

## Meeting Notes

Item	Description
Name/Title	Educational Environment & Facilities Committee
Date	February 21, 2013
Time	9 am to 10:30 am
Location	217 Halle
Attending	Colin Blakely, Rita Bullard, Jim Carroll, John Donegan, La Verne Higgins (for Fraya Wagner-Marsh) Sandra Hines, Patrick Koehn, Marianne Laporte, Sandy Norton, Eric Owen, Carl Powell, Shawn Quilter, Barbara Scheffer, Maria Sipos, Mary Vielhaber
Absent	Caroline Gould, Don Keller, Fraya Wagner-Marsh
Guest	Bob Densic, EMU Physical Plant

**Meeting convened by Eric Owen at 9:01 am.**

### **I. Agenda approved**

- Moved by Pat Koehn, seconded Barbara Scheffer, approved unanimously

### **II. Review and approval of January 17, 2013 meeting minutes**

- Moved by Barbara Scheffer, seconded by Pat Koehn, approved unanimously

### **III. Computer Refresh Policy**

#### **a. Possible criteria (review documents)**

- Budget is \$150k. Replacement cycle was 11-year replacement cycle, now 7-year, because equipment is less expensive, not because we have fewer labs.
- Reviewed “Criteria for Determining Lab Refresh Policy”:
  - Exclusively for walk-in student use? Haven’t determined answer to question
  - Age of current computers not on document – this document is only for establishing lab use criteria not when labs are refreshed
  - Include: special software, if building locked?
  - Clarify “Dedicated to single program/department”? If only students and/or faculty from a single department use a lab, even if for multiple uses (research, homework, classes), it would be designated as single use by department.
  - How do we capture usage of lab – how many classes, class caps, number of computers, if a walk in lab, etc? Can do that. Usage statistics not currently available. Should department do so to justify a lab being a refresh lab?
  - How are labs for GenEd use that are housed in a specific department fit into question 1? Some single department labs not supported by this refresh? It probably varies, because we haven’t applied criteria.

#### **b. Plan for setting/applying criteria**

- Reviewed “Computer Laboratory Strategy Committee, May 28, 2008”
- If collecting data, should have template. By reviewing these documents we can develop a template or survey document.
- Eric Owen projected Sample Survey developed by Don Keller
  - Form needs a general description of lab
  - What is its primary use? Who uses it?
  - Have colleges rank order
  - Wouldn’t include column “K” – “Should computer replacement paid for from University refresh funds?”
  - Age and traffic need to be taken into account
  - If lab staffed, how does that impact criteria? Staffed labs may be more important because resources dedicated for staffing show importance/commitment.
  - Should we include classroom labs?
  - 2008 document has better definitions that should be included in survey
  - Don’t sacrifice quality of information for a simplified survey

- Should include usage; range of hours, percent of usage
  - Record data and give back to colleges for them to act
  - Reviewed most recent computer refresh lab inventory, will use that document for upcoming refresh unless new criteria can be established and applied.
- c. Computer lab refresh review remaining steps
- Not able to make informed decisions on criteria by April, 2013, but goal of April, 2014
  - When creating new labs, get Physical Plant involved early to determine electrical and HVAC needs.

#### **IV. Facilities Projects**

##### a. Ongoing Campus Projects

- John Donegan introduced Bob Densic, EMU's Manager of Planning and Design (architect).
- List of current projects:
  - Halle ARC
  - Rackham
  - Repairs in King, 10 building roofs, Best residence hall (summer), COB - stairwell, lights, carpet, paint
  - Bringing McKenny up to code, will be done by end of month. No space assignments yet, but will be able to occupy whole building.
  - Replaced pool filter at Jones
- Committee appreciates update emails of which buildings with work being done. Bob Densic responsible for sending those emails.

##### b. Capital Funding

- Started building local capital plan
- Rebuild Bowman-Roosevelt parking lot – will start work in June using next fiscal year funds. Are people being notified? Not sending out emails yet, but notifying through this committee. Parking lot rebuilds include storm water retention, ADA, and these requirements alter the number of spaces in the new lot.
- Undergoing a feasibility study for housing. Jones-Goddard may be considered for possible reopen, or maybe new dorm? Would that be razing existing structure or new building in new location? That is part of the study. Also part of the study is if new dorm would be privatized or self-managed? Jones-Goddard is a definite candidate for repurposing – there is value in structure.
- Consolidating art department? Can cost out and develop plan, but will need funding and direction from department and provost.
- Alexander – tracking issues regarding accreditation.
- Snow pharmacy work because of new prescription plan

##### c. IT Projects

- Distributed handouts, “New VoIP Phones/VoIP Upgrades” and “Wireless Upgrades/Enhanced Wireless”
- VoIP is in year 2 of 3
  - Welch will be upgraded to VoIP in March for security aspect
  - VoIP installation
    - Up and Running: Halle, Hoyt (DPS), Mark-Jefferson, Pierce, Porter, Pray-Harrold, Sill, Strong, Student Center
    - By March 2013: Welch
    - By April 2013: Alexander, Boone, Convo Center, Ford, Marshall
    - By July 2013: McKenny, Owen, Physical Plant, Quirk, Roosevelt, Snow
  - Working with Chief Heighes to integrate emergency alerts to classroom phones. As classroom technology project is updated VoIP phones will be installed. Looking to see cost to update all classrooms at once with VoIP.
  - Rackham didn't have usage designation when VoIP plan developed, will eventually get VoIP
- Wireless is in year 1 of 3
  - Wireless Installation
    - Up an Running: Alexander, Boone, Halle, Mark-Jefferson, Marshall, McKenny, Owen, Pierce, Porter, Pray-Harrold, Quirk, Roosevelt, Rynearson, Sill, Strong, Student Center
    - By April 2013: Ford, Sherzer, Snow
    - Summer 2013: Best, Fletcher

