

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

10-15-2013

Planning minutes 10/15/2013

Planning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan>

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 10/15/2013" (2013). *Planning Committee*. 34.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/34>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Planning Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

MINUTES
Of the
Planning Committee
Tuesday, October 15, 2013 Meeting

Present: Arne Kildegaard (chair), Jon Anderson, Jim Barbour, Michael Eble, Julie Eckerle, Jim Hall, Jane Kill, Sarah Mattson, Jordan Wentz

Absent: Joe Kleckner, Leslie Meek, Joe Vertnik, Lowell Rasmussen

Arne called the meeting to order.

- Arne asked for approval of minutes from the September 17, 2013 meeting. After minor editorial correction Jon Anderson made the motion to accept the minutes, seconded by Julie. Approved unanimously.
- Jim Hall moved to approve the minutes from the October 1 tour. Seconded by Julie Eckerle and approved unanimously.
- Arne asked for the group's opinion of the campus tour.

Discussion:

Julie Eckerle felt the tour was very useful and informative. There was the hope more buildings would be visited. Julie also suggested the next tour be more detailed, with less standing outside buildings. However, she did understand the issues, as Tammy Berberi was not able to access all buildings on this tour.

Discussion about the library ensued. The issue being when the Student Center is closed, there is no ADA access to the Library. Likewise, a very important and unnerving fact is there is no sprinkler system in the library.

During the tour, Lowell made a remark he heard from his predecessor. "These buildings are indestructible unless the building envelope is compromised. We only have enough money to seal the envelope." Basically, it is saying the insides of buildings have been neglected, as funding has been scarce. How many of the "envelope issues" have been completed?

Jane Kill would like to see rooms retrofitted with new curtains, desks/chairs, and such. "If we are proud of the outside shouldn't we be just as proud of the inside."

Julie reiterated the fact that two things during the tour really shouted out with a profound voice:

- 1) Accessibility
- 2) Safety

These are necessary things to keep in mind. We need to go with safety before aesthetics. I also feel we need to look at accessibility for Camden, MRC, and the Library (when the Student Center is closed). These are vital and trump other issues. Prioritize on the “external seal” yes, but then accessibility and safety come next. What are the grandfather issues for our buildings?

The question was asked, what is the minimum standard for safety and security? In addition, do we then focus on presentation and if so, what is the progression? Do we need to make sure all classrooms are functional with proper desks, accommodations, clean etc. before going on to the next step?

Arne asked where the air handling and climate control issue falls on the priority list. A response questioned is it above or below ADA. Jim Hall feels that ADA takes precedence but again feels the climate control/environment would come next. However, considering air quality it might be on the same point with ADA. Arne injected he is aware of a mold issue in Science 2085/2090. When mold/mildew is present, it may trigger asthma.

We need to ask Lowell if recent air quality tests have been taken. Michael Eble informed us both the painting studio and ceramic studio are fine. The air handler in those areas is built to handle what transpires in those rooms. Those are geared more to handle VOCs.

Is this a good juncture to ask Lowell to discuss the HEAPR handout? After the tour, our memories may be more alert and have more ideas of what we need to present Vice President and CFO Richard Pfutzenreuter when he visits Morris mid-November. In addition, he may be able to address more of our building improvement questions.

Why was HFA and its railings put ahead of other issues? Who makes the priorities? What is the priority regarding the railings by the gallery? Accessibility issues with offices such as Ray Schultz and Jimmy Schryver.

- Arne reported that he met on Thursday, September 26 with Chancellor Johnson and Vice Chancellor Lowell Rasmussen. This meeting revolved around the priorities for the 2013-14 Planning Committee agenda. Discussion in that meeting centered on two points:

- 1) The committee should review the 2006 strategic plan
 - a. Note what has been completed
 - b. Drop certain antiquated goals
 - c. Update the goals of continuing interest
- 2) The committee should carefully review the desired enrollment figure of 2100, which is prominently featured in the 2006 strategic plan. The target number has consequences for many other staffing and space considerations on campus, and these should be part of the Planning Committee’s deliberations

Planning Committee Discussion: About 2 years ago we had several persons from various campus departments visit this committee. The committee needs to revisit those conversations before other invitations go out. Julie Eckerle believes it was very clear from previous conversations there is not room for 2100 students. Jon Anderson believes people think in hard blocks, when in reality they are not necessarily hard. For example, labs could be held in the evenings. Other university/college campuses do not necessarily shut down at 4:30. He wonders if this a structural impediment we impose on ourselves? Kildegaard promised to review minutes from 2011-12 and 2012-13 to identify those sets directly concerned with the facilities constraints that may make 2100 infeasible. He will email the committee with the relevant minutes.

- The essential agenda for 2013-14 will be as follows:
 1. Play a stronger role in prioritizing HEAPR funds
 2. Make clear recommendations in terms of capital planning (expansion and major renovations)
 3. Review the strategic plan, identifying goals accomplished, goals that are effectively outdated or otherwise no longer on the agenda, and a few priority areas for continued pursuit.
 4. Reconsider the optimal enrollment, along with recommendations for faculty-student ratios, housing units on-campus, and other enrollment-sensitive staffing and space considerations.

- Next meeting: first on the agenda however is to have Lowell Rasmussen (15-30 minutes) discuss the HEAPR list. Next: begin our review of the strategic plan.

The next meeting is October 29, 2013 at 11:00 am in the Prairie Lounge.