## 2017-2018 Year-End Committee Report Form

**Committee:**  Campus Planning Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair:</th>
<th>Chair-Elect for 2018-2019:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Silke Higgins (co-chair)  
Craig Clements (co-chair) | Silke Higgins  
silke.higgins@sjsu.edu |
| **Number of Meeting held:** | 4                                    |
|                 | 408-808-2118 (Please include phone/zip/email if available) |

### Items of Business Completed 2017/2018

The Campus Planning Board used this academic year’s meetings to begin the committee’s restructuring process.

### Unfinished Business Items from 2017/2018

The committee did not work on specific tasks, thus there is no unfinished business.

### New Business Items for 2018/2019

Over the course of the academic year 2018/19, the committee is expected to shift from theoretical discussion about the future of the CPB to active restructuring.

Due to the fact that the committee meets no more than four times per semester, the process is expected to take at least one academic year.

---

**Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by May 31, 2018.**
MINUTES

(a) Call to Order/Introductions

Members Present
Silke Higgins
Craig
Etc.

Members Absent
Daniel No
Barry Shiller

(b) Public Forum – No public forum

(c) Old Business

(1) Review End of Year Committee Report – The following items are on the unfinished items from 2016/17: Preserving “the bricks” naming, way finding signage, water fountain’s functionality, campus construction, bike related, landscape master plan review, FD&O planning committee.

(d) New Business

(1) Call for New Agenda Items – Silke opened the floor to discuss possible future items of the agenda. The final consensus was to prioritize the following items discussed as well as the items from our old business to decide which ones to focus on for the upcoming year:

   I. Skateboarders creating unsafe conditions.
   II. Pesticides. The group seemed interested in learning more about what is used on the campus and if is safe for people and animals.
   III. How to “educate all members of the campus community.” The group agreed that this would be a good idea but not sure about the best way to go about pursuing this.
   IV. Follow ups request – so we have old and new business on the agenda and minutes
   V. Correcting human made alternative paths through grass areas
   VI. Possible polls or forum and outreach to gain community input on CBP projects.

(e) Adjourned

Meeting adjourned at about 1:30pm.
Campus Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Fall Semester 2017, November 14, 2017

Meeting held at Clark Hall 412

Note Taker: Clements

Present: Bailey, Chang, Clements (co-chair), Drury, Higgins (co-chair), Jeon, Jones, Kemnitz, No, Rabin, San Fratello, Virick
Absent: Shaffer
Invited Guest: Shriel Deogracias

1. The Project Unity Tree Into Action.
A presentation by Shriel Deogracias was given to the CPB where the project motivation and vision was described. In addition, the CPB was provided a hard copy of the project proposal that included the project scope and motivation, timeline, projected costs and potential locations on campus.

The Project Unity Tree (PUT) is an actual statue that will be in the shape of the tree.

The CPB asked a number of questions and made a number of comments regarding the project. First, the committee commended Shriel for the excellent proposal document. Potential locations proposed was between SPX and MacQuarrie Hall and it was suggested that where it can go may be different from where the group may want it to go. Additionally, there was a suggestion to make sure the statue is made robust so that parts do not fail. For example, leaves may be weak and fall off the statue. Another suggestion was to make sure it is made of material that can withstand weathering and graffiti. Additionally, make sure that the statue can not be climbed for safety. A potential location was suggested where the PUT could be placed in the row of trees that surround Tower Lawn.

In summary, the CPB is very supportive and asked to be kept in the loop and looks forward to working with PUT Into Action as they further develop their project.

2. FDO Updates
   a. Updates on current projects:
      
      ● Aquatic / Rec Center: estimated March 2019 completion date.
      ● MLK library: completed glass railing in atrium.
Campus water well: being installed between South Parking Garage and Duncan Hall. The well is 600 feet deep and will provide the campus with potable water. To be completed by summer 2018.

Old heath building, renovation still going on, Jan 2018 completion date.

b. FDO campus planning and steering committee.

The goal is to help create a master facilities campus plan. The committee (10 members, architect, academic planner) conducted a study to investigate, campus-wide, where would be right location for new buildings and demolition in order to meet future needs. Waiting for strategic planning results to develop plan further. End result is for planning next 5-10 years of potential construction projects, etc. Strategic planning document is not yet available in final form.

This plays a role in class planning. Turns out there is plenty of academic space on campus, but not at ideal times.

