

**MEETING NOTES OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACILITIES PLANNING BOARD  
November 8, 2011**

**Members Present:** Joe Fedock – Chair, Walt Banziger - Vice Chair, Kurt Blunck, Jeff Butler, Jeff Jacobsen, Linda LaCrone for Tom McCoy, Patricia Lane, Jim Rimpau, Jim Thull

**Members Absent:** James Becker, Allyson Bristol, Michael Everts, Mandy Hansen, Terry Leist, Martha Potvin, Tom Stump, Joseph Thiel – ASMSU, Allen Yarnell, Brenda York

**Guests:** Ritchie Boyd, Debbie Drews, Billy Dubois, Bob Lashaway, Candace Mastel

The University Facilities Planning Board met beginning at 3:30 pm to discuss the following:

**ITEM No. 1 – Approval of Meeting Notes**

Butler moved to approve the meeting notes from September 27, October 11 and October 25, 2011. Jacobsen seconded the motion. The meeting notes were unanimously approved by the Board.

**ITEM No. 2 – Executive Committee Report – No actions to report**

**ITEM No. 3 – Consent Agenda**

**ITEM No. 4 – Informational – North Hedges Suites Building 3**

The site was selected for a three building complex 15 years ago. Only two suites were completed in 1997 and now the third suite is being designed. The third suite will not be the same as the existing two. Now that students have changed, it will be reprogrammed to give what is needed. It is located on the master plan in blue, northwest of the North Hedges Tower and east of the historical SOB Barn, and will form an important place in the long range campus plan. It will reflect key architectural elements and will complement the SOB Barn and North Hedges Tower, but won't replicate them.

The proposed building is roughly 30,000 sq. ft. and will be three to four stories. The building will hopefully accommodate up to 90 residents (75 to 80 residents is the goal). There is a possibility of having some ancillary uses within the building, such as centralized laundry. More ancillary space would allow the three buildings to have their own services. Currently there is a resident director that serves North Hedges, the two existing suites and students in the family housing area. There is a possibility to put a new resident director department within the new building so that they can serve a more sensible number of residents. It will be a building with no back door and will have four fronts on it. Service areas will be an issue as they go through the site design, but they will most likely be on the eastern side of the building and will also assist in servicing North Hedges. The social green space will also be enhanced.

There is a fixed budget of \$6 million. Construction will commence next summer and will be completed in summer 2013 for move-in of fall 2013. This is a GCCM project, which means the contractor is brought on board at an early stage and is a way to shortcut the design process down so that it can get designed in a rapid period of time. Contractors will be interviewed in the next three weeks and designs will be presented in about two months.

**ITEM No. 5 – Informational –Landscape Master Plan**

The Landscape Master Plan is being developed as a complementary plan to the LRCDP. It deals with landscaping and site work, and breaks down to a more micro level of planning. Feedback from this first reading will help determine if the Plan accomplishes the three major goals and other goals that are outlined in the document. The first goal is to create a document that would support the continued improvement and appearance of campus. The second is to assist with lining the desires for aesthetics and amenities with the realities of funding, maintenance and real life issues that are dealt with on campus every day. The third is to present in the very end some more bold and conceptual ideas for how focal areas on campus could be redeveloped or enhanced through incremental improvement or a “let's just go for it” kind of improvement if we have the funding.

A lot of accomplishments have already been made towards the big ideas that The Plan presents because they're balanced and good decision making ideas. It also gives guidelines for the future if we decide to change the paradigm for how those things are done and how they are accomplished without a limited budget and by doing simple best management processes. It tries to

take that huge spread of opportunities and address them. It could address maintenance to something big like the redesign of the entire centennial kind of space.

There were a series of public charettes that faculty and staff attended fairly readily as well as a student charette. People inside the university, such as internal staff, maintenance and those in horticulture were also consulted with to help bring up more realistic things for the document that would work in the real world. Mastel will take edits and implement them over the next four weeks, and UFPB will come back for a second reading. It will then be finalized and presented to faculty senate, staff senate and professional counsel for more input in January or February. Then it will be brought back to UFPB with final edits and a final recommendation will be sent to the President in March or April.

#### **ITEM No. 6 – Recommendation – College of Agriculture Donor Signage**

This is a recommendation to continue to move forward with the College of Agriculture donor recognition package. This is the second phase of the package. The first phase came to UFPB previously when the donor board, located in the lobby, was installed. The second phase recognizes nine rooms in the building. The package has been developed by the College of Agriculture and has gone to the Commemorative Tributes Committee. They have reviewed it and find the naming appropriate for the University and made their recommendation that it come to UFPB for design concept review and approval. Once UFPB approves it will go to the President for recommendation of finalization and installation.

