I will look at each of these in turn to illustrate my interpretation.

Compact Growth

Coding revealed that one of the most common ways campus plans recognized the surrounding community was by asserting a desire to decrease the physical impact (Table 2). This includes redeveloping parking lots, making better use of existing infrastructure or developing land already owned by the university (e.g. auxiliary campuses). "Compact growth" was a value code that included *in vivo* codes and keywords, such as: "infill,"

"compact," "walkable," "densification" and other statements that discourage property acquisition or encourage infill development.

Table 2: Examples of Planning for Compact Growth	
School, Year	Example (emphasis added to denote code)
Memorial University, 2007	"While no significant land acquisition opportunities are available in the vicinity of the Campus, the Plan demonstrates that **infill opportunities** do exist on campus, particularly in the North Campus, but also in the Core Campus where most of the current activity on campus is concentrated. The **displacement of surface parking lots** with proposed development and **infill opportunities** has required close collaboration between the team's designers and transportation engineers, resulting in an integrated solution that will see the emergence of a **compact** and more **walkable** campus." (2)
University of New Brunswick: Fredericton, 2003	"The concept plan for the Core Campus hinges on the notion that ample land exists to fully develop the University within an **intensified**, **compact core** area and by expanding development eastwards […] In addition, a fundamental premise of the Core Campus is that **densification** will provide the **infill** necessary to allow for a dynamic open space network that is **walkable**, beautiful and inspiring." (17)
McGill University, 2008	"**Compact Campus**: Growth Capacity and Growth Projections In order to maintain and intensify the rich academic experience provided by its current campuses, increased space needs will be met primarily through **infill** and redevelopment, reinforcing the existing campus precincts." (19)
University of Toronto, 2011	"The re-zonings proposed in this document for those sites as well as certain additional **infill** sites would increase the capacity of the campus in the immediate term to 524,000 gsm [ground square metres] (480,000 net new gsm) **without requiring additional property**." (16)
University of British Columbia, 2010	"Focusing these new facilities in **infill** locations will maximize the economic and environmental benefits of shared infrastructure and reduce greenhouse gas emissions." (7)

Active Transportation

"Active transportation" emerged as a significant code distinct from connectivity or compact (walkable) development because it was a major factor in design guidelines and policies. Many campus plans introduced pedestrian-oriented design in vision statements or goals and then used streetscape guides or transit plans to implement active transportation within the campus plan (see Table 3). Coding for active transportation was difficult because the community was often not recognized even though shared use was inevitable or expected. Commonly, a campus plan would acknowledge the surrounding community in general statements regarding active transportation but then fail to recognize connections off-campus in streetscape design guidelines. The exception to this was that many campus plans encouraged or planned for activity trails to adhere to the structure and connect with the greater community trail network. Codes that supported this theme included "pedestrian," "transit," "bicycle," "trails," and other keywords regarding transportation.

Table 3: Examples of Planning for Active Transportation	
School	Example (emphasis added to denote code)
Ryerson University	"2. PEOPLE FIRST: **PEDESTRIANIZATION** OF THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT Create a distinctive public realm which defines the RU precinct within its urban context, enhances the vitality of all green open spaces, streets, and sidewalks, promotes a collegial **pedestrian environment** within the University, and enhances **accessibility** to the campus by increasing **public transit** opportunities." (75)
Memorial University of Newfoundland	"**Transit** improvement must be an evolutionary process, with coordination of changes between MUN, Metrobus and the City of St. John's. MUN can assist Metrobus by informing them of impending changes that may affect transit ridership (such as parking rate increases), so that Metrobus can add extra service to cope effectively." (200)
University of Guelph	"Co-ordination with the City of Guelph will ensure the campus **bicycle** network is integrated with the surrounding city, including existing **bicycle lanes** on Gordon Street, Stone Road and College Avenue." (100)
University of Lethbridge	"Conceived as unique **discovery trails**, the Coulee Trails provide the University of Lethbridge an opportunity to bring the Lethbridge

	community down through campus to experience the extraordinary natural setting that it is a part of." (89)
Queen's University	"The University will continue to consult with Kingston **Transit** in determining future routes that best serve the needs of Queen's students, faculty, and staff." (46)
University of Waterloo	"While meeting the needs of some within the university community, the Grand River Transit (GRT) bus system is simply not convenient for many others, and inexpensive parking encourages driving. However, the Region of Waterloo is planning a **rapid transit corridor** that is expected to pass through the Waterloo Campus along the rail corridor east of the Ring Road." (59)

Connectivity & Mixed-Use

Codes for the principles of "connectivity and mixed-use" revealed that in campus plans these factors were often considered to stimulate the development of the other. Campus plans encouraged connectivity through partnerships with the surrounding community and by bringing the community on to campus. Campus plans encouraged mixed-use development to diversify users and non-academic uses of the campus. Coding that contributed to connectivity and mixed use included "mix of uses," "link," "connect," "partner" and other phrases that signified encouraging more diverse use of campus.

