

Master Plan Committee (MPC) Minutes

Wednesday, October 10, 2018, 1:30–3:00 p.m.

Lory Student Center, Room 308–310

Members & Ex Officio: Fred Haberecht, Mike Rush, Tom Satterly, Dave Bradford, Lynn Johnson, Alan Rudolph, Kathleen Henry, Rick Miranda, Rudy Garcia for Kim Tobin, Leslie Taylor, Tom Milligan, Doug Max, Dell Rae Ciaravola

Other Participants: Yuval Rosenthal (ASCSU), Tracey Abel, Shelly Carroll, Julia Innes, Jessica Kramer, David Hansen, Adam Daurio, Aaron Fodge, James Pritchett, David Mclean, Nick Lobejko, Sonia Kreidenweis, Tonya Malik-Carson, Alex Bernasek, Bruce Ronda, Ben Withers

1. Glover Redevelopment – Draft Charge (Fred Haberecht)

- a. Create stakeholder group to discern process and make recommendation to MPC on Glover redevelopment options.
 - i. Stakeholders to work collaboratively, on a deadline with defined goals and concrete direction, reporting back to MPC.
 - ii. Dean David Mclean will lead process for Glover Redevelopment stakeholder committee with facilitation from Facilities Management.
 - iii. Dean of WCNR and Dean of Natural Sciences have natural synergies with Glover space. See “charge draft” for full list of recommended stakeholders.
 - iv. Expect several options to come out of this stakeholder committee.
 - v. Count on key stakeholder dean to bring in other relevant stakeholders/resources.
 1. Lynn Johnson believes it is the responsibility of base committee to invite various constituents in, to inform and act as resources for their meetings.
 2. Recommendation to consider Water Center or Division of Engagement representation or to access their input as a resource.
 3. Alan Rudolph recommends that committee members who have more central responsibilities to take on explicitly the role of reaching out to other stakeholders on campus who want to be considered.
 4. **Action Item (FM):** Add this explicit language to the charge – *The expectation of committee members to bring in resources/constituents to inform the group.*
- b. Alan Rudolph asks, How much of the financial story behind the proposed programmatic involvement in Glover needs to be considered? Recommends breaking out of the who-can-pay model, allow for some risk or possibility for people to propose things, rather than just who can show the money now.
 - i. Fred Haberecht believes key stakeholder of location, or adjacency, or a potential donation initially drives exploration of redevelopment.
 - ii. This process is designed to bring ideas in. This project and ideas generated are seen in the context of Glover Redevelopment not being the only large redevelopment occurring on campus.
 - iii. Rick Miranda shares there are five big sources of funding for projects. In different contexts, different funding sources are used, depending on many different factors specific to the projects.

- iv. Alan Rudolph is concerned that by limiting it to people who can show the revenue streams now, we may limit the vision. Take a measured view. How much do you want to base future programmatic infrastructure on who can pay now?
- v. Lynn Johnson shares example of other prior processes not based on funding available, such as with Biology. Administration felt it was one of the best directions to go and it wasn't a situation where people were able to pay. Another example was BSB.
- vi. It's a new phenomenon to have donors wanting to fund projects. Adds a new element, needing to find a way to fund donor pledge payments. Still looking at what is the best use and highest need.
- vii. Committee will explore what makes sense to co-locate at Glover Redevelopment versus what makes sense to move into other facilities, making sure similar things go together and are conducive to being together.
- viii. Will be helpful for informing Space Committee as well.
- ix. Dean Mclean sees it as College of Engineering having an opportunity for funding and the committee asking, does it make sense?
- c. Outcomes – See “charge draft” for list of expected outcomes.
 - i. Need to consider what is in the building today and what will go there in the future.
 - ii. Bring back options when reporting recommendation to MPC in Feb./March, including ideas/opportunities on-hold that should be considered for other redevelopment sites.
- d. Alan Rudolph asks for more definition of “potential patterns of development.” This means physical planning, such as:
 - i. How close to Centre Ave. Mall?
 - ii. Will there be enhancement to walkway going to Administration?
 - iii. Is it an 8-story building on a small foot print? Two 5-story buildings? A 6-story building and a 3-story building?
- e. Alan asks if there is any value in the committee having interface with institutional research. If a group comes in to report tuition or research revenues, is there a way the committee should react to the data or do further due diligence and ask what the likelihood is of raising that channel of revenue through research or tuition or advancement?
 - i. People on committee should do their own inputs from their units and pull the resources in.
 - ii. Lynn Johnson adds, historically we've not made our decisions around who is in what space. There are many non-revenue generating activities on the university that we generate space for. In some situations, will need to back up claims to justify space, but do not always have that for all cases. For example, Student Affairs potentially wanting to co-locate some of the programs on east side of campus. They are not revenue-generating, but they serve students. Would use something different as metric like how many students they serve.
- f. Yuval Rosenthal asks if there will be a student on the stakeholder group.
 - i. Stakeholders should be representing the students. Limited key stakeholder group with a reporting up through the colleges.
 - ii. Rick Miranda adds, from a process point of view, if a project seems like it will rely on a lot of UFFAB funding, then they will want to have great connections with UFFAB. For other projects (for example, projects with less student traffic in the building) those connections areas are less important.
 - iii. Lynn Johnson believes it could be helpful to invite students from UFFAB to MPC to say what they look for in projects and how they want to engage for providing resources. What kinds of things are UFFAB students interested in funding?

