

University of Washington
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services
October 17, 2013, 10:00 am – 11:30 am
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Introduction
 3. Voting Privileges for Ex-Officio Members
 4. FY14 UW Capital Budget and UW's 10 Year Capital Plan
 5. Odegaard Project Review
 6. Future Agenda Items
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Christie at 10:05 a.m.

2) Introduction

Christie introduced himself and the role of the council. The next couple of meetings will be held in different locations and Christie asked members to be aware of the changes.

3) Voting Privileges for Ex-Officio Members

Christie explained that ex-officio members have voting privileges on the council. Voting privileges for these members are determined when they are nominated by the Senate Executive Committee.

4) FY14 UW Capital Budget and UW's 10 Year Capital Plan

John Seidelmann, Director of Capital and Space Planning with the Office of Planning and Budget, presented the proposed Fiscal Year 2014 (FY14) UW Capital Budget and UW's 10-year Capital Plan.

FY14 UW Capital Budget

Seidelmann distributed an overview of the capital budget for projects in FY14. Seidelmann clarified UW FY14 is July 2013 – June 15, 2014 and is influenced by the state's 2013-15 biennium cycle. The level of funding differs during the biennium cycle and UW is currently seeing the new money that was recently appropriated by the state.

Funding for UW capital projects come from a variety of sources:

- Direct state funding (6%)
- UW Building Account - composed of state-approved allocation of tuition funds (8%)
- Local funds - sources include indirect cost recovery, UW Medical Center, auxiliary events (athletics), donations and grants (34%)

Seidelmann clarified that the UW Building Account is tuition money from UW students that can be allocated to capital projects.

Potential debt is the largest portion of project funding (52%) in the 14FY Capital Budget. The debt is paid off through different revenue sources including indirect cost recovery and tuition. The debt is continuing to be a significant portion of how UW will fund capital projects and will face critical issues as UW moves forward. Debt impacts interest rates and UW's bond rating which is currently at AAA status. Seidelmann explained that the UW Treasury has a goal to keep UW at an AA rating. There are many factors that influence bond ratings which are not connected to the size of the debt, such as the financial health of the institution. UW is not in a critical situation at the moment, but it is important to keep an eye on the size of the debt.

UW's 10 Year Capital Plan

Seidelmann distributed a chart titled "UW 10 Year Capital Plan – Proposed Projects by Tier and Program Use". This is a tool that his office uses to determine the remaining and anticipated funds available for projects across the university. Projects are categorized by the following tiers:

- Tier 1 – Fundamental projects. These projects are considered essential and need to happen.
- Tier 2 – Proposed projects. These projects have the potential to be funded and funding sources are still being determined.
- Tier 3 – Not able to fund. Projects that fall under this category are unlikely to be funded for the next 10 years but are still included for safekeeping. It is possible that a project will move up to Tier 2 depending on funding availability, and whether it fits in with the university's vision for the future.

A question was raised about revenue generated from athletics, such as television rights for sporting events. Athletics is a revenue stream for the university which does influence bond rating agencies when they review UW's entire finances. However, this revenue does not show up on the chart because it does not pertain to the debt, it is classified as a future revenue stream.

This is the office's first attempt to put together all projects and sources of revenue into one place which is useful in identifying projects across campus. Additionally, it provides a way to observe the expansion of different schools and colleges throughout the years. Seidelmann clarified that this is an evolving document and will change as new proposals and revenue sources evolve.

A question was raised asking how the decision is made to fund certain projects and not others. The decision is based on what the university wants to achieve and where it wants to go in the future. Another question was raised asking about the role faculty have in influencing and prioritizing capital projects. The Office of Planning and Budgeting is continuing to work on a process by identifying projects with schools and colleges. Discussion ensued regarding the role of shared governance influencing capital projects across the university. In the past faculty have had little influence, the Office of Planning and Budgeting would just "run it by" the faculty without allowing feedback or input. Seidelmann explained that his office is open to opportunities for feedback. By having this tiered system to identify projects the Office of Planning and Budgeting has provided an opportunity for dialogue.

