**Planning and Finance Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, January 24, 2024**

**6:00 P.M.**

**Spotlight Room**

**Call to Order: 6:01pm**

**Roll Call**

**Present: Jeff Helms, Visha Midha, Rick Valentin, Paige Hofstetter, Zach Roy, Dan Elkins, Lea Cline, Wendy Polifka**

**Absent: Carl Palmer, Amanda Hendrix, Jimmy Holmes**

**Public Comment**

Approval of Committee Minutes

Edited to change Name spelling and comments attributed to Jeff Helms

Approved, all in favor

**Chairperson’s Remarks**

**Rick Valentin:** Today we will be reviewing the academic facilities priorities report. Today Dan Elkins is here who is a member of the committee who has helped draft this report.

**Order of Business:**

1. Issues Pending
	* *Academic Facilities Priorities Report*

***Dan Elkins***: This is a report prepared by the Academic Facilities advisory committee, which is prepared by representatives of every college, usually the assistant Dean. We also have members of the people involved in facilities. The charge of all of these members is to bring their expertise to the group to help us figure out the facilities in need on campus.

Simply put, we review the academic enhancement fee, which creates the budget for a variety of things. In this includes tenure requests as well as facilities. These requests go to the dean who then rank orders all of these requests that are then sent to the office of the provost so that they can be used to help adjust the academic enhancement fee.

This fee is meant to help impact students, so its focus goes to spaces, computer labs. The question then becomes what we can afford, which in the summary this plan approves about 1 million in funds towards facilities and different projects. Our allocation in this is about 2 million, where we allocated around 1 million. The education college and nursing did not make a request. The approved and not approved came down to how the dean ranked it.

We allocated around 1.6 million out of our 2 million, we try to hold money in the case that estimates are lower than the actual cost. We make decisions on this topic over the summer.

In the last section of the report, colleges bring up their big picture needs, which are projects that do not need to be included in this 2 million but allows for administrators to get to know the needs of the departments. This is a way to communicate these needs and potentially get some of these projects on a capital request for state funding.

**Rick Valentin**: These additional planning requests are from colleges as well as internally?

**Dan Elkins;** Generally these are things that our committee brings to discussion, occasionally you will see a request from a department though. In this case some of these need to be brought in another area and not into this discussion.

Some examples of this include the new science building and renovations to cook hall.

**Rick Valentin:** Any questions?

**Paige Hofstetter:** Was there any communication with students in regard to what projects get funded?

**Dan Elkins**: I am not sure, however, we will reach out to the registrar’s office and ask how this will impact students, if it is not clear we will generally reach back out to the dean, who will then talk to the department chair who has more than likely talked to students at some point. There is back in forth on this, we do not just say yes or no and do extensive research into this. This is also with tenure track, where the dean does usually make these decisions, but we can occasionally decline when there are questions. Regarding the specifics of the chairperson talking to the students we are not sure, but do get lots of data from the registrars office on a variety of aspects in which it will affect students.

**Kerem Tasdan**: If something is not approved is it considered on the next committee or will it have to be reapproved?

**Dan Elkins:** It is not automatically put back into the queue, but we do give them the option to put it back there. There are times when we do not approve projects and do not see it again, often times they find money to cover something.

**Tracy Manieri**: Is there any coordination or standards into having criteria for student success projects that will push it over the line and make this happen? How does this tie back to the bigger picture of student success?

**Dan Elkins:** This is something that we have made an attempt to coordinate these issues. There was supposed to be a student success center at Milner but lots of things changed. When you think about people getting impatient departments will often try and do it their own way, take for example the college of ed having their own student success center. This has been something that we have discussed with the provost, at the time being people are pitching these ideas and talking with the provost. Something that also concerns me are the competing services, rather than creating new ones we try to make sure that there is not something that already exists. We need to coordinate things more generally on this campus, we work in silos, and student success is something that we were unsuccessful at launching a campus wide initiative in

**Rick Valentin**: On that point, about the specific planning priorities, the allocation for Williams Hall being used for academic activities, is this considered also education students activity or is the more general Williams hall recommendations?