- 1. Facilities recently at UFFAB – MPC process and potential redevelopment projects presented, setting them up for that type of engagement.
- iv. Stakeholder Charge Committee needs to have higher level discussion before putting projects in front of students.
- v. Students will be a resource. Will be on case by case basis if UFFAB will be involved from beginning.
- g. Lynn Johnson moves that we approve charge with any modifications recommended at this point.
 - i. Tom Milligan seconds the motion.
 - ii. All are in favor; none opposed.

2. Temple Grandin Equine Center Phase 1 – Project Approval (Mike Rush and Adam Daurio)

- a. This is a long-anticipated project in the master plan. Worked through parking and floodplain planning issues. Further along in the process because began this before master plan process was formalized.
- b. This is a donor funded project. Have a program plan. Intent to go to phase 1, then follow up with phase 2, if funding becomes available. \$ 4.6-million project for phase 1, which includes:
 - i. Riding arena
 - ii. Offices and clinical space
 - iii. Seminar and observation areas
 - iv. Accommodations for patrons
- c. Green and blue on slide indicates phase 1; tan indicates phase 2 (approx. \$4.5 million).
- d. Will be immediately north of existing Pickett Center; takes out half of parking lot.
 - i. Parking lot needs to be replaced. It has not existed under purview of Parking and Transportation Services, so hasn't been maintained, since it was built and installed in approx. 2000. with funding from a donor.
 - ii. Parking that is left will be able to accommodate patrons of Temple Grandin Equine Center and Pickett Center.
- e. Existing Pickett Center needs to be re clad—the brick is cracked and falling off. From a controlled maintenance perspective, the state accommodated enough funding to re clad the building. May run procurement concurrent with the Temple Grandin procurement to save funding. Then the two buildings could look similar from continuity perspective.
- f. Project will be delivered with target value-based design-build lump sum process.
- g. The facility fits with the agricultural style architecture at Foothills Campus.
- h. Approx. 450 undergrad students. Equine assisted activities and therapies is the most intriguing and asked about facet of equine industry. It grows 300 percent nationally and annually.
 - i. Temple Grandin Equine Center would be accomplishing research, education, as well as community outreach.
 - ii. Currently hindered because of traditional classes and can only host educational and community activities from 5-7:30 p.m. in Adams Atkinson Arena.
 - iii. Only have two classrooms currently at Foothills for Equine Sciences.
- i. Equine assisted activities and therapies expanded beyond recreational and competitions.
 - i. Ongoing programming is occurring but has been hindered.
 - ii. However, CSU has taken on challenge of being the university over last four years to lead this research. Have a strategic plan and need a place to further the research in the industry.

