Meeting Minutes

DATE: Thursday, November 5, 2009 1:00 p.m.

SUBJECT: Community Partnerships Master Plan Task Force

LOCATION: Regent 302

ATTENDEES: Rich Wobbekind
Bob Hohlfelder
Frank Bruno
Glen Segure
Joe Roy
John Ackerman
Phil Simpson
Robin Suitts
Megan Rose

11-5 Community Partnerships Regent 302

1. Introductions

2. Susan Graf's community Flagship 2030 plan overlook
   a. Envision the relationship between the University and the City in 2030

3. List of thoughts and suggestions by subject
   a. More inclusive, added some principles and opportunities from the city
   b.

4. Our goal is to create some guiding principles and actionable items about city and university interaction as one part, the next item would be to create a priority list of facilities we would like to collaborate on
   a. Multi-use structures
   b. Residential community concepts
   c. Speak to community members about feedback and receive some city input
   d. One meeting with the city in March, one is planned for January about the Campus Master Plan

5. Review of the guiding principles
   a. Rob Hohlfelder
      i. There is no current framework for faculty to participate in city and county wide service, and there needs to be one put in place
1. FURPA is the faculty annual assessment program could push this in a direction
2. CU media is trying to break down stigmas and get into the community
3. There is an international push for service
4. As a clarification point the Regents focus is on a congressional district, state wide basis, while City Council is only focused on Boulder
   a. The primary relationship should be with the campus administration, which will interact with council and city members, not to go to the Regents
b. Glen Segrue
   i. More organization between CU and BVSD to enhance our cooperation—currently specific departments meet with specific departments and there is no overarching communication
      1. 4 entities involved: City, county, school district, university
         a. Highest elected official of each meets quarterly, opportunity to bring up some of these ideas
   ii. We currently do not have a way to broadcast from campus
      1. Possibility of this infrastructure
   iii. Jacque Sullivan—responsible for engineering k-12 outreach
c. Rich Wobbekind
   i. The further down we can go in these relationships the longer lasting
   ii. Money woes may accelerate some partnerships
d. David Driskell
   i. Leaving baggage behind
      1. Pushing to an international push seems more counterproductive when we speak to being more involved locally
   ii. Commit to comprehensive, real sustainability
      1. Social, economic, and environmental
      2. Smart growth
      3. “that which is not growing is dying”
e. Joe Roy
   i. Enhancing community quality of life
   ii. Alternate funding in support of community enhancement programming
   iii. Implement programming aimed at shaping an affiliate culture
   iv. Media relations, how we give information to the community about what we do
      1. Public relations, and accountability
      2. Continuous
   v. Identify all of the points of contact that currently exist
6. Sub-committees need to find ways to communicate conversations
7. Sustainability initiative model would be a good model for creating institutional partnerships
a. For example: transportation, housing, arts, sustainability, public safety

8. Discuss a plan to get more input
   a. Gathering activities that are out there
   b. Talking and listening to students
   c. Develop a before and after survey to measure the connectivity to the community
      i. Introductory class or plan to educate students on the city and their surroundings and tradition
         1. Other university models?
      ii. And the reverse is true, community accessing campus
         1. Sensitive to how we are open physically to the city

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, November 25, 10-12 UMC 382-384