

Meeting Notes

Item	Description
Name/Title	Educational Environment & Facilities Committee
Date	November 2, 2010
Time	11:00 am to 1:00 pm
Location	Physical Plant Conference Room
Voting Attending	Dennis Beagen, Mary Brake, Rita Bullard, Steve Camron, David Crary (co-chaired), Matt Evett, Ali Eydgahi, Sandra Hines, Bob Neely (co-chaired), Eric Owen, Wade Tonquist, Fraya Wagner-Marsh
Non-Voting Attending	Sylvia Bethea, Sean Braden, John Donegan, Amy Nolff, Kay Sekerak, William Shell, Scott Storrar
Absent	Shawn Quilter, Barbara Scheffer, Mary Vielhaber

I. Review and approval of minutes from October 12, 2010

Motion: Moved by Eric Owen to approve minutes from October 12, 2010. Seconded by David Crary. **Motion carried:** 11 Yes, 0 No, 1 Abstention.

II

A. Furniture for Classrooms

John Donegan explained the process for selection of building furniture. Mark Jefferson and Pray-Harrold are two of the largest projects in the history of EMU. For these projects, furniture procurement was considered from the onset of the project. The architects deployed concept plans with the end users in the advisory committees. The furniture for these projects is \$4 million. In order to save money, the furniture purchases for both projects were combined. The Pray-Harrold advisory committee created a Solutions Group to advise on the furniture, and a smaller sub-committee from Mark Jefferson was also involved. These groups considered the use of the space, functionality of the furniture, cost and quality of the furniture. The Physical Plant not only has to consider the programmatic needs of the furniture, but must consider durability, and the EMU and State of Michigan purchasing guidelines. This was a very large and detailed process. Once bid packages were created, and sent to bid, Physical Plant created a showroom. The small groups evaluated the showrooms.

John Donegan explained the detailed and complex process for the selection of the building furniture. Physical Plant worked with the Solutions Group formed by the Advisory Committees for recommendations on the furniture. In addition to Programmatic functionality and durability, adherence to the EMU and State of Michigan purchasing guidelines must be considered. The Purchasing Procurement team also evaluated the warranty, quality, durability, and different price points for achieving savings. Different manufacturers are included in the bid, depending on the manufacturer's specialty.

David Crary commended the Physical Plant staff for their effort, also for their efforts to economize. Sean Braden commented that savings was realized by combining the bids, above and beyond the normal bid process. He also explained that while the two buildings were bid collectively, Mark Jefferson wasn't under the same State of Michigan conditions as Pray-Harrold.

Bob Neely suggested a formal motion in support of the bid process, but this was set aside for time for consideration of the motion.

Committee reviewed the furniture selections.

Sean Braden explained the furniture showroom items available for viewing, specifically the instructor station. The remaining items not available for viewing can be viewed through pictures. He has a slideshow of the selected furniture available for viewing. He will send it to Robertta Goffeney for distribution.

Matt Evett asked for an explanation of what is involved with the Advisory Committee, and David Crary explained the process and timeline. The review of the furniture occurred over the summer. The committee was

comprised of eight members from two buildings. Each member prepared separate rankings, and these were tallied. The group also reviewed what is needed in a standard office, and identified which offices were shared offices. The group reviewed multiple examples of each item from each vendor. David Crary shared his thoughts that some of the criticism stems from the uncertainty of change, whether people will like the new offices, and the concerns that offices will be underequipped.

Wade Tornquist added that the Pray-Harrold committee was concerned there was no reporting back to committee as to what was selected, and the Solutions committee wasn't authorized to do the final recommendations. Also, there was no report out to both committees explaining process. This Friday there will be a presentation to both committees explaining the process and showing the selections.

Sean Braden spoke to the budget of the project. Currently the budget is \$1.8 million for furniture, still under the \$2 million needed, but enough to outfit offices sufficiently. The prioritizing the office furniture needs is not for the basic needs, but the quantity of bookcases, file cabinets, work surfaces, etc. Wade Tornquist informed the committee that the bid pricing for most items will be available in the future, so if additional needs arise, EMU will be able to purchase most items at the bid pricing.