Discussion moved to fundraising activities. Fundraising is a process that involves faculty cooperation because many alumni have strong relationships with faculty on campus. Additionally, the Office of Planning and Budgeting has been working directly with the Advancement Office to align projects that require funding with opportunities for fundraising activities.

A question was raised asking how a proposed building would fall under the master capital plan if the university is approached by a large donor. This would be a big issue since it requires a site selection process. Seidelmann explained that there are still development sites on campus which fall under the master plan. Discussion ensued regarding site locations.

5) Odegaard Project Review

Steve Tatge, Odegaard Project Manager with the Capital Projects Office, provided a review of the recently-completed renovation of the Odegaard Undergraduate Library.

The renovation project was aggressively scheduled; construction began in June 2012 and completed in August 2013. During the planning process there were a number of aspects of the study which required stakeholder participation to determine the scope of the project. A great deal of work was conducted to analyze the building since the project was just a partial renovation. This was a difficult process and there are still issues that have been unresolved, such as the mechanical system. The charge of the project was to add instructional spaces into the library and optimize square footage. After assessing the building it was realized that there was a lot of real estate that was not being efficiently used. Additionally, the project also focused on incorporating audio/video sources and other technologies, creating flexible learning spaces and consolidating staff into one area of the building.

The scoping exercise was led by a work group including Tatge, Rebecca Barnes and Jill McKinstry to develop a menu of options to incorporate into the project. One of the most innovative outcomes of the work group was the idea of “active learning classrooms” modeled after institutions such as MIT and the University of Minnesota. Tatge commented that Minnesota was very generous in providing support to the work group by describing their experiences with active learning classrooms and identifying areas of improvement. The result was the creation of two active learning rooms in Odegaard which includes a podium station, “data diners” on the perimeter, writing surfaces, and monitors at each work table. The active learning classrooms are relatively large; one fits 90 students while another fits 63. The goal of these classrooms is to allow faculty to incorporate group study sessions into their curriculum while giving them the freedom to move about and facilitate discussions. Use of the rooms depends on how the instructor tailors their curriculum to the resources provided. In the case of Minnesota, the active learning classrooms support courses such as life sciences, language and art.

Tatge expanded on the group study rooms. These are dedicated rooms that have plug-ins for laptops, wall surfaces to write on and media-scape units. Each room can support 6-8 students. Tatge also mentioned that UW created an app that shows which study rooms are available at any given time.

A question was raised about food and drinks in the library. This has been a constant battle and after many discussions it was decided to allow food and drink inside. Tatge mentioned that there is even a vending machine for coffee and snacks.

Tatge discussed additional revisions to the library. A new mezzanine was created to consolidate book processing and library staff. The stairs in the middle of the atrium were removed creating a large public space for students to meet and move about. The third floor was converted into a “quiet floor” with a glass wall insulating noise from the atrium. Tatge also mentioned the project budget was supplemented by the libraries to incorporate a skylight.

A question was raised about security of the building, especially after hours. The library is a 24-hour facility 5 days a week, and requires access with a UW ID after 8 p.m. Security guards are also present and

have the ability to approach individuals to ensure they are allowed in the building. There have always been issues with transients and Odegaard will continue to address this problem.

Discussion moved to nighttime lighting in the atrium. The ceiling is very high and the library uses LED light bulbs that have extended lifespans and do not require constant replacement.

A question was raised asking for more detail on the mechanical system and its limitations. Tatge explained that the library cannot increase its load on the building given its current capacity. During the planning stage of the project several issues were identified for replacement and maintenance. While these issues were not resolved they were forwarded to facilities to address in the future.

6) Future Agenda Items

Christie passed out a list of potential agenda items for the upcoming academic year. Members spent time identifying the items they wish to address and Christie collected the responses.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Christie at 11:25 a.m.

Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst, gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Balick, Mescher, Ozubko
 Ex-Officio Reps: Zuchowski, Byrne, Goldblatt
 Guests: John Seidemann (Director of Capital and Space Planning with the Office of Planning and Budget), Steve Tatge (Odegaard Project Manager, Capital Projects Office)

Absent: **Faculty:** Gates, Proksch
 President's Designee: Kennedy
 Ex-Officio Reps: