

Meeting Minutes – January 30, 2018- 2:00pm-4:00pm

Location: SB Harbor Room

Members Present: Chuck Haines, Ann Jensen Adams, Margaret Klawunn, Martin Shumaker, Beverly Colgate, David Paul, Joel Michaelsen, Hieu Le, Pierre Wiltzius, Henning Bohn, David Marshall

Members Absent: Joe Incandela, Rod Alferness, David Stamps, Patricia Fumerton, Richard Watts

Alternates Present: Frank Castanha, Matthew Fritzler

I. Announcements

A. State Budget Review

Acting Assistant Chancellor, Finance and Resource Management, Chuck Haines reported the state is swapping Proposition 56 money into the UC budget resulting in \$92M net for UC. The governor acknowledges UC is going to meet the criteria stipulated by audit recommendations and expects the state will release the \$50M from sequestration. He considered that part of the basis for which he grew the budget by 3%. Assistant Chancellor Haines noted the state budget for higher education, as published online to the public, is almost entirely dedicated to community college. In part because students had expressed strong opposition to tuition increases at the November Regents' meetings, the UC is planning a concerted effort between students and administration to appeal to the state assembly and state senate for increased funding through the May-Revised process.

Assistant Chancellor Haines confirmed this campus to have received the budget allocation for 2017. New funding decreased by 10% as a result of the end of year to year re-benching.

II. Minutes

The minutes from November 28, 2017 were approved with corrections.

III. Consent Item (none)

IV. Action Items

A. UCen/Student Union Renovation and Expansion

Hieu Le, President, Associated Students (AS), gave a presentation of the UCen/Student Union Renovation and Expansion, a plan to create a more student-oriented facility that addresses physical and mental well-being. The plan updates the goals and objectives of a previous PPP that CPC approved in 2013. Associated Students proposes two sources of funding for the project: donors and undergraduate student fees by referendum.

Le described how historical lows in state-funding, coupled with increased enrollment, are straining departments and hindering the student experience. The university also struggles to offer services that meet ever-increasing student needs such as adequate career advancement opportunities and study space. Prior AS surveys and data indicate a student appetite for improvement. The UCen project represents a unique opportunity to solve two issues at once; to improve student life while addressing imperative building renovations.

Ian Caples, the AS CFO and chair of the UCEN Governance board sub-committee emphasized how the UCen has strayed from the core values of its mission statement. Instead of providing a cultural, social and recreational compliment to the educational experience, Caples reports that the UCen feels more like a shopping mall to students. Its only purpose is to offer them a place to eat and kill time. Meanwhile, the majority of the retail establishments are not profitable. Caples suggested a new approach to the UCen's business model, one that focuses more on student-centered resources and lower operational costs to support students as they proactively maintain their physical, mental, emotional, and social well-being.

The plan is to reinvigorate the UCen to create a functional and aesthetically pleasing facility that capitalizes on its natural surroundings environment (the lagoon) within a budget of \$48M. There would be an entire interior and exterior renovation for modernization, while integrating all the

different sectors of the UCEN under one roof. This would provide for more peer-peer collaboration and an opportunity to showcase student experiential learning. The priority of the facility would be student resources and departments to resemble an actual “University Center”. It represents a shift in campus culture by giving students access to a safe, secure, and controlled environment in contrast to the trappings of student life in Isla Vista.

A slide presentation illustrated the visioning architectural concept of the new building. As a top priority, it proposed a re-location and substantial enlargement of the existing food bank to accommodate a student body that reports 48% as food-insecure. The vision includes a unification of the building from east-to-west and circulation pathways that also serve as student social/study space with views of the lagoon and ocean. New, enhanced main entries on east and west sides and a new communicating stair from the ground level to the lower level would breathe new life into the existing structure. The plan features an enclosed courtyard would at the east entry to the UCen, meeting rooms to support CLAS, redesign of the Corwin Pavilion to provide a more formal, but flexible theater seating for lectures and presentations to support student group meetings, practice and other activities proposed. A Wellness Center would replace the space vacated by Santorini’s Grill and Romaine’s. New construction would accommodate meetings rooms for Student Affairs and Associated Students. There would be an expansion of “The Hub” at the lower level.

