UNIVERSITY PLANNING COMMITTEE
The University Faculty Senate
Minutes

8:30 to 10:30 AM, October 22, 2013
214 Business Bldg


1. Approval of Minutes of September 10, 2013 UPC committee meeting. minutes approved

2. Announcements by the Chair
   a. Information from Roger Egolf's discussion with Chet Ray from the Research Committee about the Indirect Cost Research Report: They are interested in expanding the report to include how indirect costs are determined for various units. Ray will pass this along to the controller. we may want to do a joint meeting with the Research committee. We will participate in this informational report. The comptroller will visit the Research Committee and put together an informational report for the full Senate.
   b. Regarding engaged scholarship -- we need to compile our section of the report to answer the charge. Roger Egolf will work on this and send a draft to the committee for feedback.

3. Brief updates from administrative liaisons in UPC
   a. Physical Plant and Resources – Ford Stryker
      • request for four architectural consultations: food prep building, mushroom research facility, York Ruhl Student Center.
      • Two authorizations in the works: Woodland building (Abington), LionPATH project (student information system, isis being replaced). These should be authorized by the Board.
      • The gas line project is moving along well.
   b. Development & Alumni Relations – Dave Lieb
      • 90% of campaign time has elapsed, and 94% of goal has been met. He is confident that we will reach the $2B goal. Expect a new campaign to commence shortly thereafter.
   c. University Budget Office – Rachel Smith
      • robust planning has begun regarding five year planning. The office will be incorporating aspects of the Budget Planning Task Force report, including tuition and instructional capacity.
      • Student leaders have asked to meet with the office to discuss the financial impact on Penn State if they agreed to freeze tuition for 2014-15 (this is not feasible).
      • Roger Egolf questioned whether there would be a new tuition policy in place for students taking over 19 credits. Response was that this has been a fairly open effort and is a policy that they are discussing. Claudia Brown asked if the
recommendations were available on-line and Rachel Smith expressed interest in making them so.

d. Office of Planning & Institutional Assessment – Michael Dooris
   - Middle States process: self study and visit will culminate in spring 2015, in the first phase. Steering committee will get a draft to Middle States in fall 2014. Working groups have been formed. Senators should start seeing the draft document in early spring. Our Chair hopes to invite Nick Jones in to our committee to discuss strategic planning. Status of search for president (question from Brian Reeves): Expect a selection to be made soon, possibly by the end of the semester.

4. Mandated Reports
   a. University Budget Report – January or March 2014 -- Ford Stryker gave an update: Chris Hurly might come to speak about housing developments on the campuses. He would speak mainly about the capital plan. Our Chair is interested in campuses that have new housing programs, Brandywine and Abington, in particular. Question from Bill Carlsen: has there been any discussion regarding short-term housing for World Campus students who are taking blended classes? Ford Stryker felt that the housing program might have some concerns regarding short term housing due to the need to keep housing at capacity to maintain their budget. Claudia Brown asked about the traveling component with joint programs among numerous campuses. General consensus that we should investigate the idea of temporary housing.
   b. Space Allocation and Utilization – Web only report in March 2014
   c. Construction – Construction Capital Plan report to be given at this afternoon’s Senate meeting. Ford Stryker gave us a preview with extra details at this committee meeting.
      - Five year capital plan and borrowing authority -- focused on renewal of existing facilities rather than building additional space. 35% of building space is over 50 years old and has not been renovated -- these are past due for updates. 30% of space is 25-50 years old -- more problematic -- 60s-70s buildings often don't have strong internal structures and functionality. Focus on renewal/replacement vs. new. plan is also about *balance* -- need to balance University Park with campuses (3:1) target.
      - Balance types of projects: whole buildings, system renewal (fix flawed systems -- plumbing, electric, etc.), infrastructure, IT systems, new construction (for example, new data centers and housing).
      - For renewal: focus on underinvested and/or strong programs with great potential for growth. Systems replacement: focus on worst problems.
      - Funding sources: capital plan reserves, borrowing, unit reserves/other (gifts, student facility fees, unit funds, etc.), state capital, major maintenance.
      - Total new spending projected as 2.74 billion over the next five years.
      - Allocation by unit: majority in education and general, also includes auxiliary and business services (housing and food), athletics, Hershey, and energy savings program. Main goal of supporting educational mission.
      - Allocation by project type within education and general: majority in new additions/renewals and renovations, also includes infrastructure, system upgrades, it/research equipment, and major maintenance. self supporting units: majority goes to major maintenance, especially in Hershey.
      - "Life of a Penn State project": BOT approves: capital plan, architect selection, final
plan approval, construction report.

- Keith Nelson expressed interest in maintaining continuity and aesthetic appeal across UP areas and campuses. Ford Stryker noted that FBAB members can sit on design boards and that much time is invested in addressing aesthetics.
- Projects under $5 million do not require BOT approval but they are reported to the Board. Capital plan development requires input from a wide array of people and units. Much academic input comes through deans. Many, many factors play a role - finite resources collide with nearly unlimited demand/interest in new building. This is just a five year plan, new plans will be developed for future years. Projects are listed at www.opp.psu.edu/capital-plan


6. Old Business -- engaged scholarship discussion -- question: how can the University strategic planning process enable general education and engaged scholarship to be a key aspect of every student's experience and become identifiable with the Penn State brand?

- There is interest in involving members of the engaged scholarship committee in strategic planning. Also interest in letting unit leaders know that this is going to be an initiative.
- Bill Carlsen raised concerns regarding increased engagement in the world possibly diminishing the scholarly/intellectual independence that is traditionally associated with the academy.
- Bill Sellner raised concerns regarding a top-down approach to integrating new policies, especially regarding promotion and tenure.
- Mary Miles and Claudia Brown emphasized that it is really important for the Engaged Scholarship Committee to recognize activities that are *already* happening. Lots of engaged scholarship happens in the English 202s and in HDFS
- Keith Nelson expressed interest in long-term assessment of the impact of engaged scholarship and other activities on future career and social engagement. He is interested in gathering data and doing a longitudinal study. Can we create a recommendation to the General Education and Engaged Scholarship Committees regarding increased creativity? Can we then test for it and demonstrate flexible, creative, thinking?
- General agreement that creativity is an important theme that should be integrated into the discussions of General Education and Engaged Scholarship. Interest in discussing these ideas further.

7. New Business -- Bill Carlsen suggested a future discussion on the issue of reporting. We spend so much time on the production of reports and some might be redundant and retrospective. It might be ideal if we could be involved in the actual planning. General agreement that we should strive for more active involvement in the planning phases.

8. Adjournment

Minutes submitted by Roger Egolf, Committee Chair