



## Facilities Planning & Management

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

### MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

#### Campus Planning Committee

February 22, 2024

Hybrid Meeting

Bascom Hall– Room 260 + Virtual WebEx

8:30am to 10:30am

*NOTE: Reference meeting recording on [CPC website](#)*

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Present: Jenna Alsteen, Cathy Arnott Smith, Josh Goldman, Yevgenya Grinblat, Yoshiko Herrera, Provost Charles Isbell, Bret Larget, Kurt Paulsen, Paul Peppard, Tonia Pittman, Tom Prunell, Doug Reindl, Doug Sabatke, Lindsey Stoddard Cameron, Mark Wells

Excused: Kate Corby, Diana Hess, Alex Lynn, Ian Robertson, Deneen Wellik, Eric Wilcots

FP&M: Lexie Baslington, Jim Bogan, Angie Bollinger, Kirsten Coe, Sadie Derouin, David Gerber, Hayden Groot, Chad Hinman, Lindsey Honeyager, Patrick Kass, Molly Lenz, Brent Lloyd, Jesse Luckey Winters, Missy Nergard, Madeline Norton, Holly O'Higgins, Ginny Routhe, Manny Tarin, Margaret Tennessen, Scott Utter, Aaron Williams, Mila Yasko

Guests: Chris Bruhn, Dan Byerly, Pete Davis, Lisa Forrest, Joel Gerrits, Kristen Henrickson, Ryan Pingel, Kurt Stephenson, Kate Sullivan, Amy Van Aartsen

a. Provost Isbell, committee chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30am.

#### 2. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 19, 2023. **(ACTION ITEM)**
- **Motion to approve by Stoddard Cameron, second by Paulsen**  
**Minutes approved unanimously.**

#### 3. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Van Hise Plaque Test – Committee on Disability, Access and Inclusion **(ACTION ITEM)**
- Presentation by Professor Lisa Forrest and Amy Van Aartsen of the CDAI committee.
  - Reference Presentation: *What's in a Name? Charles Van Hise and the history of eugenics at UW-Madison*: <https://diversity.wisc.edu/2022/12/whats-in-a-name-charles-van-hise-and-the-history-of-eugenics-at-uw-madison/>
  - Plaque text:  
The Legacy of Charles Van Hise

Charles Van Hise was a professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison from 1879 to 1903, after which he served as president until 1918. As president, Van Hise offered the best-known articulation of the Wisconsin Idea. He was also an advocate of eugenics. Eugenicians seek to justify discrimination against marginalized people whom they deem unfit based on individual and group

characteristics and identities. The impact of eugenics can be seen not only in the genocides of the 20th century but also, for example, in discriminatory immigration practices and involuntary sterilization laws. As UW-Madison strives to serve the people of Wisconsin and the world, the legacy of Van Hise reminds us that we must acknowledge and grapple with all parts of our past and our present to move forward together.

Committee on Disability, Access and Inclusion – 2024

*(braille to reference the QR code to be applied in sticker form to the plaque)*

- Paulsen: Do we have plaques with QR codes on them as the Signage and Wayfinding ad hoc committee ultimately supported not having QR codes for signage on campus.
    - Williams: Correct, we do not allow QR codes on exterior signage. For interior signage applications the ability for a monitored QR code to tell a broader story in multiple languages seems appropriate.
    - Reindl: Help me reconcile if the legacy of Van Hise is mostly good or mostly evil.
      - Forrest: He was mostly good along with others on campus with similar views and feelings on eugenics. At the time research was breeding out traits in animals and eugenicists were seeking ways to apply this to humans.
      - Reindl: Was there consideration about a plaque identifying the greater issue of eugenics on campus as he wasn't the only one?
      - Forrest: He is singled out because the building is named after Van Hise.
      - Van Aartsen: He was a complicated individual like all of us.
      - Reindl: Was Van Hise unique in his views during this time or was this also occurring at other higher education institutions?
      - Van Aartsen: He was focused on because of the building name and his well-documented advocacy around eugenics.
    - Stoddard Cameron: The fact that the building is named after him and the fact that he was the president is articulated. He had a unique platform and exercised a lot of power. We could have multiple explanations across campus, but this message is an important statement to make in this space. The context matters.
    - Grinblat: The QR code and website is where the discussion can and should happen as a plaque alone will not be fully informative of such a complex topic.
    - Provost: The last sentence is attempting to get there is no good vs. evil, we are pointing out that an important person with a voice and platform definitely did very important things, but also advocated for other things that most would agree were mistaken. This is less about Charles Van Hise and more about the complicated nature of all people and we have to admit all sides of people and grapple with that reality in a place of higher education.
    - Paulsen: One of the thirty-one existing heritage plaques is extolling Charles Van Hise and the Wisconsin Idea. Ultimately, I'm supporting the plaque, the text and the context because it is the right way to go with a robust process. I appreciate the work of the committee in creating the text.
    - Peppard: Is it a fair connection of the Charles Van Hise to genocide?
      - Stoddard Cameron: Wisconsin was a state that had an extraordinarily large percentage of forced sterilizations in women. There was also a recent 'Go Big Read' book that discussed this topic and therefore I feel comfortable with the language as presented.
  - **Motion to approve plaque language as presented and located inside the Van Hise building lobby (exact location TBD) by Stoddard Cameron second by Paulsen.**
  - **Opposition: 1**
  - **Motion passes**
- b. Biennial Campus Budget (BCB) Ranking as submitted to UW System
- 2025-27 Capital Budget timeline and status review.
  - Discussion with committee to review thoughts on most recent BCB process.

