**Council on Campus Planning and Usage (CCPU)**

**MINUTES**

Friday, February 22, 2019

2 – 2:35 PM

Chicago Room, University Union

PRESENT: Fetene Gebrewold (Public Health), Jongho Lee (Political Science/Secretary), Duke Oursler (Art), Tom Sadler (Economics), Erin Taylor (Political Science/Chair)

ABSENT: Katharine Pawelko (RPTA), Troy Rhoads (Facilities Management/ex-officio), Roger Viadero (Environmental Studies/ex-officio)

At the beginning of the meeting, the previous meeting’s minutes were approved unanimously. Taylor then presented two topics the committee needed to discuss at the meeting—the development of a report on findings from the CCPU Faculty Space Needs Survey and the creation of a new list of peer institutions. Taylor asked Lee and Sadler to look at data from the survey and produce a rough draft of a report summarizing key findings from the survey next week. Oursler suggested that the report look more like an executive summary. Taylor indicated that she would create a google drive for the survey so that a draft of the report could be shared among the members of the committee as it is being completed. The draft of the report is to be discussed at the next meeting.

On the topic of the creation of a new list of peer institutions, Sadler asked whether criteria for choosing peer institutions had been provided by the faculty senate. Oursler pointed out that it would have been ideal if the faculty senate specified criteria for selecting peer institutions. Gebrewold asked about the intent of creating a list of peer institutions at this time. Taylor responded by stating that the previous list of peer institutions had been created by the social responsibility committee a number of years ago and is obviously outdated. She also indicated that without any specific guidance from the faculty senate, the CCPU should proceed with setting up a set of criteria for selecting peer institutions and then develop a list of peer institutions drawing on that set of criteria.

In choosing peer institutions, Lee pointed out that two separate questions—who we are and who we want to be—would need to be answered and the matter of which of the two questions is more important should be decided. Lee also stated that the process of selecting peer institutions could be subjective and politicized to advance specific interests. Oursler reacted by emphasizing that the CCPU should make the process as transparent as possible. Sadler, Gebrewold, and Oursler then discussed several possible criteria the CCPU could use. Taylor stated that she would create another google drive for members of the CCPU to continue to brainstorm about how best to proceed.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:35PM.