Table 4: Examples of Planning for Connectivity and Mixed-Use	
School	Example (emphasis added to denote code)
University of Prince Edward Island	"With the introduction of a **mix of uses** on campus, including more places for cultural and social activity like the **community recreation hub** of the CARI Facility, UPEI can attract people of all ages to the campus, including the growing seniors population." (10)
Laurentian University	"The University **hosts community activities** ranging from summer camps to athletic meets, and both neighbours and the Greater Sudbury community use Laurentian's unique sandy beach as well as the network of trails for hiking, running, biking, snow-shoeing, and cross-country skiing." (13)

Queen's University	"Envisioned as a 24-hour **mixed-use campus**, offering University uses as well as housing and services for **nearby communities**, West Campus will consist of a **variety of uses** and facility types." (145)
University of Waterloo	"The Northwest Campus **currently limits connectivity** between surrounding uses. Good planning is about integrating communities and the environment, and the planning framework should **enhance the linkages** between surrounding uses, both natural and built." (123)
University of Alberta	"The Partner lands will allow architecturally controlled, prestige development, **attractive to partners** who not only wish to be associated with the University, but also want a quality address that reflects their corporate image. A Partner is defined as an independent firm, or research transition firm, or a joint research venture with an outside agency, or a joint venture among Faculties with a close affinity to University research and development." (99)

Coding emphasized the number of campus plans that propose or support existing plans for specific, distinct areas of university land to be developed for community use. These "Community Developments" are built on university land but leased or endowed to the city or private businesses. My coding analysis revealed that the most common forms of Community Development are research and business parks or residential communities.

If these developments are already planned or built, it was much less likely for them to be included in the campus plan. For instance, University of British Columbia has developed a number of residential precincts but did not include these areas in the campus plans. Alternatively, Trent University created an entire plan for the Trent Endowment Lands, which includes all university property not being used for the core campus. The Trent Endowment Lands Plan encourages development focused mainly on serving the surrounding community with university connections. Trent's final resulting "plan" is a map with no accompanying text so one must read the community consultation session presentations to fully understand this intention (Trent University, 2015). More examples of how campus plans talk about developments for the external community can be found in Table 9.

Table 5: Examples of Planning Community Developments	
School	Example (emphasis added to denote code)
University of British Columbia: Neighbourhoods	"The Campus Plan subject area only includes institutional lands but incorporates the **North Campus and University Boulevard neighbourhoods** due to their academic uses. The **family housing neighbourhoods** are excluded as these areas are not focused on accommodating UBC's academic uses." (7)
University of Regina: Innovation Place	"In 1998, the Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation (SOCO) entered into a 99-year lease with the University of Regina for land to be used for, and devoted to, **research and technology development** activities complementary to university programming. This was followed by the preparation of a **Research Park Master Plan** by Saunders Evans Architects Inc. in 1998." (9)
University of Waterloo: Research and Technology Park:	"In addition to its research and academic excellence, the University of Waterloo is a national leader in the transfer of ideas and technology to the private sector. […] **The North Campus Research + Technology Park** speaks to the university's strong relationship with industry; growth in the **R+T Park** is unprecedented as more firms locate to this important technology node." (7)
Other Schools with Community Developments	University of Guelph: Research Park McMaster University: Innovation Park Western University: Research & Technology Park University of Saskatchewan: Innovation Place Simon Fraser University: UniverCity, Research Park Trent University: Endowment Lands, and Trent Research and Innovation Park

Gateways

"Gateways" emerged as a major code because most campus plans encourage defining the university as separate to the surrounding communities through emphasising key entrances. For many plans that considered the surrounding community a Minor factor, mentioning the campus edge and a desire to maintain segregation and contrast was the primary recognition of the surrounding community. When a campus plan mentioned gateways it was commonly in reference to wayfinding and placemaking. The code "gateway" was the most consistently used New Urbanism terminology and was the standard *in vivo* code across all plans.

