

Meeting Notes

Item	Description
Name/Title	Educational Environment & Facilities Committee
Date	December 7, 2009
Time	10:30 to noon
Location	320 Halle
Attending	Dennis Beagen, John Boyless, Mary Brake, Michael Bretting, Dave Crary, Matt Evett, LaVerne Higgins (for Fraya Wagner-Marsh), Chris Karshin (for Murali Nair), Bob Neely (Chair), Eric Owen, Sean Braden – Liaison with Physical Plant
Absent	Steve Camron, Sandra Hines, Wade Tornquist, Mary Vielhaber, Fraya Wagner-Marsh

I. Approval of minutes from 9/17/09 and 11/12/2009

Motion: Moved by Dave Crary to approve minutes from 9/17/09 and 11/12/2009. Seconded by Eric Owen. **Motion carried:** Unanimously.

II. Winter, 2010: regular meeting time

- Provost will visit a winter meeting (probably in February), once his tours of Academic Affairs space are complete. It was suggested that on the tours still outstanding, a member of this committee specific to the college being visited should be included.
- Email will be sent out suggesting a meeting time of the second Monday of each month at 10:30 a.m.

III. Update on swing space issue:

- Approval from Cabinet
 - The Cabinet has approved the plan for office space as per the memo distributed at the November meeting.
- Communication with Pray-Harrold Departments
 - Bob Neely asked CAS to begin working with its departments. Departments have until December 18th to give feedback to the Dean's Office on potential office space to which they may be assigned and by mid January this process should be finalized.
 - Sean Braden discussed the Pray-Harrold move:
 - Working with Housing to facilitate open houses in Pitman and King, so faculty can familiarize themselves with the buildings.
 - Working on a linear progression/calendar for the move.
 - Vendor for move still has to go out to bid and should be on board toward end of January.
 - Packing materials will be provided by the moving contractor.
 - Move manager will be on hand to work with faculty.
 - Would like to use plastic crate system with rented crates.
 - Gondolas to purge unwanted items may be available before the break.
 - Departmental items can be moved quicker, as Goddard is being used for storage.
 - Will discuss the best dates for move with the Advisory Committee.
 - Offices being moved to will probably be larger than existing space.
 - Faculty moving themselves gets University into liability area.
 - A lounge in Hoyt can be used for classrooms for faculty with mobility issues.
 - Dean is planning two or three informational meetings with faculty re move.

- Meeting with AAUP
 - A week ago there was a meeting with AAUP leadership and Bob Neely, Sean Braden, Scott Storrar, Provost Kay, Bette Warren, Tom Venner and Wade Tornquist re office and classroom space.
 - Shared with AAUP memo to cabinet re office space, and also assignments of space, mobility concerns, and transportation possibilities.
 - Main outcome was need for proactive communication. Toward that end:
 - Communications and Marketing will be putting out an article about this, outlining the process in a general manner.
 - Discussed the possibility of a website with FAQs that Department Heads might have.
 - Solutions Committee will be housed in CAS, which can deal with routine problems. If an issue can't resolve at that level, it will be kicked up to Provost's Office.
 - Walter Kraft will set up an open forum type meeting in January for any interested faculty, staff, and students on 1) what is happening in PH and 2) the swing space component.
- Faculty Senate resolution - Dave Crary discussed the hand-out he distributed on resolution regarding scheduling guidelines, asking that the Provost--given the considerations outlined in the proposal--issue some additional time slots for evening class times that would be acceptable.
- Other Issues
 - Sean Braden stated that some classroom furniture will be recycled and he will maintain enough of a stockpile to ensure adequate supply for start of semester use.
 - Concern about wear and tear in rooms not usually used for classrooms (e.g., in Boone). Perhaps the possibility of a sprucing up fund should be discussed with the Provost.
 - Concern for about 70 faculty members that really don't have room in Pray-Harrold, and question of long term space for them. Every faculty member should have own office; the issues are space and affordability.
 - Two departments have expressed an interest in being considered for a permanent move out of Pray-Harrold. If the Dean's Office is amenable and the facilities could handle this use, the Provost's Office would probably support this.

IV. Computer Refresh: Discussion

- Art accepted 23 iMacs.
- Laptops being ordered for Biology (approx \$22K).
- \$27K remaining
 - Eric Owen distributed and updated spreadsheet.
 - Discussion of purchasing another laptop cart. Bob Neely asked for feedback from the CAS and COB representatives on the carts currently in use.
 - John Boyless stated that the machines in Roosevelt are in bad shape. Bob Neely commented that Math Placement computers might not be replaced (given that they are moving and hand downs could be used), which would make COT next on list. The question is do we want to use carts or outfit a lab.
 - Michael Bretting asked if there are funds to address the wear being experienced on computer in the COE lab. Bob Neely stated that the committee has the discretion to use funds in a different way than at present and discussed the possibility of identifying other sources of funding. In response to the question if funding would be tied to credit hours, he stated that a memo will be going out to the deans, asking for an analysis of the number of extra sections offered that have lead to the credit hour increase presently being experienced. On the basis of this, a computationally based request for additional funding to support those credit hours will be created.

V. Paulien Study – Sean Braden discussed the study and addressed questions raised by the committee in a prior meeting.

- The study:
 - Paulien looked at the condition of facilities relative to our peers and based on a visual inspection. They gave a nominal dollar amount per ft² to bring facilities up to today's standards based on those of other universities. Hence, the figures quoted are not necessarily for major improvements, but just what it would cost to level the playing field.
 - The study looked at each classroom in every classroom building, the hours they were used, and the actual classes scheduled for fall, 2007. Use of rooms for functions other than classes was not considered.
 - Paulien's work finished at the end of 2008. Further consultation would involve further cost.
- Response to Committee's list of questions:
 - Benchmarking: Provided a handout of the benchmark institutions (regional and national) used.
 - Grouping: Data exists on a room to room basis per building and there is a building summary sheet with gross ft² and a building assessment. The new scheduling software will contain data for future analysis.
 - Classification of Space: Paulien used the strict federal definition of university room space and a visual inspection of rooms. Classrooms and labs are distinctly different, but often the classification is not what you would expect.
 - Revitalization Potential:
 - Paulien's dollar per ft² is not an age based number, but based on a visual inspection.
 - Renovation needs/costs are looked at from an educational adequacy point of view.
 - The Physical Plant uses the study as a tool in conjunction with its capital preservation list when prioritizing projects. The study helps quantify where the biggest need for building improvements exists. Pray-Harold and Mark Jefferson were listed in the top three buildings in terms of use and need.
 - The \$17 million figure for King is not for renovation, but only to bring it up to standards of peer institutions.
 - The age, useable ft² and gross ft² for each building are listed on a summary spreadsheet.

VI. Other Items - Committee Effectiveness

- Bob Neely commented that increased effectiveness translates into being proactive. To that end:
 - In addition to the capital asset preservation list and the Paulien analysis, we need a systematic collection of information regarding faculty priorities. Next semester, we should think about a structured survey to get quantifiable, verifiable, and specific data.
 - Committee members can be ambassadors to their colleges and departments and might consider a standardized method of communicating feedback to colleagues.
 - Electronic access for committee member to the Paulien data will be arranged.
 - The committee needs to examine its role for the long term.
- Interaction with Physical Plant
 - Sean Braden stated that the Physical Plant looks at assets in two ways—asset preservation and high risk. In addition to this is the programmatic component which may necessitate prioritizing certain projects ahead of others (for example, a project like Mark Jefferson).

- He is willing to explain to the committee how the bidding process works and why costs often seem high.
- The process whereby the EEFC contributes input into maintenance projects needs to be redefined.