Matt Evett inquired about the selection of members for the Solutions Group. Wade Tornquist explained that the Solutions Committee was created as a forward-looking group concentrating on issues and concerns that may need attention in the future, and to find possible solutions. The committee was created in January. In early spring Tom Venner referred the Physical Plant staff to the Solutions Group when asked for a group to review the furniture needs. David Crary contributed that this was discussed in Advisory Committee, and it was deferred to the Solutions Group as well. Faculty Senate would find a timeline of the process helpful.

Bob Neely commented that with all that was accomplished with the Pray-Harrold move and Swing Space that the furniture selection should be viewed in context of everything happening on campus. Matt Evett recommended a motion commending the effort of the Physical Plant staff.

II

B. Classroom Technology Standards Recommendations

Bill Shell highlighted the process including the origination of the standards recommendations. This group originated from the IT Academic Technology Advisory Committee. Standardization of classroom equipment and technology is beneficial because it will be easier for faculty to operate and enables better support. The group's members include all of the college techs, which are very familiar with faculty classroom needs.

Eric Owen asked how and why specific survey institutions were selected. Bill Shell said the committee selected the Michigan schools, and the other schools in the study responded to a ListServ request. John Donegan added that the state is mandating in the future, "cloud technology". Will cloud technology affect these recommendations? Bill Shell explained that the items recommended for the classroom are still needed. Cloud technology affects where you load your applications, i.e. servers. EMU currently uses this technology for online courses and email.

Eric Owen brought up the Computer Refresh program and a request he received from Ron Woody as to the cost of the college computer labs. Eric suggested that Carl Powell and Ron Woody attend the next EEFC meeting to discuss the labs and their needs.

Bob Neely expressed that there have been some concerns as to representation on the Technology Standards Committee. Matt Evett shared faculty concern regarding representation. The Academic Technology Advisory Committee originally developed the committee. Members of Academic Tech Advisory joined Technology Standards Committee as they wished and other interested parties were welcome to join. The Technology Standards Committee reported back to the Academic Technology Advisory Committee their findings. Bob Neely told the group that he requested Bill Shell accelerate the work of the committee to study the technology standards at other universities. Two committees with faculty representation, which fulfill contractual obligations, must approve the standardization recommendations. Because of this, the EEFC comments, positive or negative, are now official input. Official response will be addressed at next meeting.

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

This item will be addressed next meeting. The next step should be a feasibility study.

IV. McKenny Classrooms

- Safety Concerns

One faculty member brought up that the doors open to the inside in the new classrooms. Bob Neely explained that the doors do meet code. This item can be addressed further at the next meeting.

- Long-term Use

Who will use the classrooms in the future, but we are not close to this decision.

V. Arts Village

This item will be addressed next meeting

VI. Janitorial Efforts

Was addressed in September, but Quirk had additional problems. Dennis Beagen explained that the Physical Plant responded immediately to his emails, and the problem is resolved.

VII. Computer Refresh

Addressed earlier in the meeting

VIII. Fall Classroom Use Report

Wade Tornquist distributed the Fall 2010 All Campus Section Offerings Report (11/02/10), which showed all main campus section offerings broken down by all hours (including evening hours) and days of the week. The report revealed that the distribution of classes is pretty balanced. Bob Neely said that this will appear back on the agenda, and that the committee should consider what other types of information they would like to see. Future recommendations for scheduling may be partially based on what we discover from the data.

Wade Tornquist shared his policy for Winter term to schedule weekend classes in one building only, with a few exceptions. He was scheduling this way to provide the information to the Physical Plant for resource planning purposes. Bob Neely suggested the possibility of a data agenda item in each meeting.

Matt Evett brought up the changing configuration of the EEFC and asked that we consider what is the committee's purview. Bob Neely suggested framing some questions to address this issue.

Meeting adjourned 12:41 pm

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 16, 2010, 11 am to 1 pm at 123 Mark Jefferson