Table 6: Examples of Planning for Gateways	
School	Example (emphasis added to denote code)
University of British Columbia	"New "**gateway**" facilities will be created at important intersections of the Vancouver campus to better support positive and memorable arrival experiences for students, faculty, staff, residents and **visitors.** Along Westbrook Mall and at other designated locations, new buildings will be of signature quality, to better represent the University to the broader community." (10)
University of New Brunswick: Fredericton	"The Fredericton Campus Plan promotes a strongly defined **campus edge** with strong landscaping treatments that form a buffer between residential neighbourhoods and incompatible uses." (46) 113225
Queen's University	"In addition to carrying people and traffic, streets are places and destinations in themselves. They are the **gateways** to the campus and one of the key components of the campus experience." (58)
Trent University	"8. Better defined **gateways** and entrance features such as signage and landscaping." (5)
Mount Royal University	"The **Main Gateway** at Mount Royal **Gate** Southwest entrance will potentially be the new home for the Conservatory/Concert Hall, providing a welcoming facade to the city, with one of the College's most highly used facilities." (40)
University of Saskatchewan	"**Campus edges** established by the South Saskatchewan River, College Drive, Preston Avenue and Circle Drive provide a context for strengthening a sense of arrival to the University through **gateways**, signage, landscaping and new development that provides a positive face to the surrounding community." (25)
University of Ottawa	"The **gateway** corner of Lees and Mann would be an appropriate location for a signature building up to 20 storeys." (150)

Models of Campus Plans

The codes that emerged, the prevalence of those codes and the overall organization of the campus plans guided an overarching code for each plan. Three distinct codes emerged that each represented a particular style and structure of how campus plans recognize and acknowledge the surrounding community. I refined these codes into three models: "Independent," "Distinct Neighbour" and "Integrated" (Table 7). The models are based on the location and treatment of the community within the campus plan. This is a unique perspective that has not emerged in existing town-gown relationship descriptions. Although it was not a determining feature of the models, a correlation between the physical structure or location of the university and the model of community recognition within the plan did emerge. The models reflected the types of development patterns of universities that were documented in existing literature.

Table 7: Model of Campus Plan

Independent	Distinct Neighbour	Integrated
Bishop's University	Dalhousie University	McGill University
Brock University	Mount Royal University	Ryerson University
Laurentian University	Queen's University	University of Ottawa
Memorial University of Newfoundland	Saint Mary's University	University of Toronto
Simon Fraser University	University of Alberta	
Trent University	University of Guelph	
University of British Columbia	University of New Brunswick: Fredericton	
University of Lethbridge	University of Prince Edward Island	
University of New Brunswick: Saint John	University of Regina	
University of Northern British Columbia	University of Saskatchewan	
	University of Saskatchewan: College Quarter	
	University of Victoria	

	University of Waterloo Western University	

Independent Campus Plans

"Independent" campus plans limited acknowledgment of the community to peripheral factors of the plan and recognized the community as a neighbour or a partner, but not as an active participant or stakeholder. Independent campus plans did not recognize the unique aspects of the community and instead focused more on the unique aspects of the geography and setting.

There were five common codes and situations when Independent campus plans referred to the community: transportation networks, views and vistas, public art, planning support, or in over arching goals or the purpose statement (see Table 8). The first three situations (transportation networks, views and vistas, and public art) included little actual participation by the community or invitation to participate. Instead, they focus on the location of the university and integrating aspects of the setting into the life of students. The only situation that actually enabled community participation in the university was planning support, but this was commonly limited to professionals or city staff. Lastly, many Independent campus plans highlighted connections to the community in the overarching goals or purpose statement but failed to support this throughout the content of the plan.

Independent campus plans were commonly produced by universities situated at the edge of a community or in rural settings, but many of these schools were not actually isolated. Some of these universities are buffered from the community by dedicated parkland, like University of British Columbia, or were once remote but have since been surrounded by urban sprawl, like University of Guelph.

