

## Meeting Notes

Item	Description
Name/Title	Educational Environment & Facilities Committee
Date	November 16, 2010
Time	11:00 am to 1:00 pm
Location	123 Mark Jefferson
Voting Attending	Dennis Beagen (co-chaired), Rita Bullard, Steve Camron, David Crary (co-chaired), Matt Evett, Ali Eydgahi, Sandra Hines, Eric Owen, Wade Tonquist, Mary Vielhaber, Fraya Wagner-Marsh
Non-Voting Attending	Sylvia Bethea, David Clifford, John Donegan, Ron Woody
Absent	Mary Brake, Elaine Logan, Shawn Quilter, Don Ritzenhein, Barbara Scheffer

**Motion:** EEFC Committee expresses its sincere appreciation for the contributions and leadership of Robert Neely. Moved by Eric Owen. Seconded by Wade Tornquist. **Motion carried:** Unanimously

### I. Review and approval of minutes from November 2, 2010

**Motion:** Moved by Eric Owen to approve corrected minutes from November 2, 2010. Seconded by Mary Vielhaber. **Motion carried:** Unanimously

### II. Classroom Technology Standard Recommendation

- **Motion:** David Crary moved to establish a subcommittee to review Classroom Technology Recommendations as put forth by the Technology Standards Committee. Seconded by Eric Owen.
- David Crary explained that this subcommittee's members would be faculty and administrators from the EEFC. Their mission to review the report with respect to faculty needs in the classroom, and then make a recommendation back to the EEFC.
- General questions regarding the necessity of a subcommittee, since the EEFC has appointed faculty members. David Crary shared that there has been some concern expressed that the Technology Standards committee didn't have faculty representation. It was noted by several members that faculty did serve on the Technology Standards Committee, even an EEFC faculty member.
- Steve Camron shared that his college tech was a member of the Technology Standards committee and that he has great confidence in him. Wade Tornquist concurred by saying that the college tech representatives on that committee are very knowledgeable as to what the faculty classroom needs are.
- Ali Eydgahi inquired as to the purpose of the subcommittee, is it just a duplication of effort.
- Matt Evett explained that a faculty member appointed to the Technology Standards committee would satisfy Faculty Senate. He said that if EEFC recommends the Classroom Technology report, that also fulfills Faculty Senate requirements.
- Wade Tornquist said the EEFC should decide what on the report is necessary, is nice to have, or is a future need.
- In response to these questions and comments, David Crary explained that the subcommittee would take a more in-depth look at the report, come back next meeting and make a recommendation. He felt that if left to the EEFC as a whole, the report wouldn't get the review necessary.
- Dennis Beagen asked for volunteers for the subcommittee.

**Motion:** Restated by David Crary that EEFC accepts report regarding classroom technology for further review; subcommittee (David Crary, Sandra Hines, Eric Owen, Mary Vielhaber, and Fraya Wagner-Marsh) will conduct further review and report back to the EEFC. **Motion Carried:** Unanimously

### III. Potential Renovations of King or other buildings for Faculty Offices

- John Donegan explained that he's preparing a Three to Five Year Capital Plan to present to the Board of Regents at its February meeting. Rackham and King are certainly in the plan, but the specifics of the funding for this plan are under review. Ideally there would be two plans presented, one that includes

Strong Hall, and one without Strong Hall.

- He went on further to say that Strong has bipartisan support in both the Senate and House bills. The budget for the project is \$38M, with \$10M EMU's responsibility.
- He offered a brief explanation of the differences in Capital Project and Capital Maintenance. Capital Projects are programmatic improvements that are academically driven, and sustain or drive the university. Asset preservation is the State of Michigan phrase for Capital Maintenance. It is concerned with how EMU maintains its facilities that have received state funding. Deferred Maintenance concerns the up to 2% University Replacement Value on items each year; however, the university is nowhere near that level of funding. When the rare emergency occurs, funding for the emergency project takes away from Deferred Maintenance.
- Dennis Beagen shared that the people coming back to campus just rave about how campus looks, especially College Place.