**Dan Elkins**: This is about the more general Williams Hall recommendations, as it is in a prime position and we need more space for departments, CIPD is also going to be a part of that building as we also need our faculty to have a convenient location on the quad. We do not have a set plan beyond that, but we do need to look into other things, such as HVAC as there are issues. There has been a firm that has been hired to evaluate Williams Hall and look at the cost to get it in line with other buildings. This is a report that was written in September and a lot has changed as there are a lot of moving parts. I sent this report to facilities asking if there have been any changes and have not yet heard back. Some of these things have not been explored. The rotunda in the CVA has been opened, and we will tour it as part of out next meeting.

**Rick Valentin:** I have another question about the proposed maker space areas, I do know that Milner has a maker’s space, so I do have questions about this. There is also an Illinois art station which has a maker’s space, is this a generalized idea, is this advocacy and prioritizing the idea of having a maker’s space?

**Dan Elkins**: Some of these ideas emerged from the discussions with the colleges, this emerged more than likely from discussions with Craig Mclaughlin.

**Tracy Manieri:** I have one more, these are bottom-up requests which come from the deans to this committee, and I think about the classrooms that are sitting out there that probably haven’t changed since they were established with poor desks. I wonder if this report captures those types of projects. Where can these come into the report, and is there a list of these?

**Dan Elkins:** Facilities gets some funding to look into this, and although we would have to ask Mike for more specific information, he does have a list of general classrooms that are 110 spaces or general use. Molton has large classrooms that are heavily used which would fall into this. They have a list and try to do as many as they can in a year, as this fee has only been in place for three years. There is also a website for the academic enhancement fund which has past current and future enhancements on it.

**Paige Hofstetter**: Where is this information coming from, who is making the list?

**Dan Elkins**: Facilities are working with scheduling as it is hard to take a classroom offline. They might want to take some classrooms in molton but finding alternative classrooms while they are fixed could be difficult. Part of this is working with the registrar’s office to learn the options with other classes.

**Rick Valentin:** Our committees need to vote to endorse.

Motion by Paige Hofstetter, Seconded by Lea Cline

All in favor

**Rick Valentin**: Moving onto the next agenda item.

**Rick Valentin**: Tonight, the policy on the unmanned aircraft will possibly be on the floor tonight. There have been some exec committee recommended changes. I have uploaded this on the teams. Most of the comments on this are regarding the formatting that got changed in the transition to the mark up. There are some issues with bolding as well as a duplicate definition. Towards the bottom, appendix 1, student hobbyist flight location, the word student has been removed. These are some minor changes and recommendations. Is everyone okay with this?

There are a couple of other comments on using links and pdf links in the policy. As links might die and not be able to be used again. My thoughts on this is that there are lots of policies that have links in them. For instance, these FAA policies that are in the current policy, some of these are dead, and the federal government will try to provide redirects when content is moved on a site which is what currently happens. Part of this process in trying to move some of the procedures and moving it to the risk assessment site, is not having to edit and update the policy. I would argue against the idea of not having links in the policy.

One other suggestion which is more substantial is the definition of things like remote pilot which are capitalized in some areas, for instance the definition and in other areas like the body is not capitalized. Does anybody have any thoughts on this?

**Lea Cline:** Dimitris Nikolaou will fix it if it is not consistent as it should fit the Chicago manual style.

**Rick Valentin**: Is everyone okay with this?

**Jeff Helms:** Other than the capitalization there have not been any substantiative changes?

**Rick Valentin:** Correct

**Rick Valentin**: Next we will see the mission statement which we approved will come to the floor as an information item.

**Rick Valentin:** Next meeting, we will have the full strategic plan draft for review by our committee, the same thing we did with the mission statement. We should have this by early February. Policies that are on our issues pending include 5.1.1 which should be marked up and ready for review by the next meeting. Also, the priority brief from last year, administration should give an official response which might show up.

**Adjourn**