Facilities Subcommittee of the Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment Council

Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>IEAC Facilities Subcommittee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>April 26, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Cheryl Hanson, Facilities Assoc. VP</td>
<td>Time: Start</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>President’s Large Conference Room</td>
<td>Time: End</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members Attending: Debra Easterly, Jason Adams, Cheryl Hanson, Nancy Devine, Brian Hickenlooper, Vince Miller, Mark Norviel, John Gribas, Doug Milder, and Karen Appleby

Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>March 15, 2018 minutes approved.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Approval of previous minutes (March 15, 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PSR 18-040 Installation of new trees</td>
<td>Jason Adams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | • Criteria 5 was scored as a 1 “Project directly advances a departmental goal in support of the University strategic plan or as a priority of Program Prioritization.” Does planting trees in the parking lot support the strategic plan?  
  ◦ A part of the University strategic plan is to increase student enrollment. If we have a well maintained and beautiful campus it will attract students and make it more likely that they will want to attend.  
  ◦ It seems that trees are being planted really close together. Is there a reason for this?  
  ◦ The amount of space given to trees is dependent on the type of tree. Some trees will need more room than others.  
  ◦ Do we want to plant trees where the branches can spread into the road and parking lots?  
  ◦ The tree branches on the trees on Bartz way are coming onto the roadway.  
  ◦ The trees in this area are called street sprites. They should spread up into an oval shape instead of out. They are not able to be trimmed until they are more mature.  
  ◦ It is very important that we are careful about what types of plants we are putting on campus. For example, we have a fruit tree that creates a mess every time it is in season.  
  ◦ They are trying to complete this project without taking any parking spaces away from Reed Gym.  
  ◦ In Meridian they have very strict ordinances that require trees and sidewalks in parking lots. We do not have these kind of restrictions on our Pocatello campus.  
  ◦ The rubric score was approved at 38. |
| 3  | PSR 18-055 Alumni Center | Jason Adams |
|    | • This project is set to be completed in 2021. This has been an idea since around 1999. They have already fundraised a substantial amount of money for this project. The have approximately $ 6 million of the $8 million needed.  
  ◦ In the project description it is mentioned that the proceeds from the eventual sale of the Magnuson and Servel homes will be allocated to the project at an estimate of $500 K.  
  ◦ The selling of the Magnuson House and Servel house have |
not been finalized. Right now it has just been brought up as a suggestion.
  • The Servel house is in need of many upgrades and repairs. The plumbing, the HVAC, the roof, the electrical, and the windows will all need to be repaired or replaced.
  • The Servel house is 6,600 square feet.
  • The new President was given the option of living in the Servel house or taking a stipend and choosing another place to live. A decision has not been made yet.

• Specifics of the new Alumni Center
  • The location is tentatively set for the North East Corner by Holt Arena. It will be on the corner of Memorial Drive and Bonneville Street.
  • They would like to have DL conference rooms, and will need Networking and Communication support.
  • This building can be utilized by other units on campus. For example, departments will be able to use it for special events.
  • Right now the plan is that this building will house ISU Foundation and Alumni Relations.
  • The attached plan is not accurate and will need to be reworked.

• The IEAC Facilities Subcommittee agreed that the score was way too high for this project. After reviewing the responses to the criteria, it was found many were over scored.
  • Criteria 4 was reduced from a one to a zero. This reduces the score by five points. This project is not necessary to ensure the physical safety of the University member or the data of University systems.
  • Criteria 5 was reduced from a three to a one. This reduces the score by eight points. This project advances a department goal in support of the University strategic plan, but does not really directly support the University strategic plan.
  • Criteria 7 was reduced from a one to a zero. This reduces the score by three points. This project will not increase research initiatives.
  • Criteria 9 was reduced from a one to a zero. This reduces the score by two points. This project will not increase student success.
  • Criteria 11 was reduced from a two to a one. This project will increase staff’s efficiency and effectiveness, but it will not mitigate a major issue for all or a large portion of staff.
  • Criteria 12 was reduced from a three to a two. The current system is not completely inadequate.
  • After the reductions are applied the updated rubric score is 69.

• A thing that we will have to consider is that this building is not generating revenue. If we were to build a new building to house our programs we would be able generate revenue from student tuition and fees.
  • The Alumni association does not have very good database in regards to alumni.
  • They have been working on building back up the database and getting additional information. It is believed that they have hired someone to gather information.

• When the University does a large capital campaign the administration works with the VPs to determine what the needs of their people are.
  • We need to remind them that this committee has already done a lot of the legwork and we have provided feedback on
the requests that we have received from the departments. We have made a prioritized list and have a perspective on how the projects relate to one another. We can give a recommendation on what the University should be fundraising for.

- The rubric does not have a place for this project to show the impact it can have on the University and the positive influence it can have on many different areas of campus.
  - One very positive impact it can have is to show students that when they leave the University they are still valued.

- Would it be possible to combine the welcome center with the Alumni Center?
  - We would need to change the scope, and most likely the cost would be increased. The welcome center would need approximately $10,000 square feet.
  - If the building was placed by Holt, this would probably not be the best place to start tours. It is kind of far away from main campus.

- With a rubric score of 69 it will be ranked as number 8 out of 9 on the capital project list.

- This project has come to the committee after the fact. They have already began fundraising and planning. If this project is to go through it will take a significant amount of time from the Facilities Services department.
  - If we begin working on this project it will take time away from the projects that have already been approved by the committee.
  - We may have to put some other projects on hold, which would not make our customers happy.
  - The longer we wait on projects, the higher the cost will be.
  - Is there a way that if the project is not a priority on our list we can instruct the department or person in charge that they will need to hire their own project manager to run the project.
    - This would add significantly to the price of the project.
    - This could deter departments from pushing project through that are not, according to the committee, ranked as high as other projects.

- It is very important that we think about the functionality of the Alumni Center while making the plans. The Alumni center at Boise State is not as functional as it could be. It could not accommodate large groups very well.

- The construction site is right where the basketball arena was going to go. The donor does have a say in where the building with go. They can stipulate that they will only donate the money if the building is put in a specific location.

- The revised rubric score was approved at 69.

### Handouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>IEAC Packages on Box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Meetings:**
May 24, 2018
June 28, 2018