Table 8: Examples of Independent Campus Plans Recognizing the Community	
School	**Example (emphasis added to denote code)**
Bishop's University	"Connected to existing **hiking and biking networks** beyond Bishop's University, these paths could better connect the campus to the region, for the mutual benefit of both." (14)

Laurentian University	"Several locations on campus have been identified as providing landmark **views and vistas** towards the lakes surrounding the campus, and towards Downtown Sudbury. Access to these **views and vistas** should be protected and enhanced." (40)
Memorial University of Newfoundland	"**Art** on the campus provides the opportunity for the University to promote local artists and draw support and visitors from the surrounding community." (174)
University of Northern BC	"Additional resources supporting the planning process include engineers, architects, developers and **city staff**." (2)
University of British Columbia	[Purpose:] "The UBC Vancouver Campus Plan supports UBC's world-class community of scholars with a beautiful, functional, sustainable and cost-effective campus that provides the optimal environment for teaching, learning and research; reflects the stature of the university; encourages a unique community life; **strengthens its connections with its neighbours** and is responsible to future generations." (2)

Distinct Neighbour Campus Plans

A campus plan was coded "Distinct Neighbour" by recognizing the impact of the university on the surrounding community and the community's use of the university, but maintaining segregation between the two groups. Distinct Neighbour campus plans had entire sections or chapters dedicated to the university's context within the community or to the town-gown relationship but did not always consider the community beyond these sections.

These plans varied the most in the amount of recognition and the depth of community acknowledgement. Some campus plans did not acknowledge the community beyond a specific section. Others used a section on the surrounding community to fully explore the possibilities or to create a better understanding of the relationship so that the community could be better integrated throughout the rest of the plan. The classification of the community as a Significant or Minor factor identifies how each campus plan used a separate section regarding the community.

The structured recognition of the community in Distinct Neighbour plans is a reflection of the most common physical structure of a Distinct Neighbour university: complete blocks of university property encircled by city or suburbs. These plans recognized the surrounding community in different ways, often specific to the individual town-gown relationship (see Table 9).

Table 9: Examples of Distinct Neighbour Campus Plans Recognizing the Community	
School	Example (emphasis added to denote codes)
University of Alberta	"The **road networks** around North Campus are congested during peak travel periods. This is due in part to the **traffic** generated by the University as well as the proximity of the University to nearby traffic generators such as the Mackenzie Health Sciences Centre." (26)
Dalhousie University	"Throughout the **planning process**, the Dalhousie University Community Committee, comprising volunteer residents in the neighbourhoods surrounding the University, have held public meetings to review the planning and advise the team." (5)
University of Guelph	"New **campus streets** will be designed to City of Guelph standards but will continue to be owned by the University." (90)
Queen's University	"Queen's is fortunate to be situated in Kingston, in proximity to historic neighbourhoods, waterways, and numerous parks. The Campus Master Plan aims to **enhance Queen's connection** with its surroundings in ways that are sensitive to the uniqueness of our location. 5.1 Enhance **connections** to Lake Ontario through new pathways and careful placement of new buildings 5.2 Ensure new development transitions sensitively to adjacent residential neighbourhoods and parks 5.3 Seek **partnerships and city-building** opportunities with the City of Kingston 5.4 Partner with the City to create a diversity of housing opportunities that **minimize strain** on stable residential neighbourhoods 5.5 Explore opportunities to **integrate non-university uses** on West Campus 5.6 Continue to **co-ordinate** infrastructure projects with the City and Kingston General Hospital." (29)
University of Waterloo	"In the long-term, the Northwest Campus could be a location for **athletics facilities in conjunction** with the city's YMCA and sports fields. Major athletic facilities are not just a resource for the university, but are often the only specialized facilities **available to the surrounding greater community**." (62)

Integrated Campus Plans

"Integrated" campus plans reflected the university's understanding of its assimilation into or mixing with the city. These plans were likely to recognize the community throughout all sections of the plan and to reference exact by-laws or city plans. These campus plans discussed development proposals for specific buildings rather than the entire campus since the campus was commonly interspersed in the urban fabric. Integrated campus plans recognized the mixture of the university community and city coming together on the streets within the campus and commonly referred to the university and the community as one.

Table 10: Examples of Integrated Campus Plans Recognizing the Community	
School	Example (emphasis added to denote code)
McGill University	"The downtown campus is designated part of the special protection zone "*le site du patrimoine*" **governed by the City of Montreal**, and as such, the *Commission des bien culturels* has, since 1987, been required to review, and where appropriate, approve the exterior finishes and integration plans of new McGill buildings." (24)
Ryerson University	"The Ryerson campus is inextricably physically and programmatically **integrated** as a critical part of its surrounding community. Ryerson's continued growth and development will only be ensured by building **strong relationships with** the City and private sector partners. As the University President said to the Canadian Club, "more and more, universities realize that **city building is a shared responsibility** and (that) brings mutual advantage". Ryerson's Master Plan builds on the President's aspiration and commitment to make a "**major investment in the community**"." (2)
University of Ottawa	"Almost all of the University's lands between the Rideau Canal and the Rideau River, north of the Queensway, are **subject to the Sandy Hill Secondary Plan**." (21)
University of Toronto	"The **institutional context surrounding** the St. George campus provides opportunities for **linkages and synergies** in programming and research, and supports **collaboration** among and between institutional partners." (22)
University of Toronto	"The **City of Toronto Streetscape Manual** should be used as a further guide to the design and improvement of circulation routes throughout the