- j. Are there reimbursements for equine assisted therapies? On a certain level there are.
 - i. Equine activities are when a person has certification, not necessarily licensure, and uses the horse in recreational, adaptive manner to teach horsemanship.
 - ii. Equine therapy is when a licensed practitioner uses the horse as a tool in their standard practice. Those individuals could receive some insurance reimbursement.
 - iii. Funding can come from private insurance, though not from CO Medicaid and Medicare.
- k. This is a multi-college collaborative endeavor.
 - i. Equine Science - provide care, maintenance, and training of horses
 - ii. Occupation Therapy – systematic review and research
 - iii. CVMBS – care and welfare research for horses
 - iv. College of Business – group of marketing students develop promotional materials and development plan
- l. Fred Haberecht asks, What is the largest capacity classroom in new facility?
 - i. Would accommodate about 40 students, is multi-use seminar classroom about 900 sq. ft. There is also an observation area that would have approx. 100 seats overlooking the arena.
 - ii. Fred Haberecht mentions that it is difficult to find a classroom that could accommodate larger than approx. 50 people on Foothills campus, and it would be useful to consider just in general.
- m. Aaron Fodge asks, How often is the classroom used in a day?
 - i. Every hour there is programming.
- n. Alan Rudolph asks for comment on FTE, research faculty, or other human capital investments. Projected increase? Human resource capital plan behind this space?
 - i. Wendy Wood is on retirement plan and has been director of research. Have always talked strategy of research for grad/PhD programs. Anticipate would not just keep one director of research trying to manage all, but individuals with background in specific expertise. Probably 3 faculty. In last few years have graduated 9 M.A. and 3 PhD students.
- o. Lynn Johnson recommends moving this project to the Operation Committee for approval.
 - i. Rudy Garcia seconds the recommendation.
 - ii. All are in favor; none opposed.

3. Clark Master Plan Verification (Fred Haberecht and Dean Ben Withers)

- a. College of Liberal Arts (CLA) engaged in series of meetings asking strategic questions about the revitalization of Clark.
 - i. Since recession, CSU has established a business plan focused on increasing amount of funds that come through external gifts, through research, and through expansion of undergraduate education.
 - ii. The business plan has been strategically welded to sense of mission.
- b. Master Plan Context
 - i. Clark is at the heart of academic life, at the “campus corner.”
 - ii. Fits into the guiding principles for the open space framework.
 - iii. Clark well positioned in the common campus amenities and support.
 - iv. Directly associated with Monford Quad open space.

- v. At the crossroads of Center Ave. mall and University Ave. mall.
 - vi. This building has a dialogue with campus, with the thousands of visitors that pass by every day.
 - vii. Liabilities or unrealized potentials exist.
 1. As result of 1968 building, front doors of building are not completely obvious, does not have universal accommodation out front. In contrast with BSB, which integrates into its environment, Clark could be dropped anywhere across CSU or even the country. It does not speak to the place of where it is located.
 2. One of five potential development sites, but it does not utilize site efficiently, even though it is a massive bldg.
 3. It is a fully occupied bldg. – question of how to accommodate the current use with whatever decisions are made for the revitalization of the building.
- c. Case for investment
- i. Adjectives used to describe Clark are telling – monstrous, torturous. It doesn't have to be described this way. Clark is part of the iconic experience of the undergraduate experience. Can turn it into something to be proud of.
 - ii. Quantify contribution to the academic wellbeing of the university as a whole. The academic capital of building is in student credit hours.
 1. This is a building that CLA inhabits primarily, though not solely. Serves needs of all campus, not just one college.
 2. 70% of undergraduates in one year take a class in Clark.
 3. Lowest-rated building in terms of student satisfaction, esp. with technology, on student evaluations.
 4. Clark has high value to entire university, but issues include leaking roofs, aged electrical system, need for fire suppression, asbestos mitigation, restroom needs, etc. Requires significant investment to maintain bldg. (\$58 million for necessary repairs) that is so foundational to university budget.
 - iii. "Clark as transactional space"
 1. Go to Clark for something you need like a class, then get out, go someplace else.
 2. Cold, institutional feel.
 3. Students don't go there to inhabit spaces, to interact, such as they do in BSB.
 4. Clark no longer aligns with CSU's sense of purpose.
 - iv. The international architecture of Clark was built to align the campus with international aspirations, to elevate campus from a regional university to be considered in national and international context.
 - v. CSU has asked us to be a place where we can discuss coming together in a civilized society to address critical issues, to talk across cultures. The general education experience that occurs in CLA is crucial, and want Clark to further play role that could create these opportunities.
 - vi. Preserve investments that have already been made (\$8 million into classrooms) but modernize and transform the spaces.
- d. Tom Milligan asks about funding.