Discussion on white board space in classrooms. It was suggested how to contact FDO to remove poster boards in classrooms.

3. Next Meeting

Next meeting will involve looking at the use of the chemical Round-up on campus, and issues of parking for faculty and staff.
1. Welcome back and general discussion.
The committee discussed at length the role of the CPB, its charge and related tasks. Senate Chair Frazier had asked the CPB to discuss the roles added to the Campus Planning Board’s charge after the dissolution of the Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee, as laid out in S15-10. Furthermore, Chair Shifflett of the Organization & Government Committee had asked the CPB to consider the CPB’s current charge and membership and to discuss whether any updates should be made to either/both.

At present the CPB is a Special Agency committee with advisory function to the President. During the meeting, the CPB discussed the need to have a more inclusive role in campus planning decisions. The following points were addressed:

- Is it possible to group charges together in order to design a set of more well-defined charges? What can the CPB do to be effective?

- It was agreed that the campus does need a Planning Board. As currently, the BPB’s role is restricted to advisory function, the CPB’s role could be proactive and strive towards improving the campus, as well as the lives of students and faculty. It was decided that the CPB should actively engage in determining what the problems are, and subsequently work towards providing recommendations for solutions to the President.

- The Campus Planning Board should have a more active role in campus planning, with some decision / voting capacity. CPB seeks to be given a more prominent role.

2. Goals for the semester
1. Change charge of CPB with advice from Senate Chair Frazier, and Organization & Government Chair Shifflett.
2. Develop a campus-wide survey using Qualtrics for students, staff, and faculty and analyze these data. Submit survey questions to Stuart Ho, IEA.
3. If feasible, given the apparent time constraints, develop a policy for use of pesticides/herbicides on campus, provide solutions to FD&O Grounds Maintenance.

3. Tasks for the March 13 Meeting
   1. Develop Qualtrics Questionnaire.
      - Chang will start a document for CPB members to add questions to.
      - CPB members submit questions to a Google doc for discussion at next CPD meeting
      - CPB to finalize questions and format and submit to Stuart Ho.

   2. Meet with Senate Chair Stephan Frazier and Organization & Government Chair Shifflett.
      - Higgins will determine whether one or both will be able to attend the March meeting.
Campus Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Spring Semester 2018, March 13, 2018

Meeting held at Clark Hall 412

Note Taker: Clements

Present: Aggarwal, Akil, Alvardo, Bailey, Chang, Clements (Co-Chair), Gerami, Higgins (Co-Chair), Jeon, Jones, Kemitz, Shaffer

Absent: Rabin, San Fratello

Guests: Stefan Frazier (Chair, Academic Senate), and Bethany Shifflett (Chair, Organization and Government Senate Policy Committee)

1. Discussion—Role of CPB

What are we currently doing, what we should do, and what we would like to do?

More hands on and focused on being active.

We are at end of master plan process. This group is at lesser matters, landscaping and monuments. We should avoid making things harder, people getting involved in things that may slow down process.

Keeping master planning and campus development team (i.e., administration) separate from the planning board. This may hold up the process?

Timing is right for campus planning board to re-envision itself because of strategic planning.

Is there a natural process to funnel things/issues through CPB? How to bring

Historically, FD&O would bring issues and plans to the CPB. This has not been the case as Daniel No is no longer at FD&O. There is no Rep for FD&O. This needs to be addressed.

How can this committee proceed on making decisions on anything historic? We need processes in place, how we operate, how we report our functions to community.

We need more follow-up of proposed projects. No follow-up after presentations made to the CPB.
Do not feel limited by what we may think others think we should be. Just change as we see fit.
Bylaw 10-special agencies.
Meetings should be attended by AS student members.

Also, what may help with organization is to help What could help is to label as an **Discussion Item,** **Action Item,** or **Information Item.** (i.e., letter of support would be an action item.)

Do we need two CoSS reps on this board?
   - Maybe we should have an arborist on the board or keep the biology position and ax the meteorologist!

Can the CPB make it so that issues would have to be run through CPB? We should represent the campus community and planning on-campus.
   - CPB does not have to remain a special agency. We can change its (such as Drug and Alcohol Policy)

CPB can’t develop a campus-wide survey. We may be able to build upon data from the campus strategic planning effort to help us with these needed data.

CPB is “soul searching.” Can CPB get a survey completed to help with our direction?
   - Maybe survey by college.