	campus, particularly where the City owned streets within the campus are addressed." (56)
McGill University	"The University's lower campus green is one of the most **important publicly accessible** and much loved open spaces within the downtown core, mediating between the intensively developed central business district and Mount Royal Park." (24)

SYNTHESIS

The degree to which Canadian campus plans recognized the surrounding or closest community varied widely, but particular trends and theories emerged. These were similar to those of other countries but were distinctly from the perspective of the town-gown relationship. My review and analysis fills a gap in Canadian planning literature on the relationship between a university and the surrounding community.

How do Canadian campus plans talk about the university's surrounding community?

Every Canadian campus plan analyzed in my study referenced the surrounding community in some way and acknowledged the importance of the town-gown relationship. Most schools mentioned the community in a major overarching principle or goal of the campus plans. The universities that recognized the community in a Significant way elaborated on the particulars of the unique town-gown relationship or supported the relationship in specific design principles and initiatives. The universities that recognized the community as a Minor factor often failed to support vision statements or goals in the policies and details of the campus plan.

All universities focused on bringing the public and surrounding community onto the campus more often than they acknowledging the impact that students or general university uses have on the community. For example, a limited number of schools referenced off campus housing, although many recognized that there is limited on-campus housing. This approach to recognition could be the result of community growth patterns and the encroachment of suburbs on the campus. Many Distinct Neighbour schools were rural

schools until the community and suburbs surrounded the campus, most notably agricultural schools like Guelph University and University of Saskatchewan. Unlike Larkham's (2000) "colonial" universities that acquire property to grow, many Canadian schools have historically dealt with the community expanding towards the campus. University planning continued to focus on the campus and let those who chose to develop near the universities deal with the issues that arose. There are a number of schools within Canada that have colonized the surrounding community so this is not necessarily the case for all schools.

The three campus plan models that I have defined, Independent, Distinct Neighbour and Integrated, recognize that the extent and style of community recognition in each campus plan is related to the town-gown relationship, location and structure of the campus. Independent campus plans commonly considered the community as a neighbour or occasional visitor but not as a partner or influence. Of these schools, only Brock University's campus plan recognized the surrounding community in a Significant way. For the rest of the plans, the town-gown relationship was Minor and did not permeate substantial planning decisions.

Distinct Neighbour campus plans recognized the community as a stakeholder but not necessarily as routine users of the campus. This group also commonly ignored the effect of the university on the community. Distinct Neighbour campus plans varied the most in style and in the amount of community recognition. The various universities considered the particulars of their unique town-gown relationships differently.

Integrated campus plans consistently coordinated planning and development goals with city or community initiatives. The high degree of community recognition was reflective of the metropolitan locations. The surrounding community uses the campus so frequently and is so integrated with the university that city plans shape much of the campus plan. However, the effect of the university and campus on the community was commonly overlooked because of the high degree of integration. The university was considered to be one with the community and the impacts on non-university residents or businesses were not contemplated in as much detail as found in the Distinct Neighbour plans.

The three university models illustrate the recognition by Canadian campus plans of the town-gown relationship.

What do the trends of community recognition in campus plans reveal about Canadian town-gown relationships?

My study found that the themes and principles that dominate urban planning trends also influence university campus plans. New Urbanism was the most popular trend to emerge from community recognition in campus plans. Almost every pattern coded in the campus plans could be traced back to the principles of New Urbanism. The understanding created by my analysis of how campus plans are incorporating principles of New Urbanism allows me to draw conclusions on trends in the Canadian town-gown relationship.

Each model of campus plan encouraged the main principles of New Urbanism (compact growth, active transportation, gateways, and connectivity and mixed use), but did so in different ways. Independent campus plans only reflected the principles of New Urbanism in broad suggestions or in the goals but not in the design or implementation. These universities were commonly built on car-centric principles that directly conflict with New Urbanism. They are now struggling to integrate the principles of New Urbanism into policies as many require mass development to be realized. Distinct Neighbour campus plans highlighted the importance of relationships, the definition of the campus and enforced the details of New Urbanism principles through streetscape designs. Integrated campus plans encouraged New Urbanism not only on campus but in the surrounding city. They considered implementing New Urbanism principles on the campus as a means of meeting city goals and following city requirements. The principles of New Urbanism were influential and central to the recognition of the community within every model of campus plan.