- Alsteen: Made the assumption that there was a pre-described process to the review, but it felt like every time we met a piece of that process changed. Was appreciative of the provided resources to understand all the needs on campus, but more difficult to discern priorities. An example of scope change would be the quantity of one-pagers to review and the biennium to focus on.
- Alsteen: It appeared our charge was dissipating over time. While I fully trust FP&M's expertise on this process it could have been better laid out to contextual the entire process.
- Pittman: It was helpful to meet and ask questions, but it did not feel the committee's role around ranking a project per a rubric was effective.
- Arnott-Smith: The templates that the SCD's are given to fill out varied in their information provided across submissions which made 1:1 review difficult. Ensure this information is obvious and complete to lessen burden on reviewing members.
- Larget: As a non-voting member it was not clear to the expectations around my role. It was beneficial to not have a review of every project, but the most current biennium projects should be presented and/or re-presented so the committee is hearing the most accurate information.
- Paulsen: Previously we have seen every SCD presentation. We learned a lot but it took a lot of time. I do not know how to balance that beneficial context and time requirement. The rubric gives a degree that there is a precision to these numbers when actually it is quite arbitrary to the extent that we are rank ordering projects that we know will not get funded. Typically, capital budgeting starts with the total budget allowed and you prioritize items to fit within the given amount to meet needs. Here, it is simply a priority listing with no knowledge of how much funding is actually available.
  - Provost: what is the committee trading off?
  - Paulsen: Seeing all of the projects all of the time and the required length of time of the committee and FP&M/SCD's to prepare necessary materials.
  - Provost: Would more information positively impact the evaluation?
  - Paulsen: More information alone has not revealed 'better' rankings in the past.
- Reindl: FP&M could present a 1-slide overview of each project during a presentation, ask committee which projects they might want to see more in-depth out of that information.
- Alsteen: I would appreciate more leading by FP&M as the experts.
- Pittman: Help committee members understand what it means to represent the groups they are representing as it relates to the budget. It would also be helpful to know what project impacts other projects. Understanding the ordering of projects would be more helpful.
- Goldman: What is more important ultimately? To be an aligned ranking amongst the entities or the discussion and comments that went along with the ranking?
- Provost: The reasonable use of this committee is to provide a ranking and why is that what this committee should be focused on? Is there something else that the committee should be doing to provide the most impact and benefit to the process and the institution?
- Stoddard-Cameron: The committee is here to consider the evidence made available to them and assess and concur if they agree with the experts in the field. It is also important that shared governance has a voice in that process. During the presentations of projects not in the current biennium it is educational to the committee to understand the broader picture and how the pieces fit together. There is great benefit to the committee to have the long-term perspective to provide meaningful insight.
- Tennesen: There is a broader discussion that will occur about the role of CPC forthcoming.
- Grinblat: Having been a part of this process previously it is frustrating in that there are so many needs. This past process was an improvement over the 2021-23 process. It will be helpful to understand what the desired role of CPC should be and how that is made operational. Potentially, should there be other avenues for faculty to engage with this process and FP&M specific to the needs of the university?
- Provost: There is a diffuse and decentralized process put into capital projects. When a department wants to propose a building there is years of conversation prior to bringing it forward as a real project. Can this committee or some other committee make this process more formal? There is a built-in premise that the SCD is the right unit at which the conversation for a new building begins at, which might limit possible conversations, the RISE initiative is about AI which has no school, college, or department. Who would own a RISE building or project? Every SCD presentation we heard comments about space for

students, so it is clearly important, but we never had a discussion from the student point of view about what they need. Maybe the right thing is to create a ‘student’ building that is not like anything we currently have, but since we are focused on individual buildings for SCDs with the ultimate goal of a ranking, there is not a mechanism for those types of discussion to occur.

- Reindl: The CPC could be asking where the synergy and leverage between SCD’s exists for the benefit of the larger institution and not just the indivial unit. The Bakke project could have incorporated Kinesiology at the time of that project at a much lower cost instead of requesting a standalone building that has become an expensive, but necessary, high priority.
- Provost: We will continue this discussion around the goals and charge of the CPC. What information would be beneficial to the committee to make informed and meaningful recommendations? We will discuss what decisions and recommendations should be made by the CPC.

4. ANNOUCEMENTS

- a. Committee will continue BCB discussion a future meeting date.
- b. Next meeting is March 14, 2024.

Date	Tentative Agenda Topic(s)	Location
April 18, 2024		Hybrid Bascom Room 260
May 9, 2024		Hybrid Bascom Room 260

5. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

- **Chair adjourned meeting at 9:38am.**