

CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of Meeting: March 25th, 2015 (3:00 pm – 4:30 pm, DTB A144)

Membership			
	Voting:		Ex-Officio:
R	Valerie Kuehne, Co-Chair	√	Ron Proulx
√	Gayle Gorrill, Co-Chair	√	Tony Eder
R	David Castle	R	Bruce Kilpatrick
√	Carmen Charette	√	Joy Davis
R	Katy Mateer	√	Kristi Simpson
√	John Archibald		
√	Thomas Tiedje		Other:
√	Andrew Rowe	√	Joanne McGachie
√	Karena Shaw	√	David Perry
R	Kayleigh Erickson	√	Neil Connelly
√	Ada Saab	√	Carmen Mailloux
√	Sheryl Karras		
√	Paul Ward		
R	Pete Rose		Guests:
			<i>Dialog BC:</i>
		√	Jennifer Fix
		R	Martin Nielsen
√ = In Attendance R = Regrets Noted			

MINUTES

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as circulated.

2. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of Jan. 29th 2015 were approved as circulated.

3. Remarks from the Chair

Ms. Gorrill indicated that she was looking forward to the conversations that would arise in this meeting as the content to be discussed reflects diverse input from many campus stakeholders and will set the stage for Phase 2 of the Campus Plan Update.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes

No business arising from the minutes.

5. Correspondence

No correspondence to report.

6. Regular Business

1. Campus Plan Update

A) UVision report

To provide some initial context, Mr. Connelly oriented the committee by outlining the current status of the Campus Plan Update process. He explained that we have completed all of the engagement activities scheduled for Phase 1 (Oct. 2014 – Mar. 2015).

The goal of Phase 1 was to undertake background research, begin engagement, and revise the Vision, Goals, and Principles for the Campus Plan Update accordingly. This content will be used in Phase 2 to inform the development of a draft Campus Plan (Phase 2: April – Sept. 2015). The Campus Planning Committee is now at the juncture between Phase 1 and Phase 2.

In this meeting the objective is to review a summary of the engagement input and the revised Vision, Goals and Principles document. A motion from the Committee could recommend to the President that the Engagement Summary and the revised Vision, Goals and Principles be used in the Phase 2 work to inform the preparation of the updated Plan.

One substantial piece of input submitted to the Committee during the engagement process was the UVision Report. UVision is a set of recommendations compiled by the University of Victoria Sustainability Project (UVSP) on how to create a more environmentally sustainable campus. Having conducted workshops, a survey, and other forms of engagement, the resulting UVision report is based on input from more than 1300 students and a selection of other campus community members.

The Campus Planning Steering Committee met with representatives of the UVision report to receive a presentation on its main suggestions at their March 16th meeting. Some of the items were operational in nature, and thus beyond the scope of the Campus Planning project. In these instances, appropriate university contacts were provided. Several of the recommendations however do fit within the scope of the Campus Plan Update, and so a copy of the report has been distributed to all Committee members in the agenda package for this meeting. Mr. Connelly also provided a brief summary of those recommendations before turning the discussion over to Ms. Fix.

B) Phase One Engagement Summary

Ms. Fix provided an overview of the various engagement activities conducted throughout Phase 1. She emphasized that over 1,000 distinct accounts were collected through mobile booths, open houses, a stakeholder workshop, a survey, and a photo contest. Many students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community members all contributed input.

Staff from Dialog BC applied qualitative analysis methodologies to identify patterns and themes and develop statistics. The engagement summary presented by Ms. Fix presented overarching themes as well as more detailed graphs, statistics, and quotes collected through each engagement medium.

Ms. Charette inquired into specific reasons why some stakeholders indicated a need for improvements in safety. Ms. Fix explained that a number of stakeholders described specific locations on campus by using words and phrases such as “sketchy”, “too quiet”, “not enough activity”, and “has bad lighting” in reference to their feelings of safety when passing through certain areas, particularly in the evenings.

Dr. Tiedje noted that some of the overarching themes that were heard across multiple stakeholders included potentially contradictory elements. For instance, he noted a strong preference expressed for the protection of natural areas, and at the same time, a strong preference for increased vibrancy 24/7. Ms. McGachie added that increased lighting and other measures to increase activity could erode some of these natural areas, and questioned how these interests could be balanced.