These models reflect both the current town-gown relationship and the future town-gown relationship. If an Independent campus plan considers the community a Minor factor, then the town-gown relationship is likely weak and there are no detailed plans to change this. Campus plans that consider the community a Significant factor and follow the trends of New Urbanism are actively strengthening the town-gown relationship.

Community Developments are a major result of the implementation of New Urbanism on Canadian campuses and are the first way New Urbanism is changing the town-gown relationship. Community Developments based solely on encouraging innovative, research or technical work in close proximity to the university prompts the emerging town-gown relationship, the knowledge hub, identified by Youtie and Shapira (2000). The proximity of

the university to centres of research or development is fundamental to the success of knowledge hubs. Canadian universities were not included in Youtie and Shapira's case study of existing knowledge hubs, but it is obvious from my work that Canadian universities are implementing similar development strategies.

The prevalence of New Urbanism throughout Canadian campus plans suggests that Canadian universities see significant advantages in New Urbanism and in strengthening the town-gown relationship. The primary advantage emerging from my research is that Canadian campus plans that follow New Urbanism principles are stimulating a stronger university brand and image. By implementing New Urbanism, Canadian universities develop campuses and connections that reinforce the physical impact of the university and increase the number of people interacting with the university. New Urbanism encourages university territory to become more defined and more pleasurable to visit so that a unique, superior experience is associated with the university. By encouraging greater collaboration and interaction, New Urbanism works to increase the visibility of Canadian universities. Ryerson University actually presented its new campus plan as a marketing strategy titled "Where R U?" and stated the connection between branding and New Urbanism, specifically connectivity and distinct regions in the plan:

> With the formulation of the Master Plan, Ryerson takes a new attitude to asserting its identity. Beyond building signage and banners on poles, RU is committed to a strong assertion of its brand value as a unique contributing member to the distinctiveness of this precinct in the city. (2008, p. 80)

By implementing New Urbanism, campuses will cease to be diluted and spread out. Instead, a visitor will know immediately when they are on campus. The intent is to increase the understanding of the university as a tangible thing, as a brand with a headquarters that makes an impact. The university will be associated with more uses and activities that spread beyond students and faculty. New Urbanism encourages universities that previously focused on pleasing students or faculty to begin attracting and appealing to the broader community. Campus plans with principles of New Urbanism establish a need to cultivate relationships with businesses, with innovative researchers and with general customers. Canadian campus plans hope to expand the town-gown relationship and better integrate the community with the

university while increasing the actual physical distinctiveness by encouraging densification and compact development.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FIELD

My research is the first step in analyzing Canadian campus planning and in analyzing the relationship between Canadian universities and communities. There is currently a gap in research pertaining to the history, the formation patterns, the impacts and the future of Canadian campuses. The structure of universities has the potential to change drastically with the emergence of electronic distance learning, e-communications and e-libraries, so it is important to analyze and determine the essential aspects and crucial roles of current campus structures. My research suggests that campus plans encourage universities to facilitate and strengthen the town-gown relationship. This is an important role of the university campus plan that should be protected. Furthermore, understanding the physical integration of the university into the community calls for future studies of additional aspects of that integration such as the cultural or economic relationships with a community.

CONCLUSION

I systematically analyzed Canadian campus master plans, determined three distinct models of campus plans and developed a greater understanding of the impacts of New Urbanism theory on the Canadian town-gown relationship. My study proves that it is possible to review and analyze Canadian university campus plans, a task that has not been undertaken in existing literature. I also used campus plans to codify and interpret Canadian town-gown relationships, relationships that are currently understudied.

Canadian campus plans recognize the surrounding community to varying degrees with varying styles but commonly through the principles of New Urbanism. Canadian campus plans restrict physical encroachment on the surrounding neighbourhood and tend instead to invite the community onto the campus and encourage partnerships. Campus master plans seek to create campuses that are even more important to the surrounding community and to the university. New Urbanism aligns with university values of strengthening the university

brand by encouraging distinctive and impactful campuses.

