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The committee met twice as a full committee, once each during the spring and winter quarters, having been without a chair in Fall 2001. Most of the committee’s deliberations involved discussions of ways to address the concerns raised in the 2000 annual report about full consultation with the Academic Senate by administrative offices responsible for capital planning and building programs and appropriate ways to involve the committee as early as possible in planning processes. In addition, the committee met with Assistant Vice Chancellor Sandoval to discuss classroom assignment and scheduling practices. The committee also joined the Advisory Committee for a meeting with the consultants charged with the update of the campus Long Range Development Plan. The committee chair routinely attended meetings of the divisional Advisory Committee. The committee chair also joined the chair of the division as a senate representative to the Capital Program Advisory Committee (CPAC) which met three times during the academic year.

In response to last year’s report, the committee charged the chair to contact all responsible campus administrators reminding them of the long standing campus practice of appointing members of this committee to all capital planning, program and building committees, a practice that for whatever reason has not been honored over the past three years. The result has been hopeful. A representative of the committee has been appointed to the working group of the Long Range Development plan, to the Leadership Committee of the Long Range Development Plan, to the building committee of the Alumni/Visitors’ Center, to the building committee of Engineering II and to the building committee of Biological Science I. In addition, AC Bolar has agreed to meet with the committee early in Fall Quarter to allow the committee to be fully informed on all physical resource initiatives.

Despite these hopeful signs of more regular and appropriate consultation, we must regretfully concur with last year’s report that a number of campus projects, for whatever reason, have moved from inception to near completion without full divisional consultation, including appropriate representation from this committee. As nearly as we can determine from our records, these include the following projects: Chemical Sciences, Undergraduate Student Housing Expansion (Pentland I), Insectary and Quarantine Facility, Campus Surge Building, Science Laboratories I, Physical Science I and Geology renovation. In addition, we cannot find any record of committee consultation on a number of seismic upgrade projects of the past three years. Consultation with the division on these projects seems to have consisted of CPAC briefings or after the fact reports to the division. Faculty members have participated in some fashion on all of these projects, but usually as departmental users rather than as representatives of the division or this committee. We hasten to add, however, that the
committee is now being kept fully informed of physical resource issues and we look forward to a cooperative consultative and advisory role in the future.

The committee takes this opportunity to urge all Senate members to participate as fully as possible in the open meetings of the LRDP consultant group over the next few weeks. As last year’s report pointed out, the relationship of the campus academic plan should be central to campus space planning, and the LRDP update process will be an opportunity to all divisional members, not just those on this committee, to ensure this outcome.
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