Minutes from March 26, 2019  
Campus Planning and University Space Advisory Committee

Attendees:

Elias Lopez- Co-Chair, AVP for Academic Resources  
Carol Ingerman- Director of Campus Planning, Facilities Management  
Dr. Karen Schneider- Dean of the Library  
Kat Marian- Director for Capital Planning, Design, and Construction  
Jenifer Barnett- Managing Director, Contracts and Procurement  
Craig Dawson- Director for Operational Sustainability  
Dr. Rachel Napoli- Faculty Representative, Nursing  
Elizabeth Chelini- Associate Director for Campus Housing (REACH)  
Dr. David McCuan- Faculty Representative, Political Science  
Neil Markley- AVP for Entrepreneurial Activities  
Jessica Way- Director of the Student Center, Event Operations, and EA Admin  
Dennis Goss- University Scheduler  
Tyson Hill- Sr Director for Risk Management  
Christopher Dinno- Chief Planning Officer  
Lee Krichmar- AVP for Information Technology/CIO  
Mike Ogg- Director of Continuous Improvement (staff to the committee)

Absent

Dana Twedell- Co-Chair, AVP for Facilities Management  
Gail Barksdale- Sr. Director for Intercollegiate Athletics  
Randy Stewart- Facilities Management  
Sean Place – APARC representative  
Claudia Luke- Director of the SSU Preserves  
Laura Watt- Chair, Academic Senate  
Noelle Dahl- ASI, Student Representative  
Green Music Center Executive Director (or designee)  
Assistant Director of Student Affairs- Vacant  
Staff Council representative, elected by the General Staff- Vacant  
Dean (appointed by the Provost)- Vacant
Agenda:

I. Introductions

Call to order at 1:05pm

II. Review of minutes

E. Lopez asked if there were any changes, additions, or deletions. Minutes approved by consensus.

III. Change to Committee Charge

E. Lopez shared the J. Lopes added “They will review projects that require a utilization change to an existing interior space or that significantly change the look to the campus”.

L. Krichmar asked if interior was necessary or if it could read “utilization change to an existing space…”

N. Markley requested adding “exterior” to “…space or that significantly change the exterior look to the campus.” A remodel of CBC was referenced to as an example.

J. Way asked if interior design was the purview of the committee.

E. Lopez suggested that changes to the charge of the committee be held off on until a process for project review can be brought back to the committee. The committee agreed.

IV. Draft Policy

E. Lopez introduced the draft policy and walked the group through the structure and content. As a part of soliciting committee feedback Lopez went around the room to ask each person for their priorities and thoughts.

a. Guiding Principles (pages 3-4)

E. Lopez- Instructional space should be a priority

M. Ogg- Instructional space and maximum utilization possible

L. Krichmar- Safety and Health, include IT needs up front

R. Napoli- Instructional space and challenges with prioritization. Hard to prioritize without a strict due date.

E. Chelini- Defer

D. Goss- Create a timeline similar to what we do with communication

D. McCuan- Similar to cities/communities Design/Review boards. Look at their timelines. How do we mitigate the various jurisdictions and code requirements?

C. Dinno- Look at the various planning departments. The committee has morphed into an interior and exterior review plan whereas it used to be two separate groups. Believes that the priority
discussion isn’t the responsibility of the space committee. It should be approved or denied by the committee and turned over to Facilities for prioritization.

J. Way- Include instructional space as well as student success spaces (ie. Food pantry). Look at importance levels rather than dictating priority to Facilities. Create a priority submission timeline with an opportunity to fit in ad-hoc projects.

N. Markley- Health and safety takes priority. Instructional space is too broad. Many other non-instructional spaces are student success based. Speed in necessary in many units and it isn’t possible to wait years to have projects completed.

C. Ingerman- Donors can come in with money and how does that work in terms prioritization. Perhaps sending out a call letter might be a good way to request projects but not limit the submission process.

K. Schneider- Donors ask whether or not the campus is on board with the vision of the department. Student study space is instructional space.

T. Hill- Don’t complicate the process more than necessary. Sometimes waiting on a project makes it more expensive in the long run.

J. Barnett- Likes the deadline approach. Setting a more structured approach similar to strategic budgeting and strategic planning. Having a furniture standard would be helpful in moving the process along. We should define the term “campus” to be inclusive of the preserves and apartment complex.

C. Dawson- Having a preliminary review or checklist from Facilities would be helpful to those proposing a project. The checklist would ensure that all of the relevant information is available for review.

K. Marian- Defer

b. Space Change Requests (page 5)

M. Ogg reviewed the “Default Report” (Attachment A) from the Darwin Math Deck.

M. Ogg review the proposed framework for a project prioritization matrix for review. Reviewed the broad categories with the committee and included that this was based on a process for project prioritization utilized by Information Technology and the Information Technology Advisory Group.

L. Krichmar reviewed the process and mentioned that it isn’t the final decider but instead is a guidance for the committee to prioritize.

E. Lopez mentioned that the framework would work in concert with the process for evaluation.

C. Ingerman shared that Facilities has created a similar form and it might be available to use for a points system.

E. Lopez asked if the committee was in support of the framework concept. The committee approved of proceeding with further development of the framework and process.

K. Marian suggested that the form be consistent and include photos of space before as well as a sketch of the intended design.

K. Schneider asked whether this would cover public art installations. C. Dinno shared that public art would be covered by the Art Committee.
N. Markley asked whether all requests would have the type of renderings that the “Darwin Math Deck” had. It was suggested that projects may be handled on a case by case basis. There could be two levels of review based on the project complexity and committee comfort with intended outcome and level of detail provided.

K. Marian suggested that after the approval of the committee Facilities would look at the implementation plan and would help facilitate the details.

E. Chelini asked what would happen if a submitted project changes after approved? E. Lopez said that the policy should indicate that if the scope of the project changes the project should be brought back to the committee. K. Marian and C. Ingerman said that as representatives from Facilities they would make the judgement of what would be returned for review to the committee.

E. Lopez suggested that a Working Group further develop the policy/process from the feedback provided by the committee. K. Marian, C. Ingerman, and M. Ogg will constitute the workgroup and will bring an updated process to the committee for review at the next meeting.

**ACTION:** Working Group to update committee on progress at the next meeting.

V. **Next Meeting**

Meeting adjourned at 2:21pm.

Minutes prepared by Mike Ogg