Universities that implement the principles of New Urbanism have an advantage by exemplifying modern and attractive planning. A better campus experience helps to strengthen the University brand. A stronger brand and increased connectivity create more opportunities for partners involved with the university, whether students, businesses or community members. Universities that are not working to implement New Urbanism principles or to strengthen the town-gown relationship will soon find themselves outdated and not competitive. Universities must remain competitive with other universities since they are fundamentally a business that must attract customers.

My research suggests that universities that do not currently have a campus plan or that consider the surrounding community a Minor factor in the campus plan are missing an important opportunity to connect with stakeholders and to strengthen the university. Including the surrounding community in the campus plan shows respect for the community and the town-gown relationship.

The next step in research regarding Canadian town-gown relationships must focus on the official documents on the town side of the relationship. The intentions of Canadian universities to strengthen the town-gown relationship through principles of New Urbanism will be unsuccessful if the surrounding community is not working towards the same goal. Community plans must be analyzed to determine coordination opportunities or possibility for discordance. Coordination is essential if Canadian campus plans hope to achieve their goals and create campuses that are even more important and closely related to the surrounding community and to the university.

REFERENCES

Allen P. (2011). The end of modernism? People's park, urban renewal, and community design. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians,* 70(3) 354-374.

Brockliss, L., 2000. Gown and town: the university and the city in Europe, 1200–2000. *Minerva* 28: 147-170.

Bromley, R. 2006. On and off campus: Colleges and universities as local stakeholders. *Planning, Practice & Research* 21(1): 1-24.

Congress of New Urbanism. 1993. *Charter of New Urbanism.* Retrieved from: https://www.cnu.org/who-we-are/charter-new-urbanism

Dober, R. (1963). *Campus Planning.* New York: Wiley.

Hoeger, K. 2007. Campus and the city – A joint venture? In K. Christiaanse & K. Hoeger (Eds.), *Campus and the City: Urban Design for the Knowledge Society* (13-23). Zurich: Gta Verlag.

Larkham, P. 2000. Institutions and urban form: The example of universities. *Urban Morphology* 4(2): 63-77.

Mandelbaum, S.J. & Lamont, W. 1990. Counterpoint. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 56(3): 350-358.

Robson, C. 1993. *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Ryan, B. 2011. Reading through a plan. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 77(4): 309-327

Silverman, D. 1993. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text, and Interaction*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Talen, E. 1996. Do plans get implemented? A review of evaluation in planning. *Journal of Planning Literature* 10(3): 248-259

Trent University. 2015. Trent Lands Plan: Round One, Two and Three Materials. Retrieved from: https://www.trentu.ca/trentlandsplan/history.php

White, S. 2013. Campus sustainability plans in the United States: where, what, and how to evaluate? *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 15(2): 228-241

Youtie, J. and Shapira P. 2008. Building an innovation hub: A case study of the transformation of university roles in regional technological and economic development. *Research Policy* 37(8): 1188-1204.

APPENDIX A: PLANS COLLECTED

School	Plan Title, Author, URL	Year
Bishop's University	Bishop's University Master Plan Report Peter Rose Architecte, Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates http://www3.ubishops.ca/visitors-media/campus-master-plan.html	2012
Brock University	Campus Plan Urban Strategies, Marshall Macklin Monaghan https://www.brocku.ca/campusplan/	2003
Dalhousie University	Campus Master Plan: Campus Framework Plan Dalhousie University http://www.dal.ca/dept/facilities/campus-development/about-master-plan.html	2013
Laurentian University	Sudbury Campus Master Plan Laurentian University https://laurentian.ca/campus-master-plan	2013
Memorial University of Newfoundland	Campus Master Plan Brook McIlroy Planning + Urban Design http://www.mun.ca/facman/construction/master_plan_update.php	2007
McGill University	McGill University Physical Master Plan Task Force; Consultants: Diamond and Schmitt Architects, du Toit Ailsopp Hillier, Groupe Gautier https://www.mcgill.ca/campusplanning/planning-services/campus-planning/master-planning/documentation	2008
Mount Royal University	Mount Royal College: Lincoln Park Campus Plan Update Brook McIlroy Planning + Urban Design, Pace Architects; Poulos and Chung Limited https://www.mtroyal.ca/AboutMountRoyal/CampusesTours/CampusMasterPlan/index.htm	2008
Simon Fraser University	Simon Fraser University Official Community Plan* City of Burnaby http://www.sfu.ca/fs/Campus-Planning/	2008
Queen's University	Queen's University Campus Master Plan Urban Strategies http://www.queensu.ca/strategicplanning/cmp	2014
Ryerson University	Ryerson University Master Plan, Part 1 & 2 Kuwabara Payne McKenna Blumberg Architects and Daoust Lestage Inc. Greenberg Consultants Inc. IBI Group http://www.ryerson.ca/about/masterplan/	2008
Saint Mary's University	Campus Plan Saint Mary's University	2013