This is a fair amount of overlap in terms of building infrastructure systems upgrades and a new remodel. Luke McCrary, chair of the UCEN board gave an overview of the infrastructure needs of the UCEN. Many systems, fixtures and finishes are original to building’s construction in 1966. The building requires revived thermal and moisture protection from repairs to expansion joints and roofing; loading dock repairs, replacements of metal doors, bathroom tile floors, carpet, elevators, and original cast iron water pipes. It also requires new boilers and air-conditioners and new electrical enhancements. The current plan includes infrastructure upgrades in the proposal at a cost of \$4.2M.

Le presented conceptual renderings. One shows an enclosed courtyard looking from east to west through the building expansion. Indicated are social space supporting CLAS, meeting rooms,

senate chambers and Corwin Pavilion for which telescopic seating is proposed to make the pavilion more multi-functional. A rendering of a conceptual exterior façade showed a new east entry, foreground, and a new west entry beyond. It also showed enclosed arcades that would provide space for the innovation labs with views to the pedestrian walk and new kiosks south of the Music Building. The A.S. Food Bank would share the demonstration kitchen space with the Wellness Center. Outside of the UCEN, in a location not yet identified, space is proposed for an enhanced Bike Shop that will provide internal and external workspace, storage space, and an area to showcase items for sale. Further discussion and evaluation of vendor opportunities would be part of the detailed programming phase.

The impact on student fee amounts to \$21 per quarter in what was described as a ‘pre-occupancy’ fee. After 4 years, the fee would increase to \$99 per quarter in year 1 with modest increases each year thereafter. This scenario assumes no donor funding, although AS is pursuing gift funds with the support of Development which could offset the financial burden to students. The point was made that some of the fee increase would be offset by a component that considers financial aid.

Concerns were raised by the committee about lack of consultation with Graduate Student Association and the MCC in the planning. In response, staff offered clarifications about the stages of the approval process and intent for on-going consultation. This planning process is a “visioning” approach intended to establish a scope of work that includes work that the architect pursued in prior initiatives that included feedback from MCC and GSA. In this phase, the project’s goal is to achieve CPC’s recommendation to move forward and establish a debt ceiling for which students would be comfortable financing. Between now and the referendum, the consulting architect is expected to engage with all UCEN building stakeholders, including GSA and MCC. The second phase would include the induction of a building committee, architect selection, and initiation of detailed programming phase.

The committee confirmed that any project that is debt funded must fit within campus’s debt capacity. This project could potentially delay other projects on the horizon. The estimated, pro-

posed Student Fee does not include any assumed donor funding. Development agreed that, without any guarantees, it is reasonable to strive to raise \$5-10 million in donor funds. Should donor funding become available, it would reduce the fee to students. In response to concerns raised about the fee increase imposed on students, the A.S. President Le reminded the committee that the project is based on direct feedback from student groups and is essentially the update of a project that was approved in 2013. The committee voiced serious concerns about the optics of a Student Fee increase to pay for the project given the recent tuition increase debate. Our fees are amongst the highest in the UC. If the project is supported, our student based fees would become the highest in UC. Discussion included concerns that the additional fees would create another financial barrier for prospective students in the future. Students publicly opposed the proposed tuition increase at the recent UC Regents meeting in San Francisco. Students, faculty and staff are concerned about the added financial pressure this puts on students.

The committee noted that the proposed Student Fee is roughly comparable to the proposed tuition increase students are protesting. A.S. President Le reviewed the project's funding assumptions and cited the inclusion of "return to aid" which helps minimize the impact on most students. Despite its initial opposition, GSA was agreeable to the committee's consensus to move forward with the UCEN project, on the condition that the serious concerns that were raised would be conveyed to the Chancellor. The Committee Chair, Chuck Haines, acknowledged that the chancellor would extend consultation prior to his action.

