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The committee, as the full committee, met twice this year to discuss the role of this committee in advising the administration upon the building out of the campus. Most of the committees deliberations were concerned with how to effectively interact with the current plans and how to influence future plans by debate. The Chair routinely met with the Senate Advisory Committee.

The Associate Chancellor, G. Bolar who is currently the “chief building planning officer” in the administration, increased our interactions by inviting us to several briefing sessions regarding the long term plans of the campus (SCOPE Presentation in February), the Surge Building for expansion of space for Mathematics, Computer Sciences, and Economic (and includes a 600 seat lecture hall) in April, and the Student Dormitories Futures (in May). These briefing sessions still do not allow for a timely feedback as most of the major decisions had already been made by others in the administration. In particular, the 600 seat lecture hall decision was made by the administration a few weeks before we were briefed, thus eliminating any real Senate Input. According to AC Bolar the decision was made by him after consulting a few faculty members. Still the briefing is a healthy opening for discussions compared with other years.

The Campus has begun to generate long range academic plan (UCR 2010) on which the Chair served upon two committees, the Campus Plan and the Graduate Students. This Campus plan is so critical to making logical decision as to what kind of buildings are needed and where to build these buildings. It is the committee’s feeling from the briefing sessions that we have not yet fully integrated any academic plan with plans for future buildings. The administration still seem to make building decisions based upon current immediate needs rather than any real dialog between all members of the campus community.

The final conclusion is that this committee can not function effectively without active and effective discussions including a meaningful feedback with all portions of the administration, including the various deans, and we still do not know how to do this.
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