	http://www.smu.ca/about/campus-master-plan.html	
Trent University	Trent Endowment Lands Plan** Office for Urbanism https://www.trentu.ca/vpadmin/endowment.php	2006
University of Alberta	Building on Vision: Long Range Development Plan IBI Group http://www.facilities.ualberta.ca/Planning_Project_Delivery/University_Architect/Campus_Planning.aspx	2002
University of British Columbia	Vancouver Campus Plan: Part 1 Synopsis, Part 2 Campus Plan University of British Columbia http://planning.ubc.ca/vancouver	2010
University of Guelph	University of Guelph Campus Master Plan: Guelph Campus 1 & 2 Urban Strategies http://www.pr.uoguelph.ca/pr/campus_master_plan_2013.shtml	2013
University of Lethbridge	University Campus Master Plan: A Vision for Core Academic Lands Moriyama & Teshima Architects; Gibbs Gage Architects; Educational Consulting Services http://www.uleth.ca/masterplan/	2012
University of New Brunswick: Fredericton	Fredericton Campus Plan Brook McIlroy Inc. Planning and Urban Design http://www.unb.ca/capitalplanning/landmanagement/frederictoncampus.html	2003
University of New Brunswick: Saint John	Saint John Campus Plan Brook McIlroy Inc. Planning and Urban Design http://www.unb.ca/capitalplanning/landmanagement/saintjohncampus.html	2004
University of Northern British Columbia	University of Northern British Columbia Master Plan University of Northern British Columbia http://www.unbc.ca/assets/reports/4a._unbc_masterplan_report_phase_i2.pdf	2012
University of Ottawa	University of Ottawa Campus Master Plan Urban Strategies https://www.uottawa.ca/facilities/master-plan	2015
University of Prince Edward Island	UPEI: Campus Plan Brook McIlroy Inc Planning and Urban Design and Bergmark, Guimond, Hammarlund and Jones Architects http://www.upei.ca/facilities/facilities-management	2006
University of Regina	University of Regina Campus Master Plan DIALOG http://www.uregina.ca/fm/p-d-c/master-plan2011.html	2011
University of Saskatchewan	Core Area Master Plan: University of Saskatchewan Brook McIlroy Planning & Urban Design	2003

	http://www.usask.ca/plan/	
University of Saskatchewan: College Quarter	College Quarter Master Plan: University of Saskatchewan	2010
	Brook McIlroy Planning + Urban Design, Pace Architect	
	http://www.usask.ca/corporate_admin/CQ%20Master%20Plan%20Final.pdf	
University of Toronto	St George Campus Master Plan	2011
	U of T Campus and Facilities Planning	
	http://www.updc.utoronto.ca/re.htm	
University of Victoria	University of Victoria Campus Plan	2015
	DIALOG, with Hapa Collaborative, Bunt and Associates, Kerr Wood Leidal, and FVB Energy	
	http://www.uvic.ca/facilities/	
University of Waterloo	Campus Master Plan Update	2009
	Urban Strategies Inc., Paradigm Transportation Solutions Ltd, GSP Group	
	http://plantoperations.uwaterloo.ca/cmp/	
Western University	Western Campus Master Plan	2015
	Urban Strategies	
	http://www.uwo.ca/ipb/publicaccountability/documents/WU_Campus_Masterplan_Feb10_2015a.pdf	

* The Simon Fraser Official Community Plan, part of the Burnaby Community Official Plan, deals entirely with university property that has or is zoned for residential, commercial or industrial uses. The Campus Development Plan does not recognize the surrounding community.
**A plan for the land owned by the University surrounding the campus. Trent is currently in the process of developing a campus plan.

APPENDIX B: FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING CAMPUS PLANS

School	
Year	
Title	
Author(s)	
URL	
Intro	
Vision/ Purpose	
Values	
Goals/Priorities	
Objectives/Principles	
Planning Process	
Context	
Design	
Implementation	
Maps	

Emerging Trends	
Reference to external plans or policies	
Expansion/property acquisition/Infill	
Changes to buildings/services that are commonly used by the external community	
Transportation	
Gateways	
Connections	

Preliminary Analysis Notes	
Significant or Minor	
Campus Model	
Main Themes/Patterns	
Differences	
Notes	