Mr. Eder indicated that it would be valuable to understand how preferences vary across stakeholder types, noting that staff and faculty might emphasize features that create a pleasant work environment while students might emphasize social gathering spaces, and so on. Ms. Fix remarked that there were many shared themes and preferences expressed across the various accounts that were collected during Phase 1 engagement. Moreover, Ms. Simpson noted that the revised Vision, Goals and Principles creates a framework for developing a draft Campus Plan that brings together all of these diverse expressions.

Mr. Proulx commented on the interest articulated for more outdoor learning spaces and interactive spaces. He suggested that students may be advancing this, while faculty might focus more on purpose-specific buildings. Ms. Karras agreed that she understood students to focus more on classroom and study spaces, while faculty will likely be thinking about work spaces.

Ms. Gorrill remarked that it will be important to develop a more refined picture of the overarching preferences expressed by each stakeholder group as we progress in the Campus Plan Update process.

C) Revised Vision, Goals and Principles

Ms. Fix projected on overhead screens the revised Vision, Goals and Principles for the Campus Plan Update. The document displayed all track-changes from the current Plan and each change was reviewed with the Committee. Elements from the new UVic Edge project and narrative were also incorporated.

Dr. Rowe asked whether the order of Principles 1 to 7 in any way reflects some prioritization. It was clarified that beyond the first two principles (Academic Priorities and Engagement), there is no order implied in the listing.

A number of minor terminology updates were implemented during the review process. Dr. Rowe pointed to some concepts that required additional clarification, such as the term “human scale”. Although this concept may enjoy familiarity within urban planning contexts, it may not be widely or consistently understood by university stakeholders even while it has been applied in response to the engagement input received. Additional phrasing will be included to clarify that this term refers to buildings, spaces, and transportation networks that can be pleasing to users that move at a pedestrian pace.

Similarly, Dr. Tiedje requested that additional temporal context accompany the use of the term “more vibrant” and Mr. Proulx noted that “engaging” can be interpreted inconsistently. He explained that there is a difference between having an engaging campus that lures outsiders in, and having a campus planning process that engages many stakeholders for input. Both are important he noted, and revisions were incorporated to add clarity in this regard.

Dr. Tiedje and Ms. Simpson also emphasized that among the various concepts listed in the document, the ultimate goal of supporting our educational mission is tantamount. This is expressed in Principle 1: Academic Priorities.

Ms. Gorrill reflected back to the original task of the meeting: to review the Engagement Summary and the Vision, Goals, and Principles and determine if it is ready to be recommended to the President. She commented that there has been a good dialogue, but only minor suggested changes to the text.

The following motion was proposed for action following the incorporation of the revisions discussed in the meeting:

(Saab/Shaw)

That the Campus Planning Committee recommend to the President, that the Phase One Engagement Summary and the revised Vision, Goals and Principles, be received and used in the Phase Two work to inform the preparation of plan concepts and directions for the updated draft Campus Plan.

CARRIED

No opposition.

D) Campus Concept Workshop / Charrette –April 8th.

Ms. Simpson described the structure and importance of the upcoming Campus Concept Charette and encouraged the committee members to attend.

2. Capital Projects Update

Mr. Perry provided an update on the CARSA project. He stated that it is nearly complete. While the building is ready for set-up, the occupancy permit is still in progress.

Mr. Proulx added that an inspector from the Saanich Fire Department will be visiting CARSA on Friday March 27th, a necessary step in the occupancy permit process.

Mr. Perry said that he is working with UVic Athletics and CanAssist to create a plan for their move. He is also keeping an eye to the need for additional space for the new civil engineering program, and anticipates some opportunities once CanAssist is relocated out of E Hut.

Mr. Perry also provided an update on the expansion to the Continuing Studies building. There have been some minor delays, and a schedule update will be provided in June. It is expected that completion of the building will occur in late December.

7. Other Business

Community Liaison

Dr. Davis informed the Committee that the Finnerty Gardens is approaching its 40th anniversary and some preparations for that will get underway soon.

She also noted that planning is underway for “Catalyst Conversations”. It is about identifying teaching, research, and transportation interests that can be discussed with municipal partners and other stakeholders in the region.

Dr. Davis has also begun conversations with the BC Heritage Branch to plan for the upcoming 150th anniversary of Canada.

8. Adjournment

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

9. Next Meeting

Campus Concept Charette –April 8th, 2015,
Cadboro Commons, Campus View Room.