

Idaho State University
Campus Planning Council
Minutes

Wednesday, March 18, 2009
10:00 AM
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301

In Attendance: Ames (Chair), Bowen, Brooks (Vice-Chair), Dance, Daniels, Han, Hofle, Horton,
Kearns, Rodriguez, Sanger, Steiner, Vahsholtz
Excused: Lewis, Plewa; Fletcher, Ford
Absent: Imel, Krehbiel, Martin; Shurtliff
Ex-Officio: Chatterton, Toney, Wallace (Recording Secretary)

1. Preliminaries:

a. Meeting Minutes of January 28, 2009

The minutes were not finished yet; deferred until next time.

b. Announcements

Ames said Gary Olson, the new Provost, would be arriving and starting his new job on April 1st. He mentioned a new article by Olson on policies, procedures and rules published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Hofle had read it and volunteered to email a copy to Council members.

2. Capital Projects Planning

a. Capital Project List Spreadsheet

Daniels reported the subcommittee met every couple of weeks. He formally thanked Bowen, Han, and Steiner for their hard work in developing the ranking form and flowchart. Han said he was meeting weekly with project managers and is compiling updated project status information into the spreadsheet. He will distribute the spreadsheet to deans and faculty as an information tool to keep them informed about campus projects. Currently the spreadsheet lists only current projects funded by the Department of Public Works (DPW) but he will add all other campus projects as he acquires information about them. The spreadsheet will soon be posted to the Facilities Services website and the information will be regularly updated. He cautioned that although feedback is welcome, many of the projects are already under way and there are many processes beyond the control of Facilities Services.

Han explained that projects and budgets have to be worked out before the paperwork can be submitted to DPW; then once DPW approves funding, the project has to fit the allotted budget. In the past, projects did not have clearly defined scopes of work before entering the process. He is working to change that and make sure a clear job scope is defined before any work is done on a project. That will make it easier to establish accurate budgets.

b. Project Ranking Form

Daniels pointed out that a clear job scope is the first criterion on the ranking form developed by the subcommittee. Draft copies of the ranking form and flowcharts were distributed to Council members. Daniels explained the five steps on the ranking form and how the final project score for each project would be derived. The final scores would provide a means of comparison and prioritization of the many project proposals. Daniels asked members for feedback and suggestions about the ranking form.

Han said faculty should work with their chairs, deans and Facilities Services to figure out project scopes and feasibility. The goal is to clearly define project scopes, establish realistic

budgets and prioritize projects across campus before Facilities Services starts working on them. Han wants to balance projects across the university so that no one unit is getting the lions' share of its projects at the expense of other units. He also wants to ensure priority projects are adequately supported and funded. Daniels said there will be instructions and guidelines to go along with the ranking form to help chairs and deans self-evaluate proposed projects before submitting them for consideration.

Han pointed out an error on the draft ranking form: in Step 5, line item 2 should read **"Improves Recruitment and Retention"** instead of **"Required for Life Safety Compliance"**

c. Flowcharts

1) **Annual Capital Project List Review and Prioritization Flow Chart**

Daniels explained the flowchart's timeline and sequence of the review and input processes before any approvals take place. Once a project proposal is approved as being feasible, it is prioritized by Campus Planning Council using the ranking criteria and forwarded concurrently to Faculty Senate, Academic Council and the Vice Presidents for their review and comments. Bowen said this was change from the original version of the flowchart was prompted by Faculty Senate's concerns expressed last year. The subcommittee felt it was important the President know where the recommendations were coming from – whether faculty, deans, or which Vice President(s) – which will help him assess the independent recommendations and make a more informed final decision.

Han pointed out **another box should be added to the flowchart** just after the President and his Cabinet review the prioritized list. At that point **both Campus Planning Council and Facilities Services should be informed** of the decisions and actions to be taken. Bowen said President Vailas indicated he wanted to be more accountable for reporting back to Senate, its Councils and other entities as to what was decided and the rationale behind those decisions.

Sanger suggested the **"Project Prioritization" box explicitly state the ranking criteria and form are used in that step**. Han agreed to make that change. Bowen clarified that the subcommittee would prioritize the projects, and forward their priority lists to the Campus Planning Council for approval, then to the Faculty Senate for its approval. Bowen suggested **the flowchart also specify the ranking criteria be used in the first step** as the project and its scope are first developed.

Daniels said Steiner mentioned that for Step 2 on the ranking form the Financial Services website has information about developing business plans. Han said the business plan would be an essential element in proposals submitted; if no business plan is included, the assumption would be that the project has not been thoroughly thought through. Bowen said **the accompanying instructions would state that project proposals will need to be updated and resubmitted every year**; they will not automatically be carried over from year to year because too many things may have changed in the meantime. Daniels said the long-term goal is to have an electronic process that represents the flowchart, and no project would progress to the next step until all the required approvals have been obtained and documented.

Ames asked that **the individuals and units submitting proposals get feedback on how their projects fared in the ranking process**. He also suggested the Council and its subcommittee keep all documents related to project ranking and prioritization on file for at least a year. Han suggested publishing the final ranking numbers for each project on the website.

2) **Project Development and Approval Process for Department Funded Projects**

Daniels said Han developed this flowchart for internally-funded projects using grants, donations, and other sources. It is essentially the same process as for state-funded projects with a few additional components for review and refining by units, deans, directors and stakeholders. Han said the major problem with such projects is to keep the rest of the campus

informed about them. This flowchart attempted to address that problem and make sure such projects fit into the overall mission and vision of the university. He pointed out that Facilities Services would not be involved in the academic decision-making process other than to provide support and feedback. The Vice Presidents would be responsible for answering questions, addressing concerns and resolving disagreements before the project is sent to Facilities to work on.