- Wireless for buildings with no wireless. Briggs, sculpture studio, will be added in the future. Will bring entire list to next meeting
- One-to-one phone replacement, additional phones funded by department
- When offices are shared, can these phones have two lines? Yes, but colleges/departments can order additional phone for only the cost of the equipment. There are no additional line charges. Fairly quick process, approximately 1 month as opposed to 3 months with traditional AT&T phones.

#### **V. State Capital Project Changes**

- Jim Carroll distributed capital funding matrix, “Capital Project Request Evaluations” and “Capital Outlay Process Reforms”
- Capital Outlay Process Reforms was a bill approved in lame duck session February 2012
- First time state has presented quantifiable selection process, trying to remove the political aspect of awarding funding. Evaluate projects objectively
- Scorecard to rate the competitiveness of the applications
- Heavily weighted toward STEM, economic impact to community, utilization of existing facilities
- Score Strong vs Integrated Arts Village – Strong would score higher. Need to revisit and rework Integrated Arts Village for it to score higher.
- Strong proposal reworked and feel will score high because it is STEM, a repurposed building,
- Need to look to a second project to submit. Can look at Integrated Arts Village. Last year only submitted Strong – deliberate decision to focus on Strong.
- Good news is we have a road map to follow to develop projects
- Hopeful we will be competitive against the other Michigan schools
- Any other documents that define the criteria?
- A congressional committee will review submitted projects. Are guidelines available? Requested them but have not received any at this point.
- Plan for presenting schematic plans? Programmatic approach in past. State looking for facility will look like, function, etc. Will need to spend capital upfront? When will we do this for Strong? Physical Plant asked for additional information from state, and is waiting until received before developing schematic. Universities don’t get the funding until they get promised match.
- No capital outlay funding during current governor’s administration
- Mark Jefferson may be collateral for Strong. Leveraging \$9M to get the Strong funding. All phases of Science Complex.
- Committee should focus on second request. Integrated Arts Village shouldn’t be dismissed, but rebrand it, emphasize the technology, technology was part of it in the beginning.
- Keep this competitive to other universities. Know what competition doing. What is happening? Physical Plant meets with counterparts from other universities knows what they’re building. Some examples are housing, club sports, and some academic improvements.
- Maintain business intelligence document? John Donegan will start one.
- Repurposing vs reprogramming? Repurposing is using an existing building for a different use (former dorm as a classroom building). Reprogramming is a user assessment and defining needs/wants.

#### **VI. Classroom Technology**

- February 14 Ribbon Cutting ceremony officially opened 109B Halle
- If haven’t visited, please do so (109B)
- 109B test technology, 217 test classroom usage
- Email from faculty, COB Faculty committees with questions, suggestions
- Carl Powell overseeing the technology piece
- Gathering information stage before buying equipment
- Get as many faculty in these rooms, get feedback, book a class in 217
- Need feedback on general equipment (monitor/screen, document camera, etc.) and on the control stations (2) Building specific classroom layouts. Installation schedule will be similar to swing space.
- Added classroom technology portion to FDC website, will add FAQs based on feedback
- What is the finalized list of buildings? Not finalized but some combination of Owen, Marshall, Roosevelt, Sill

- Owen needs consideration of when to do the rooms as not to impact classroom usage
- CAS – Pray-Harrold, Mark Jefferson VoIP phones and help desk button integration
- Controllers are very big issue.
- John Donegan – Physical Plant not responsible. Need single source accountability. There will be centralized support through IT. Carl Powell working with Steve Dotson to learn/build on Steve's expertise of working on these issues in Pray-Harrold and Mark Jefferson.
- Goal of project to get a centralized support. Work with college techs to build on past experience
- Repair cost vs replacement cost. Funding should be part of project.
- Where's the line between punchlist and regular usage issues. Warranties triggered by date of beneficial occupancy. Day of building usage start.
- When is equipment evaluated/assessed? Currently non-existent. Needs evaluation prior to warranties' expiration.
- Survey faculty around Thanksgiving on classrooms upgraded this summer
- Equipment evaluation will be similar to computer refresh to add and/or retire technology
- Training – Diane Lawrence developing training and quick reference guides for the rooms
- Use COB response as an example for colleges

### **VII. Committee Goals/Agenda Items**

a. Ideas?

b. Projects?

### **VIII. Adjourn**

- Meeting adjourned at 10:30 am

Winter Term Meeting Schedule/Locations:

~~Thursday, January 17, 2013 – 9:00 am to 10:30 am – 109B Halle~~

~~Thursday, February 21, 2013 – 9:00 am to 10:30 am – 217 Halle~~

Thursday, March 28, 2013 – 9:00 am to 10:30 am – 109B Halle

Thursday, April 18, 2013 – 9:00 am to 10:30 am – 109B Halle