V. Discussion Items

A. Capital Needs Presentation: Division of Humanities and Fine Arts

Dean John Majewski began his presentation by describing the Humanities and Fine Arts as understanding significance and meaning by exploring how individuals, cultures and societies make sense of the world. The division is a diverse collection of disciplines focusing on the humanities, performing arts and humanistic social sciences. It includes 22 departments, programs and centers, offers 29 different undergraduate degrees and is home to more than 260 ladder faculty.

The division has an ascending reputation among institutions of higher education. In recent years, HFA faculty have won fellowships and grants from NEH, ACLS, and Guggenheim. In addition,

Times Education of London ranked UC Santa Barbara in the same range as UNC Chapel Hill, Carnegie Mellon, and Northwestern. Other evidence of academic distinction is also seen in the number of retention cases in last two years, which include UCLA, Stanford, Northwestern, North Carolina, UT Austin, Cornell, Harvard, and MIT.

HFA has a wide variety of interdisciplinary research and teaching initiatives. Areas include the Digital Arts and Humanities, Environmental Humanities, Cognitive Science and Humanities, Global Humanities (Middle East, East Asian, Latin America), Civic Engagement and Public Humanities and Performing Arts.

Space requirements for HFA focus on four themes. The first involves spaces that support innovative ways of investigating and sharing knowledge. The new HFA generation has very different space needs. Unlike traditional office-based research and classroom teaching, this new generation requires digital and gaming labs, maker spaces, specialized labs, visual art production and display as well as community engagement spaces. Examples of these new space types include Film & Media Studies' Wireframe Studio, HFA's Digital Arts & Humanities Commons, History of Art & Architecture's Digital Learning Lab, Phonology Labs in Linguistics and Music's Cognition Lab.

Secondly, the division has a public-facing role that makes it unique from other academic units on campus. For example, the AD&A Museum, Department of Art, Media Arts and Technology, Department of Music, Theatre/Dance and CWC's Pollock Theater welcome tens of thousands of visitors to campus each year. Establishing and maintaining spaces that support and host these events creates distinctive space needs for the division.

Given the size and complexity of the division, HFA has a fairly small I&R footprint of approximately 165,000 assignable square feet. The traditional planning model calculates a current space deficit of 87,000 asf. However, the division proposes that the planning model be updated to reflect the additional requirement for collaborative spaces and labs. The updated assessment increases the deficit to 107,000 asf.

Lastly, HFA has concerns about the aging infrastructure its buildings as 66% of HFA space is more than 49 years old. The Music Building, Phelps Hall, South Hall and Theater & Dance East

are four vital academic buildings that fall into this category and represent over \$100M in deferred maintenance.

To help address the space needs outlined above, the following list summarizes HFA's priority projects.

- Music Building - Seismic Safety and Renewal including the relocation of the music library as well as renovated rehearsal and performance spaces
- Comprehensive plan to address mounting space deficit and aging infrastructure
- New Classroom Building with collaborative teaching space including a permanent home for Digital Arts & Humanities Commons
- Hatlen Plaza renewal providing more inviting outdoor space for events and collaborative events (donor)
- Museum collection preservation & storage space at Devereux (donor)
- Permanent home for the HFA Development team

During the discussion that followed the presentation, Dean Majewski confirmed that many teaching spaces are outdated and increasingly, departments have significant technical requirements. HFA has been updating specific rooms on an ad hoc basis to make better use of space and encourage more collaboration. However, the space deficits and aging infrastructure faced by many campus units are large problems that need campus-wide solutions.

VI. Information & Follow-up Items

A. Status Report: Special Projects Subcommittee (*B. Colgate*)

No report

B. Status Report: Design Review Committee (*J. Michaelson*)

No report

C. Status Report: Faculty & Staff Housing (*J. Michaelson*)

A. Status Report: Student Housing (*R. Watts*)

B. Status Report: Major Capital Projects (*attached*)

II. Correspondence

Meeting adjourned at 3:16p.m.

Minutes taken by Carolyn Franco, Office of Budget & Planning