

Academic Health Center Student Consultative Committee (AHC-SCC)

October 14, 2015

Minutes of the Meeting

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.]

[In these minutes: Welcome, Review of Charge, Upgrades to AHC Facilities]

Present: Jeff Theismann, chair, Nicholas Schuler, Chad Mickelson, Jamie Dean, Katie Thibert, Morgan Mensick, Sarah Bahler, Ashtyn Johnson, Jonathon Eckerholm, Megan Guthmiller, Nicholas Schuler, Jamie Dean, Morgan Mensick, Javi Monardez

Absent: Crosby Tindal

Guests: Lorelee Wederstrom, director, AHC Office of Facilities & Capital Planning; Brenda Trebesch, planning professional, AHC Office of Facilities & Capital Planning

Others: Gina Kundan, director, Center for Health Professional Programs (CHIP); Katie Hamilton, program assistant, CHIP; Katie Ask

1. Welcome and Introductions: Jeff Theismann, chair, convened the committee and asked committee members to introduce themselves.

2. Review of Charge: Theismann reviewed the charge with the committee.

3. Upgrades to AHC Facilities: Lorelee Wederstrom, director, AHC Office of Facilities & Capital Planning, provided an overview of the strategic planning process for upgrades to AHC facilities, starting with a history of AHC strategic planning, leading up to the current planning process: In 2006, Wederstrom said, the strategic plan was updated, identifying the facilities necessary to allow the University to become a top three university in public research. In 2011, the University put together a ten-year capital plan, which is currently being updated. Wederstrom stated that the strategic process involves looking at what type of environment students need to learn and faculty need to teach, do research, or provide patient care.

She shared the following goals for the AHC Strategic Facility Planning Process:

- Create a 10-year plan for improving the quality of space and predicting right sizing of the main programmatic drivers in academic health sciences.
- Create strategies that will increase utilization of retainable spaces while improving connectivity between mission related programs.
- Work toward a reduction in occupied space by 20%, including the elimination of obsolete facilities. The goal is to take poor utilization, high real estate inventory out of use and replace it with more efficient, higher utilized space.

- “Embed” the Academic Health Center district within the University campus.

In spring 2015, the planning committee published a Phase One report, which developed a model for determining how much and what type of square footage was needed now, and how much and what type will be needed in the future. That report can be found [here](#).

Phase Two of the planning kicked off in June. Phase Two Strategic Planning Objectives are as follows, Wederstrom said:

- Physical Assets Strategy: Create a ten-year plan for improving the quality and right sizing of space based on the programmatic priorities in academic health sciences.
- Identify programmatic priorities that will increase utilization of retainable spaces while improving connectivity between programs.
- Work toward a reduction in occupied space by 20% including the elimination of obsolete facilities.
- Integrate the Academic Health Center district within the University campus.

Wederstrom stated that concurrent with Phase Two were recommendations of the legislative Blue Ribbon Commission, which include funding a new education and learning center, and a new clinical research center. Members of the State Legislature recently toured AHC facilities, and viewed the facilities that students encounter as they progress through the curriculum.

Wederstrom provided the following proposed outcomes of Phase Two:

- Physical Assets Strategy: Identify specific strategies for each building in the study, address all AHC assets in core area, provide high level cost information, and define the investment sequence and swing space needs.
- Program Fit Testing: AHC Education and Learning Center.

The project is in the predesign stage right now, she said. Cannon Design, the University’s planning consultant for this project, is working to develop various design options to the University’s Capital Strategy Group, which includes Brooks Jackson, vice president and dean of health sciences, Medical School; Pam Wheelock, vice president, University Services; Richard Pfuzenreuter, vice president, Office of Budget and Finance; and Karen Hanson, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost, Office of Academic Affairs and Provost. This Committee, said Wederstrom, will decide AHC facilities needs considering utilization, curriculum, projected growth, etc. By early 2016, they will have prepared and sent a report to the legislature for consideration.

Wederstrom added that the core of the University academic health facilities totals 4.8 million square feet including all campuses. Over the next five to ten years, based on the quality of facilities today, the plan is to keep Moos and the connected buildings, and take down the Masonic VFW site and the Mayo Building. In fact, she said, the University six-year plan already includes money to take Mayo down. There are no plans yet to put anything in that spot. Longer-term plans are also considering removal of Children’s Rehab Building and Diehl Hall as well.

Wederstrom stated that renovation options for the new Health Sciences Education and Learning Center include the following two scenarios:

- Option 1: Renovate floors two, three, and four of the Phillips-Wangensteen Building, Weaver Densford Hall, and Moos Tower. Provide more light, connected spaces, and new entrances. There is a potential for three new entrances. The cost of renovation is a consideration, as renovation could cost more than the University wishes to spend.
- Option 2: New construction. Use the Masonic VFW site as a new building site. The entire building would be dedicated to education. The issue with new construction at this site is that unless Diehl and the VFW Masonic site are developed at the same time, the plot itself is quite narrow.

In conclusion, Wederstrom stated that when Cannon Design provides visuals of the two options, she will share those with the Committee. When design actually begins in mid 2016, she will be looking for more input from students, and she invited any students with questions or concerns to contact her. If the legislature approves the plan, design will start in July, followed by construction. When asked how likely legislative approval is, Wederstrom stated that the Blue Ribbon Commission brought a lot of energy to this proposal, and the University has a strong advocate in the legislature.

Hearing no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Patricia Straub
University Senate Office