



FACILITIES COUNCIL
MEETING NOTES
December 12, 2006, 3:00 p.m.
Center Bldg. Rm. 407

Present: Janet Anderson, Lee Imonen, Sandy Ing-Wiese, Patrick Lanning, Cathy Lindsley, Bob Mention, Margaret Robertson, Mike Ruiz, Susan Tatar

Absent: Dawn DeWolf, Rob Dow, Hanna Ebener, Robin Geyer, Glenn Goss

Guests: Stephen Pruch

1. Agree on Agenda

Agenda was approved. Margaret e-mailed the agenda and attachments on topics the council is discussing previous to the meeting.

2. Approve Minutes

Minutes were approved.

3. Announcements

Bob Mention is now co-chair for the council, replacing Marie Matsen.

4. Space Standards Policy

Margaret handed out excerpts from *Space Planning for Institutions of Higher Education*, by the Council of Educational Facility Planners International (CEFPI), including a Summary of Recommendations which listed recommended assignable square feet per type of space.

Margaret said the council has to come up with two policies: one for space assignment and one for space standards. Margaret said standards are used for planning, determining how many square feet per student, and incorporating standards for new classrooms and other spaces. Bob said needs come from departments outside of Facilities and must be validated; however, sometimes units don't know how much space they need. Bob said facilities uses standards to put spaces to the uses approved by the college. The facilities department does have a set of space standards but they need to be more detailed. Mike Ruiz said some space guidelines were made for the bond construction and some space is dictated by codes, but we are not at standard for all spaces. Bob questioned whether the discussion was about implementation rather than policy and suggested Lane needs a policy for implementation to develop space standards.

The council discussed ways the college determines and prioritizes space needs for programs, functions and uses. Patrick explained that the Office of Instruction is studying types of activities, unit plans, teaching methods, and redesign ideas to help define what types of spaces are needed. Mike commented that current space may be adequate if it was better utilized and we need to understand what we have. Bob said he believes the principle reason space is not fully utilized is the move to four credits, not the facilities itself. Lee noted that departments are doing the credit conversion piecemeal which affects other departments, and Patrick agreed that there is a gap in the transition that will be addressed.

In a discussion on new bond needs, the council listed and discussed the following factors for determining and prioritizing need:

- Community demand or need
- Employment outlook

- Enrollment/FTE projections
- Cost of program
- Accreditation
- Teaching methods
- Know what we can get from the state
- Clear procedure and policy for input on bond needs
- Fully engage departments
- Make a system for prioritizing needs
- Have space standards for different types of spaces, such as specialized labs
- Attributes of existing spaces, in addition to square feet
- Include HVAC, upgrades, major maintenance, grounds, and infrastructure
- Space utilization: e.g., multiple uses for space, sharing space
- Ability to maintain new space
- Role of space quality and appeal in student enrollment and retention
- Use of data

Margaret said the council needs tools to help with decision-making and Bob said a survey was done in 2003 to assess needs by department. Mike noted that asking people what they need serves a different function than having a centrally-applied space standard. In response to Lee's question if another survey would help, Patrick suggested a "gap analysis" of the 2003 survey to determine if there are new needs.

Stephen said an assessment of the last bond might be useful. Sandy noted that although there is a decrease in enrollment, the previous bond alleviated serious facilities problems with overcrowding, lack of confidentiality for students, and lack of ADA accessible space.

Margaret polled the council to see if they wanted to continue with space standards. Bob suggested determining what the policies would be and what the standards would do. Cathy said it might be better to have benchmarks to aim for and suggested focus groups with faculty who do the same types of instruction to find out what makes a good learning environment. Lee commented that there should be a set of policies to use to assess needs or a formalized transparent procedure to make priority determinations, and there should be standards to justify the decisions. Janet agreed there should be a set of criteria but said there must be flexibility.

Patrick noted that there is a timeline to meet for the next bond. Margaret said the council will look at current standards as a starting point for the next meeting.

5. Campus-wide Conversations Plan

Agenda item postponed. Margaret handed out a proposed plan for members to review.

6. Design Guidelines

Agenda item postponed. Margaret handed out excerpts of articles about campus design guidelines.

7. Suggested Agenda Items

Current facilities standards.

8. Next Meeting

January 9, 3:00-5:00 p.m., Center/407

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Submitted by: Susan Tatar