#### IV. McKenny Classrooms

##### a. Safety Concerns –

- One faculty member, who teaches in McKenny's new classrooms, expressed concern that doors open to the inside. John Donegan clarified that the doors meet code; otherwise we would not receive an Occupancy Permit.
- David Crary inquired about the code for egress opening out or opening in. John Donegan explained that code is situational, dependant on the building classification and room use. He went further to explain that not all items are coded, i.e. Gender Neutral restrooms, and therefore not funded by the State. EMU can build them, but are responsible for their entire cost.

##### b. Long-term Use

- David Crary asked what is the process for the assignment of rooms for long-term use. John Donegan informed the group that these requests would go through the Provost's Office, but would originate in the Deans' Offices. Physical Plant would offer recommendations as needed.
- Discussion about the how buildings are designated for use ensued. How is it decided which buildings become general use or auxiliary buildings? Wade Tornquist explained that the decisions on building use come from the Cabinet.
- Multiple areas use McKenny. It remained empty because no one knew what use it could be. Since it was mostly vacant, it is used for classrooms this year. Events Planning would like to use it for conferences, dances, etc, and the new basement classrooms will likely remain as classrooms. David Crary asked if any requests have been made to the Provost's Office for the long-term use of the McKenny classrooms. Wade Tornquist said that there has been nothing formal. David Crary expressed his desire to have an RFP go out to any department interested in using these classrooms. Matt Evett brought up the trend to end specific assignment of classrooms by departments and to the more equitable use as is being done this year because of Swing Space. John Donegan shared his belief that this matter may be decided by the State. EMU may have to report its building usage as a demonstration of efficiency on campus.

#### V. Arts Village – John Donegan

- John Donegan believes there is a genuine interest in doing the Arts Village. This belief stems from the recent concentration on funding for sciences, and now it's time for the arts. The project began with an ad hoc group three years ago, which came up with an initial plan and vision. This will need to be revisited if the project moves forward. David Crary inquired about the origin of the 25% match for these projects. John Donegan explained that it isn't part of the bond payment that it comes up front. EMU does not borrow the match, and should not borrow it. State isn't concerned where EMU gets the funds.
- There is concern that there wouldn't be a capital bill this year in the State.
- An Arts Village presentation is proposed for a future meeting.

#### VI. Computer Refresh

- Ron Woody of the IT Department joined the meeting.
- Eric Owen briefly explained the EEFC Lab Refresh Program for Ron Woody's benefit. He also shared a

report showing the projected replacement cycle of these labs. Based on current data the projected replacement cycle would be 7.27 years. He went further to explain that the report does not contain all the labs in the various colleges, only the ones that the EEFC includes in its refresh program.

- Carl Powell is in the process of developing strategic budgets for certain IT items, computer refresh being one of them. One of the areas to be included in this budget is the Academic Computer Labs Refresh. IT proposes a 4-year refresh plan for all labs on campus and needs data from all areas to complete this budget proposal. Not only is hardware a consideration, but the electrical and HVAC capacity must also be addressed. Ron Woody stressed that the data submitted to IT must be complete and accurate to ensure the success of the refresh program. Future needs must also be considered in the data. Ron Woody shared that there is a separate line item for the refresh of classroom technology.
- Wade Tornquist explained that when scheduling classrooms this semester, they ran out of general use classrooms, but not classrooms with computers. There are many more computer labs for classrooms than needed. Also noted were that very few classrooms need to be scheduled in a specific location because of technology. He will provide data on the percentage of computer labs use.
- Dennis Beagen shared his thoughts that many times we “just make do” with what we have, but never consider what could be if we had unlimited space and funding. A proposal needs to take in future technology considerations for it to be realistic.
- Ron woody explained for technology to be specific by location, only hardware requires the restriction. Software technology can be managed via other means. Students who have their own computers, but require access to specific software use this. Another consideration, along with solid, strategic data, is the potential of eliminating department specific labs and creating larger general-purpose labs.
- Matt Evett pointed out that this is a delicate issue, the potential elimination of department specific labs. Who would be best to look into this matter? However, he did note it is good fiscal responsibility.
- Ron Woody outlined the specific data needed. He needs all the labs, plus each lab’s current funding.
- Wade Tornquist will provide a report of all the computer labs used as classrooms for Fall10/Winter11, which will demonstrate that there are some without much use.
- Ron Woody would like the data as soon as possible, but definitely by January 2011 or February 2011.
- Eric Owen asked the administrative representatives from each college to compile the data for their respective colleges. Administrators should send their data to Eric Owen, who will compile the master list.
- Ron Woody also shared the trend to provide power and connectivity to students instead of the actual computers. The computer refresh would be shifted to the students and fewer computers would need to be in labs. Funds would be used to provide updated electrical and HVAC.
- Dennis Beagen thanked Ron Woody on behalf of the committee.

