

## CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Minutes of Meeting: October 30th, 2014 (11:00 am – 12:00 pm, ASB Boardroom 120)**

Membership			
	Voting:		Ex-Officio:
R	Valerie Kuehne, Co-Chair	R	Ron Proulx
√	Gayle Gorrill, Co-Chair	√	Tony Eder
R	David Castle	√	Joanne McGachie (for Bruce Kilpatrick)
R	Carmen Charette	R	Joy Davis
√	Sarah Blackstone	√	Kristi Simpson
√	John Archibald		
R	Thomas Tiedje		
R	Andrew Rowe		<b>Other:</b>
√	Karena Shaw	√	David Perry
R	Kayleigh Erickson	√	Neil Connelly
R	GSS rep	√	Rhonda Ljunggren (Secretary)
√	Sheryl Karras	√	Carmen Mailloux
√	Paul Ward		
√	Pete Rose		<b>Guests:</b>
			<i>Dialog BC:</i>
		√	Jennifer Fix
		√	Martin Nielsen
		√	Antonio Gomez-Palacio
√ = In Attendance R = Regrets Noted			

### 1. INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Gorrill opened the meeting by highlighting that the Campus Plan Update process creates an opportunity to think about how we move forward with campus development in the future and create a framework that guides this. She highlighted that a well-developed engagement plan is crucial to making this happen.

Mr. Connelly introduced the consultants from *Dialog BC*, who are embarking on the preparation of the Engagement Plan for the Campus Plan Update.

## 2. CONTEXT SETTING

Mr. Nielsen explained that his team from *Dialog BC* are presently on campus as part of a two-day preliminary workshop (Oct. 29 and 30) to glean ideas from students, faculty, community members, and the Campus Planning Committee members regarding the development of an effective Engagement Plan.

He provided a brief overview of the themes that emerged during the first day of meetings, emphasizing that there was consistency across all groups interviewed in their sense of pride in the UVic campus. Many expressed that they have been drawn to the UVic campus for specific reasons, such as the natural environment, academic offerings and lifestyle. Residence Services members that were interviewed noted the need to offer more housing for students, and that living on campus was interpreted by students as a privilege given the excellent amenities available. In general, the accounts were very positive.

Jennifer Fix described the timelines and milestones for the Campus Plan Update.

## 3. PROCESS

Ms. Fix highlighted three phases of the Campus Plan Update process:

- 1) Understand Baseline Conditions
  - Engagement strategy (types of questions to ask, who to reach out to, how best to reach out, etc...)
- 2) Draft Campus Plan
  - Specific focus on content to be included in the Campus Plan as it pertains to parking, buildings, land, etc..., and its need to serve the academic mission.
- 3) Refine the Campus Plan
  - Opportunity for final review and refinement via engagement.

Mr. Gomez-Palacio emphasized that at this early stage in the process, their role (*Dialog BC*) is to be listening; what should they be thinking about? And what are the big picture focus points? (i.e., the Campus Plan will not be focusing on operational details). This meeting is for *Dialog BC* to hear from the Campus Planning Committee to guide the engagement plan design.

#### **4. DISCUSSION: ADVICE FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON ENGAGEMENT PLAN THEMES AND DESIGN**

##### ***Summary of Key Engagement Questions Raised***

- a) How can we re-define the role and meaning of Ring Road, now that UVic has outgrown the Ring Road model?
- b) What designs and spaces foster creative activity, interaction and cross-pollination across disciplines?
- c) How can we accommodate and enable pockets of growth (i.e.: international students, indigenous students, and graduate students) that are in need of additional services and space?
- d) How can we best enable additional large classroom spaces in the context of all of our other campus goals?
- e) How can we best provide additional student residence spaces?
- f) What portions of the campus can be 24/7, with a village feel?
- g) What activities are most suited to either purpose built or flexible designs, taking into account the role of technology in the use of flexible spaces [engage Technology Integrated Learning Centre].
- h) How can we strengthen relationships with the residents and neighborhoods surrounding the campus?
- i) How can research activities on campus be made more visible?
- j) How can we better showcase that sustainability is a core value?
- k) How can we promote health, wellness, and social interaction through the Campus Plan?
- l) How can we increase the interaction that UVic community members have with the outdoor environment when they are on campus?
- m) Should the Campus Plan incorporate the development of an institutional knowledge bank that informs the way that the UVic community engages the campus? If so, then what form should it take and how would it be developed?