Need more clarity: lesser structures, inside or outside.
   - **Proactive** – build into periodical environmental scan of campus structures. **Then we make recommendations on changes—making us proactive.**
Campus Planning Board Meeting Minutes  
Spring Semester 2018, April 10, 2018

Meeting Held at Clark Hall 412

Note Taker: Aggarwal

Present: Aggarwal, Higgins (Co-Chair), Jeon, Jones  
Absent: Akil, Bailey, Chang, Clements (Co-Chair), Drury, Gerami, Kemitz, McKinnon, Rabin, San Fratello, Shaffer, Virick

Discussion

1. The discussion started with focusing on the need to define the role of CPB.  
2. Aggarwal suggested that the CPB could reach out to other CSUs to find out if they have a CPB and what it is they do. Ideally, the CPB should look at all 23 CSU campus to see how their roles compare with SJSU CPB.  
   a. CPB could inquire about their reporting structure, asking whether or not other CPBs’ write a report, collaborate with other committees, their level of impact on their respective campuses (and beyond), and what projects it is they have undertaken lately.
3. The CPB would like to set up a meeting with the President in order to receive input about what she would like the CPB to be/do.
4. CPB should contact FD&O in order to ask that a representative of the FDO attend CPB meetings on a regular basis.
5. The Question was raised if the CPB could have a presence in the senate. That is, could the CPB make itself known as a committee, present updates (e.g. like the Athletics Board)?
6. Strategic Planning Steering Committee: Part of their mission sounds like what the CPB is doing – their goal is physical campus development. Why is the CPB not involved/consulted?
7. The CPB should get involved in or attempt to generate projects that unite campus activities. As an example, the Virtual Reality Group is looking for space on campus to host a virtual reality lab. It was proposed that one of the CPB’s roles could be that committees like these can approach the board to request a lab space. The committee in turn could approach the university to allocate the type of space which would best suit the group’s need but also have a positive impact on the greater SJSU community. Doing so would relieve pressure off of individual departments to find space, and possibly consolidate multiple efforts of similar nature.
8. CPB needs to devise a way to distribute surveys about what is needed/wanted by the campus community. Surveys appear to becoming increasingly difficult to administer, creating a bottle neck with trying to figure out the needs of campus. Ideally, such surveys should come from “higher up” in order to ensure that the survey not only meets all standards and mandates, but also results in a better response rate.
9. Going forward, the CPB is thinking to utilize Zoom in order to accommodate members who cannot attend meetings. However, the decision when to use Zoom will remain with the CPB Chair(s) in order to avoid members using Zoom as a permanent means to “attend” the in-person meeting.
1. Continuation of Discussion on the Future of the Campus Planning Board (CPB)
   ● Higgins reported on the follow-up conversation with Senate Chair Frazier:
     ○ The purpose of the CPB is not to go out and seek work, but rather to be given appropriate tasks by the President’s Office.
     ○ Chair Frazier and Higgins discussed whether the CPB should be turned into an ad-hoc committee.
       ■ Agreed that unless the President’s Office decides otherwise, this would be a viable option.
     ○ Chair Frazier agreed to contact Senate chairs of other CSUs in order to inquire as to whether SJSU’s sister organizations have CPBs, and if so, what roles they fulfill on their campuses.
     ○ CPB chair(s) should try to get onto the President’s calendar if possible to obtain Dr. Papazian’s vision for the CPB; if not possible, chair(s) should try to consult with an appropriate member of the President’s Office.
   ● CPB group discussion following Higgins’ report:
     ○ Chief of Staff Bailey saw the restructuring of the CPB to an ad-hoc committee as a viable option, confirming that the president would rather see a group that comes together when needed instead of meeting on a regular basis without specific goals or objectives.
     ○ Bailey said that getting on the President's calendar would be challenging; Bailey agreed to work with the CPB chair(s) to undergo preliminary discussions, and to consult with the President at opportune moments

2. Campus Planning Board Chair Succession
   ● Higgins’ term on the CPB is ending at the end of the academic year 2017/18; there is a very real possibility that the General Unit seat will go to another faculty member.
   ● CPB members should be prepared for this eventuality, and consider stepping up to be the next chair.
     ○ It is possible to have a co-chair, or a vice-chair.

3. Meeting Room for Academic Year 2018/19
   ● Deputy Provost Kemnitz kindly extended his invitation to let the CPB use the Provost’s Conference Room in Clark Hall 412 for the academic year 2018/19.