There are nine plaques that are going to be put up. The locations are finalized, however, the size of the plaques are not. There is a lot text and graphics that might go with the plaques. The largest plaque is expected to be 2' x 3'. The College would like a concept approval from UFPB first, before the sizes are known, and then get proofs made and finalize those. It is up to UFPB so say yes, they can move forward or no, and have the Board see the development of the layout first. Only concepts are in the package provided. The different sizes are due to varying text and descriptions for each donor of what the donor would like to see for describing their contribution. The lettering has to be a certain size and that guides the size of the plaque itself. The goal was to have the plaques the same size, but some of the donors are interested in a lot of text. The plaques are by the door inside the rooms and not in the hallway. So you won't see the varying sizes when walking down the hallway. They are, however, being made of the same material, which is cast metal.

The cost is about \$5,000 for each sign. No state funds are being used. It will all come from private funds collected that was leftover from the project. The plaques will retire under another major renovation or change in function of space. At that point the donor will be contacted.

Lashaway moved to allow continuing to move forward. Jacobsen seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved with no opposes or abstentions.

#### **ITEM No. 7 – Recommendation – Second Reading of Classroom Design Guidelines**

This is the second and final read of the Classroom Design Guidelines. The Guidelines have gone through this Board, the Classroom Committee, and were submitted to Faculty Senate, ASMSU, Professional Council and Staff Senate. There weren't any comments that came back from any of those groups. The document hasn't changed much since the first reading. Some grammatical corrections were made as well as a change in some terminology. The terminology in square footage per space per student was changed to be more reflective of how our current usages are. It was changed to "a square foot per station" rather than "a square foot per seat." The reason it is called a square foot per station, is if you go from a traditional front to back lecture with a tablet arm, you have a seat with a tablet arm, but now when you go into seminar space or into a lecture style with a table and chair type setup, it's more of a station and not a seat in the square footage. That difference is made in the modifications to reflect the greater square footage per station once you start going in those other pedagogies. The document has been tested with the Wilson renovation, the AJMH renovations, and the Roberts Hall renovation. A lot of this document was used to develop those classrooms and a lot of lessons were learned from the Reid Hall Room 108 renovation that helped tweak it. The ADA is covered as well. It would pertain more to renovations than new construction. Renovations would be made accessible where possible. During a renovation we do the best that we can with the space that we have.

Thull moved to approve the recommendation. Blunk seconded the Motion and it was unanimously approved with no opposes or abstentions.

Update with Classroom Committee – Over the last 2 meetings registrar classrooms were being prioritized into a 1, 2, 3 or 4 priority. 1 being a 0-2 year window, 2 being 2-5 years, 3 being 5-10 years, and 4 being over 10 years. For example, Gaines and Reid 108 would be in priority 4; and Linfield 125 and Roberts 101 would be in priority 1. The large classrooms (115

people or more) and medium size classrooms (50-115 people) were categorized and prioritized. During the next meeting in December the small classrooms (49 people and less) will be prioritized. Once complete, we will have a list of what the Classroom Committee thinks the priority for renovating individual classrooms across campus are. Those three levels of classrooms will be brought to this Board to finalize and discuss, and will then send to the President for approval.

As we get money, such as the \$1.5 million year end funds that we have been told we have the next year and the year after for renovating classrooms, the priority 1's will start to be renovated using the Classroom Design Guidelines as our standard. The one question the Board will have is: will there be a draw to one side or another of pedagogy vs. capacity? That is something the Classroom Committee is looking to get some guidance on in terms of when a classroom is picked to be renovated, does the pedagogy teaching styles move more toward the 21<sup>st</sup> century or are we still going to be focusing on capacity. With a front to back lecture style teaching classroom we maximize the capacity of the room. With the concerns about shortage of classrooms that's what we have been doing. If we want to go into other teaching styles, such as pod design, seminar design and other interactive classroom design, the configuration starts to change. So between 20 and 30 percent of capacity will be lost. That is something the Classroom Committee is struggling with, meaning the direction the university should be thinking of in terms of its future with pedagogy vs. capacity. Once a room is renovated, it's hard to change down the road. It will be like that for the next 15 -30 years before it's renovated again.

This meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

VCD/ik

PC:

President Cruzado  
ASMSU President  
Jody Barney, College of Agriculture  
Pat Chansley, Provost Office  
Victoria Drummond, Facilities PDC  
Heidi Gagnon, VP Admin & Finance

Diane Heck, Provost Office  
Jennifer Joyce, Planning & CIO Office  
Linda LaCrone, VP Research Office  
Shari McCoy, Presidents Office  
Becky McMillan, Auxiliary Services  
Julie Kipfer, Communications

Lisa Duffey, College of Agriculture  
Robert Putzke, MSU Police  
Bonnie Ashley, Registrar  
JoDee Palin, Coll of Arts & Arch