ACTION: Bowen moved **to approve the documents and processes with the revisions suggested in today's discussion.** Seconded by Sanger.

Discussion: Sanger suggested **the traffic flow be clarified:** there are several places where the flow splits and can go in different directions but with no indication under what conditions it goes one way rather than the other (e.g. YES, this way; or NO, that way). Rodriguez would like more time to discuss the drafts with department chairs and other faculty members.

ACTION: Rodriguez moved **to table the documents until next time.** Seconded by Hofle. No discussion. The motion **passed unanimously;** the items were **tabled** until the next meeting. Han agreed to incorporate the changes and send the revised documents to the secretary for distribution to Council members.

There was discussion about the different shapes used in the flowchart. Han said each shape has a specific technical meaning, but did not go into details other than diamond shapes are a decision. He explained that the ranking form fits into the strategic plan for the campus and each goal listed in Step 3 has its own subgoals. The multipliers are too complicated to explain in a document, but it all fits into the campus master strategic plan. Bowen said the subcommittee's intent was to write instructions to go with the forms, but they have not had a chance to do so. The form and flowchart should be finalized and approved first. Han said that the most important thing is that all groups have input and buy-in on the process, otherwise any prioritization effort will be for naught. Ames asked Han to keep the Council apprised of the administration's view of the documents.

3. Facility Naming Requests – confidential, do not publicize proposed names

- a. Naming of new Meridian facility (requires SBOE approval, on their April 16th agenda)
- b. Naming of Pharmacy Complex in new Meridian facility
- c. Renaming of ISU Graduate Dental Residency Clinic in Meridian facility
- d. Renaming of College of Technology Industrial Crafts Building

Ames briefly reviewed a memo from Vice President Fletcher regarding the naming requests. The Vice President of Finance and Administration chairs the Facilities Naming Committee, but Mr. Fletcher had been tied up with the budget crisis all semester and was not available to answer Ames' questions and repeated requests for information regarding the naming process and status. Instead, Mr. Fletcher sent the memo to inform the Council what had been decided on the four naming requests without Council's involvement, input or knowledge.

There is a problem in that the Facilities Naming Committee is a standing subcommittee of this Council and is also described separately in the Faculty/Staff Handbook. Ames said there were two issues at stake for the Council to consider:

- 1) What does the Council want to do about the naming decisions?
- 2) What changes does the Council want to propose be made to the process to ensure the subcommittee reports to and acts through the Council as it is supposed to?

Bowen felt there was no discrepancy between the two descriptions of the Naming Committee, and was upset that Mr. Fletcher had not responded to the Council's multiple invitations to

come to the Council to discuss how the Facilities Naming Committee fits into the shared governance structure and how naming requests should be handled. The Council members were adamant that the administrative decisions made without this Council's nor the Faculty Senate's involvement were inappropriate and out of line. They agreed that further clarification of the process was needed.

There are many costs involved in changing building names: taking down old signs and installing new signage, updating printed and online maps, informing telecommunications and emergency service networks, and other associated costs. Not having those costs recognized and discussed openly and transparently is not in the spirit of shared governance nor is it in the spirit of what this administration has publicly advocated.

The relevant section of the Faculty/Staff Handbook was read aloud, and the Handbook clearly identified the Facilities Naming Committee as a standing committee of the Campus Planning Council, not an independent entity operating outside the purview of the shared governance structure or the Faculty Senate. No promises may be made to potential donors as to prospective names until the naming process is completed and the final recommendation is approved by the State Board of Education.

The Council discussed various ways to clarify the naming process and membership of the Committee. The Council had the option of proposing changes to the Faculty/Staff Handbook and changing its own bylaws to clarify the role of the Facilities Naming Committee and the procedures to be followed in naming buildings.

ACTION: Bowen moved **that the Campus Planning Council refuses to respond to the naming decisions that have been made and requests that President Vailas come to the Council to discuss their concerns about the facility naming process. The refusal to respond is based on the fact that the Council and Faculty Senate were not involved in the process.** Seconded by Kearns.

Discussion: Brooks asked Ames to elaborate on the chain of events that led up to the Committee's meeting on February 19th. Ames said the initial contact he received last fall was a request to rubberstamp an approval of a renaming request via email. The Council was aghast at that time that a building could be renamed based on a casual email vote with no discussion at all. The fact that of the four naming requests mentioned in Mr. Fletcher's memo to the Council, only two were known of by the Council and the Faculty Senate's administrative assistant, who handles all the paperwork and information flow to Faculty Senate and the Council, was a major concern and a strong indication that there was a serious communication breakdown between the Administration and the Faculty Senate.

Toney asked if the Committee ever met in person. It met once on February 19th. Ames could not attend that day. Steiner did attend; he said the Committee went through the list of naming requests, asked for comments and voted on each one. The problem was that no alternatives were solicited nor discussed as the Handbook calls for, and that the faculty governance system was circumvented. Another problem was that the administration ignored invitations to discuss the process with the Council or with Faculty Senate. The budget crisis experienced this year demonstrated the inherent flaws in a process that calls for the Vice President for Finance and Administration to be chair of a Committee – he or she is simply too busy with other important issues to arrange meetings that are not central to those issues. Ames said he would draft a Faculty/Staff Handbook change for the Council to consider next time.

ACTION: Daniels moved **to table the motion until the next meeting.** Seconded by Brooks. The motion was **passed**, with two opposed.

Because of time constraints the rest of the agenda items were deferred until the next meeting.

4. Adjournment: 11:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Ames
Chair, Campus Planning Council

Catherine Wallace
Administrative Assistant 1
Faculty Senate Office

Approved by Campus Planning Council: May 1, 2009 via email ballots
Accepted by Faculty Senate: May 4, 2009