

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

10-29-2013

Planning minutes 10/29/2013

Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 10/29/2013" (2013). *Planning Committee*. 36.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/36>

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 29, 2013 Meeting

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

Absent: Joe Kleckner, Leslie Meek, Joe Vertnik, Jordan Wente

Arne Kildegaard called the meeting to order.

- Arne asked for approval of minutes from the October 15, 2013 meeting with the corrections Julie Eckerle discovered. Jim Barbour made the motion to accept the minutes, seconded by Jon Anderson and approved.
- Lowell Rasmussen presented information regarding HEAPR and capital planning. He distributed two documents and offered the following information:
 - 1) the current HEAPR request related to UMM that is going before the state legislature this spring
 - 2) the historical allocation Capital Planning and Project Management. The document begins in 2010 and goes forward. This is useful to see what UMM historic funding patterns look like.

The following discussion ensued.

- In August UMM submitted the initial HEAPR request. A request for electrical upgrades for Camden Hall appears on the list, but was subsequently removed, as it did not meet the HEAPR criteria. The request was for pre-design and engineer work. We discovered all pre-design and engineer work must be paid for and completed before the actual project starts. These funds need to come from other sources than HEAPR. It is a “catch 22.” If we do not do the engineering and pre-design the project will never happen. And UMM needs the HEAPR funds to do the project. The purpose for the electrical work in Camden is to enable the electrical load handle of window air conditioners and other high electrical draws. Camden’s full HVAC renovation system and elevator is somewhere down the road.
- All discussions and actions need to be accomplished before August/September 2014. If the work is not done, it cannot be added to the list as a viable project. In addition, discussions need to happen now regarding any other ideas this committee sees as viable projects, as groundwork needs to be completed ahead of time.
- After the campus tour, the two main issues the committee felt have highest priority for this campus remain:
 - 1) accessibility
 - 2) safety

- The legislative session begins in February and the approval/passing of bills continues until May. This is the window for appropriations of capital and HEAPR projects. Next year will not be a capital request year. However, the University often pushes a HEAPR request in a non-capital request year. Does this guarantee anything? No. Should we plan on it? Yes. That way something is ready if we receive a request in August (to have the submission ready by Sept 1.)
 - The committee needs to scrutinize the list--look and see what's on this list and if there are things not addressed. It falls back to what the committee decided after the tour, see which projects need to be added. Determine where areas are glaringly deficient? Which of these projects do we see making its way to the top?
 - In two weeks, the facility audits should be in Lowell's possession. As of 2013 there will be a new set of data regarding deficiencies and UMM campus buildings. These are the things that drive HEAPR, as HEAPR is focusing on facility conditions. This information will help guide the committee and upcoming conversations. (As a reminder, HEAPR funds may only be used for items that have a useable life of longer than 20 years and are related to facilities infrastructure.)
 - Jon Anderson sees this activity as standard work for this committee. The more inclusive we can be on how this list comes together ensures a better list. The same can be said about the capital request list. Lowell has agreed to lay-out a typical time frame the committee will be able to work from. Conversations for both HEAPR and capital planning need to begin early this winter.
- Review of Strategic Plan.
- Everyone received a copy of the review. The document needs to be broken down into various objectives. A spreadsheet would work. The committee could then put items in various categories.
 - If we do this, we could have two columns: 1) Jacquie's column; and 2) our column, based on where this committee feels we are. A 3rd column might address what we think about this objective going forward, in terms of this committee's recommendation. There will need to be a separate key.

Key 1 (Jacquie's key)

- #1 Goal accomplished
- #2 Progress toward goal well underway
- #3 Some but not much progress made toward goal
- #4 Campus needs to reassess goal
- #5 Goal unlikely to be met, due to external or other intervening circumstances

Key 2 (PC key, for column 3)

- #1 Campus should declare victory and move on
- #2 PC recommends continuation of current approach
- #3 PC will study and make recommendations by May, 2014 (dig in on)
- #4 This goal is outside the domain of PC deliberations

#5 PC recommends dropping this goal (move away from this)

- Discussion continued as to how the committee members rated the objectives.

Arne feels the Chancellor could take this list to the Regents and say look at the things we have achieved, and what we are still working on (since 2006).

Lowell commented that the VC group did spend some time discussing the strategic plan. He believes that Jacquie wants to say the plan provided guidance to the campus. Those that have a 1 & 2 noted are items that have been addressed and either completed or well on the way to completion. However, the Chancellor is more concerned about items on the list that we should not be spending time on. Are they a distraction from our focus, or is this document aged to the point it is no longer valid? Are there changes in circumstances or situations that we need to look beyond what is listed. As the committee looks at the document please note if there are things that need to be added?

- Assignment for the next meeting.

Review minutes from 2011-2012 and previous conversations about constraints. Are we getting ahead of ourselves.

Arne will send out a spreadsheet in Google form for all to plug in ratings. At the next meeting bring your completed form and we will dissect as discussions for the Morris 14.

The next meeting is November 12, 2013 at 11:00 am in the Prairie Lounge.