

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

---

11-24-2015

### Planning minutes 11/24/2015

Planning Committee

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 11/24/2015" (2015). *Planning Committee*. 78.  
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/78>

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](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

<b>To:</b>	<b>Planning Committee:</b>	Oscar Baldelomar, Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Jana Koehler, Mike Cihak, Helen Juarez, Austin Tipper, Rachel Evangelisto, Bryan Herrmann (ex-officio), Gwen Rudney (ex-officio), Jim Hall (ex-officio), Alison (West) Campbell -(secretary)
	<b>Present:</b>	Oscar Baldelomar, Bryan Herrmann, Sandy Kill, Gwen Rudney, Austin Tipper, Bryan Herrmann, Jim Hall, Alison (West) Campbell
<b>From:</b>	Engin Sungur, Chair	
<b>Subject:</b>	Meeting Agenda	
	<b>Date:</b>	November 24, 2015 (Tuesday)
	<b>Start:</b>	8:02am
	<b>End:</b>	9:04am
	<b>Place:</b>	Imholte Hall 115

The agenda:

1. Approval of November 17, 2015 Minutes (5 min.).  
*Action: Approval after a word change*
2. The Blakely elevator design and the Facilities Condition Assessment reports (Bryan Herrmann) (25 minutes)
  - Why does Blakely have the curved arch over the door way? Concrete dome at the entrance of Blakely was trying to match the curvature of Behmler
  - Why doesn't the breeze way to be constructed as part of the elevator project look the same as the rest of the building? –
    - Historical architects would prefer that new structures look new and not detract from the rest of the building or try to match it too closely.
    - Wanted to mirror what we are doing with Imholte and Welcome Center
  - The original plan was to put the elevator on the South side of the building but there is an electrical cable that runs along the outside that would cost \$200,000 to remove
  - Other option was to not do the breeze way and have the entrance be in the back but other buildings have that and it sends the wrong message
  - Elevator will have 3.5 stops
  - Sidewalk will be added, leading to the back door on the garden floor which will have access to the elevator
  - Breaking ground in May
3. Board of Regents – current status of buildings current assessment every 10 years they look at where each building is on structure/safety level
  - .50 is seen as okay – anything above is considered poor and critical
  - Education is the worst at .69
  - Humanities needs to get worked on – it gets used a tremendous amount, need to update the HVAC system.
  - Argument for Blakely is that the people and programs in the worst rated building on campus need to have facilities, it's a division and a major program that supports the need in Blakely – putting the elevator in makes the entire building handicap accessible

- When we see increases in that number what needs to be done?
    - They do assessment of entire building
    - Not considering what class room spaces look like
    - Sightline has done some work and will come in January – they do a walk around and tell us what the general insides of the building looks like
  - Need to plan for regular maintenance and correction of building that are having trouble
  - What is causing the dorm numbers to be so high? - Roofs and plumbing
  - Do we have a map that shows what buildings are accessible or not? – not at this time but Bryan can get one
    - Do we have a master plan to take down the older buildings? – not a great strategy as they are in the historic district
    - 15 years ago looked at Skyway connections or tunnels – very expensive
  - It doesn't cost us as much to take them off of the .7 list as it does for Twin Cities Campus
  - Not sure when other buildings will be put into the funding systems – 2018 for next funding
    - Elevator in the Multi-ethnic building would be next
    - Do we do Education next or Camden?
    - We always need to wait until a project is funded to do the final design as we don't have the resources to fund multiple designs on a project in case it is funded.
  - Are there any other campuses that have similar accessibility issues? – Crookston has some similar issues.
  - If Twin Cities has .8 building they would take it down but for us it would be cheaper to renovate it
  - Is there a common complaint about what needs to be done? – Planning Committee did a space audit 7-8 years ago so some of this is coming out of that
    - Take the ones that are our highest priority
    - We have a master plan and space utilization for courses during the school year in which building and which class rooms are being used, that is some student flow– we have not had a great deal operationally
    - What comes next for our 2018 Capital HEAPR?
  - Twin Cities a 4 million investment wouldn't do much but for us 4 million a year would help us change the outlook 10-20 years out
  - Capital planners collect info about what you need and they send it to architects
4. Continued Discussion on Strategic Plan Revision/Update. (30 minutes)
- Engin integrated the three documents - Took 2006 plan and added in color what the 2013 and 2014 plan reviews said
  - To assess what we have done we need metrics – Maroon and gold from Twin Cities
    - Suggestion that we should give up on the term “Honors College”
  - Every year the document will be updated
  - Trying to figure out if the strategic plan needs to be changed/assessed every year?
    - Trying to get us to a document that makes sense for everyone

- Lots of new grants that we can get and will shape the future of the university which needs to be integrated on how we will make use of them
- The strategic plan should not go in different directions each year. Pulling from 2 reports and an old strategic plan. Are we progressing? - It will go to related unit then go to campus assembly if there is a major change
- Engin said that people don't look at the Strategic Plan but Gwen said that she knows for a fact that people refer back to it all the time
  - Was not a systematic assessment through the committee structure
- First stage is to merge the 3 documents and make a living document
  - Need to have everything merged and include the metrics before the new Chancellor comes in
- Second stage (next year) is to send to related units and get updated data, then it will go to Campus Assembly if there are major changes