### ***Summary Notes of Meeting***

Key points outlined in the meeting included the following:

Mr. Eder provided a brief historical overview of university enrolments. There has been continual growth in the student population over the past fifteen years, and at this point in time the university is considered to be a the “right” size. However, even if the overall population stabilizes, UVic is still undergoing evolution and there are pockets of growth. Demands from the government, from students, and so on, drive this, and there are space shortfalls, especially in regard to research laboratory space. There are opportunities to expand services and spaces available to international students and indigenous students (both are experiencing increases in enrollment), and there is demand for additional non-traditional space that facilitates social interaction and stimulates creativity. Also, as a research intensive university, there is a need to increase the space and housing available to graduate students. In terms of residence services, we guarantee housing for year-one students but not beyond that, and with a mere 3% vacancy rate in Victoria, there is opportunity to expand. Looking ahead, we expect that demographic changes will result in reductions in the 18-24 year old cohort in British Columbia, and so it will be important to accommodate our pockets of growth.

Dr. Blackstone added that there is a significant wave of retirements expected across academic affairs. There may be value in reviewing the experience of Congress in June 2013 as the implementation of this program was considered a success. Also, there is demand to become a 24 hour campus. The original Campus Plan had a distinct concept of the role and meaning of Ring Road, and the incoming Chancellor has already made reference to the “inside the ring” vs “outside the ring”. We’ve grown beyond this model, and therefore we need to re-think the symbolism of Ring Road, especially as this may create the feeling of exclusion among members outside the ring.

Ms. Karras introduced the question of whether we should continue to delineate buildings based on the disciplines that they house.

- Mr. Gomez-Palacio indicated that students interviewed so far had raised this point, saying that they enjoyed having a home base where they could interact with their peers, but this meant having to find other ways to connect beyond their departments.
- Dr. Blackstone remarked that a “classroom building” can be a bridge across disciplines.

Mr. Rose, as a resident member of the Alumni Association, commented that the Gordon Head community, broadly speaking, may not perceive the campus as a “good neighbor” with available amenities. There could be benefit in strengthening the neighborhood immediately surrounding the campus, and there is an

opportunity to coordinate with the municipality of Saanich on improving integration with the campus with more housing opportunities in the area.

Mr. Perry suggested that flexible spaces could become increasingly valuable given the online technological advancements that make learning possible anywhere.

- Dr. Blackstone responded that the Technology Integrated Learning (TIL) unit is looking at emerging technologies and how best to use them. It will be important to engage them as well in this process. She also cautioned that well-designed purpose-built buildings can be far superior to any flexible space, and the purpose-built Fine Arts facilities provide a good example of this.

Mr. Eder added that there is significant demand for large classrooms, and that if more large classrooms become available, it will be possible to re-purpose smaller classrooms into offices and other spaces.

Dr. Archibald commented that there is no strict divide between the core learning and research endeavors, and the everyday on-campus activities of eating, sleeping, studying and walking from one place to the next. The pedestrian flow (ex. the radial flow from the Clearihue building) and interactions in eating spaces can facilitate creative activity, learning, and research ideas. Physical campus design therefore, can enable cross-pollination and interactions across disciplines.

- Mr. Gomez-Palacio indicated that in the interviews so far, respondents remarked that the east side of the campus is more animated than the west side.
- Mr. Perry agreed that we need “people places” and we need to foster interaction and circulation. As an example, he mentioned that members of the Business Administration department have asked for glass walls, so that activity can be made visible.
- Dr. Blackstone emphasized the role that a new café had in improving interaction across students in the Fine Arts departments.

Mr. Nielsen noted that students wanted to have more interaction with the outdoors (outdoor classrooms perhaps), and also have a way to observe research. They often hear about research at the University, but it remains invisible to them and there is a curiosity there that could further engender their learning and development.

- Dr. Shaw noted that there are increasing challenges and protocols with research off campus and that students would benefit from increased opportunities for experiential learning on campus.

On the topic of outdoor interaction, Dr. Blackstone remarked that there are niche areas where the outdoor campus is engaged, but this is not well communicated across the institution (she provided the example of the tree walks and bird walks available). She states that we don't do a good job sharing this information beyond

specific programs. There exists no institutional knowledge bank about what's going on across campus, and there are no 'self-guided' labels that could improve the way that students engage the campus.

Ms. Simpson added that there might be some value in reviewing the Community Green Mapping materials in gleaning insights for the Engagement Plan and Campus Plan Update.

Ms. Mailloux suggested that the Campus Plan could be a tool that shapes the way that prospective students, staff and faculty understand the UVic campus and community. There could be value in highlighting the ways that the campus currently meets some of the values and goals expressed in the updated Campus Plan.

Mr. Gomez-Palacio concluded the meeting with a summary the key themes emerging, expressed as questions that could become part of the engagement process. Next steps involve *Dialog BC* completing their interview sessions and drafting an Engagement Plan that will be presented at the upcoming Steering Committee meeting on Nov.12<sup>th</sup>, followed by the CPC meeting on Nov.21.

## **5. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm.

## **6. NEXT MEETING –**

STEERING COMMITTEE – November 12, 2014: 4:00 – 5:00 pm ASB Boardroom 110

CPC – November 21, 2014: 1:00 – 2:30 pm ASB Boardroom 120