## VII. Fletcher – Autism Collaborative Center

- David Clifford joined the meeting to discuss the issues with the Fletcher Building and how it will affect the Autism Collaborative Center (ACC). The ACC is a cooperative of nine different disciplines, across three colleges at EMU. Easter Seals of Michigan is a major outside partner, along with St. Joseph’s Hospital, the University of Michigan and the Judson Center. It provides education, advocacy, treatment, and programming for families. Since its opening in October 2009, it has been extremely successful, and is ahead of client and income projections. Because of this success, the ACC is also ahead of its space needs. The university purchased Fletcher School and the grant paid for the building improvements. In early 2009, the original plan was to have the Children’s Institute (CI) also at Fletcher; however, no plans were finalized as to the logistics. The ACC converted multiple rooms to their specific needs. CI wasn’t moved to Fletcher initially because of lack of funding. Currently Fletcher also serves as a Swing Space classroom building. The ACC occupies the central area and one wing. The ACC understood that the CI wouldn’t move to Fletcher until Fall 2011, maybe 2012. Two weeks ago the ACC learned that the CI would move to Fletcher by Fall 2011, with construction over the summer.
- The ACC has 80 children enrolled in their summer program, with the expectation of 100 by summer. Construction during this time is prohibitive, as it will cause a drop in enrollment and revenue. The use of the space has to be reevaluated and new rooms will need to be built. The ACC also serves as a training and educational center for EMU students and the community.

- Both the ACC and the CI can co-exist, but will require much more modifications than just the classrooms. More space will need to be created by adding to the building. In conversations with David Clifford, John Donegan said an addition is feasible, but that isn't anything official.
- David Clifford went further to explain he would like the EEFC to work with the various concerned parties to improve the communications regarding Fletcher Building usage.
- Sandra Hines asked if the CI is not part of the University. David Clifford replied that the CI is part of Student Affairs. Sandra Hines followed up with an inquiry about the students' schedule at the ACC. David Clifford shared that the students come and go all day, depending on what their purpose. They can be there for classes, to observe, or hands-on work, i.e. Music Therapy.
- Matt Evett asked David Clifford what was his expectation for an acceptable result. David Clifford said there is no fundamental objection to the CI moving to Fletcher. There are benefits to having the two entities together. He would like University to add space to the building, to have an architect design an addition, and build it. Adding the CI to the current layout will seriously compromise the treatment, education and research at the ACC. Matt Evett followed up with an inquiry about the cost of the addition. David Clifford replied that it might not cost that much, and expressed his regret that John Donegan wasn't available to contribute to this discussion.
- Dennis Beagen suggested the best avenue to pursue would be for some group to approve and initiate a space utilization analysis of the CI, of the ACC, and then of Fletcher and the expansion. David Clifford shared his concern with the timing of the project. With the construction and ACC summer programs timing will be critical. One suggestion for temporary space was portable facilities. David Clifford agreed they were a possibility. David Clifford offered to host the next EEFC meeting at Fletcher.

#### IX. Wade Shen Capital Request

**Motion:** Mary Vielhaber moved to support the U.S. Department of Energy Grant Fund Surface Science Laboratory Project. Seconded by Eric Owen. **Motion carried:** Unanimously.

Dennis Beagen asked that the Swing Space Communications subcommittee reconvene prior to the beginning of the Winter semester.

Wade Tornquist explained the current scheduling problem of requests to move classes to specific days and times. Potential solutions are to move the sections to another day or request a classroom in Fletcher or Owen. Dennis Beagen asked that the administrators review their respective schedules and make what adjustments they can.

Meeting adjourned 1:07 pm

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 7, 2010, 11 am to 1 pm at 123 Mark Jefferson