- i. Moved away from funding model that is exclusively tied to bonding, and now generally see donors having interest in assisting with funding, esp. if they knew this was a university priority.
- e. Shelly Carroll comments that it could be considered as a state request after Shepardson.
 - i. Lynn Johnson adds that A/Z and Chemistry are on that list as well. Would need to assess from a point perspective from state.
 - ii. It impacts so many more students.
 - 1. Tom Milligan believes the most compelling argument is the experience that we are selling. It influences a significant portion of students and he believes it is important.
- f. Alan Rudolph agrees that this is a useful way to present that space creates value institutionally. Doesn't tie itself to space consideration in context of where revenue is being generated. How do we integrate and plan with that?
 - i. Rick Miranda believes that most of the curriculum proposals that come through are largely at master's level.
 - 1. Data science is a large undergraduate expansion.
 - 2. CVMBS reorganization of undergrad curriculum is example. If CVMBS was successful in attracting so many students, then that would put pressure on other spaces.
 - 3. Alan says it is not part of the investment thesis, shows output of investment, but not sure how to factor it into the process.
 - 4. Tom Milligan thinks BSB is analogous. Went through student fee discussions, small level of donors; there are mechanisms where student experience is factored into process.
 - ii. Ben Withers adds:
 - 1. CSU budget model is different from other universities where that would have to be accounted for, factor that in and understand space cost, office cost, etc. Our budget model doesn't want us to do it.
 - 2. CLA has a dual role: how CLA works for their majors and also how it works for the whole university.
 - 3. Changing paradigm with other universities emphasizing professional success alone, in contrast to an undergraduate educational experience that produces citizens, promoted by Dr. Tony Frank, not just narrow professionalism. CLA wants to be a leader in that type of discussion.
- g. Rick Miranda asks if they've started to mock up vision of Clark and the reconfiguration of the public spaces.
 - i. Mike Rush has started the process. By introducing a more transparent addition onto the A and C wing, then a person's vision will be drawn in that direction.
 - ii. Tom Milligan says Clark has not kept up with the rest of the architecture on campus.
 - iii. Mike Rush adds that Clark was structurally built well.
- h. Yuval Rosenthal asks, with the comments on the student evaluations about classroom quality, has that been looked at or envisioned yet?

- i. Classrooms in Clark A are better than in Clark C.
 - ii. Ben Withers believes students may also react to the spaces around the classrooms in Clark A with dismal surroundings possibly producing a perception.
 - iii. UFFAB has helped to invest in some of the spaces in Clark A.
 - iv. Need to reimagine what Clark C looks like in the relationship with the surrounding building.
- i. What are the next steps? Currently at the sub area master plan step of the MPC process. There is not funding at this point or identified program, but there is a need to go deeper. If it is considered a project of significant/complex scale, then through MPC process, will create a stakeholder group to look at further and in context of other redevelopment sites (broader than just CLA group) or will ask Dean of CLA to work with FM to develop visioning documents (college specific), depending on MPC guidance.
 - i. Tom Milligan thinks it's a bad building for as much as we do with it and the case has been made for needing to invest in it. Fixing up quad area would be helpful too. Important to consider how to pay for it and find out if there is a way forward, but do not need to redo the studies already done.
 - ii. Lynn Johnson adds that there is more work to do because can't tell if can pay for it until there is some visioning work done. She believes the next step is to charge a group.
 - iii. UFFAB wants to be at the table for this, suggests a stakeholder group rather than just CLA specific.
- j. Motion for Facilities Management to work with the Dean of Liberal Arts to develop a charge to be accepted by MPC for a stakeholder group to explore Clark.
 - i. Tom Milligan makes the motion.
 - ii. Lynn Johnson seconds the motion.
 - iii. All in favor; none opposed.

4. Campus Wide Inclusivity Standards for Commuter Showers & Break Rooms

- a. Delayed until November meeting due to lack of time.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, November 14, 1:30–3:00 p.m., Lory Student Center, Room 304–306