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***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Senator Kalter: Hi, everybody. So, we’re going to have a brief Caucus. We don’t need to get, tonight, to our Information Items. So, if we don’t, that’s fine. Basically, the Campus Master Plan Committee asked everybody who had given input in the fall if they wanted to have a follow-up meeting to see what the plan looked like. Chuck Scott was not able to be here, so Dr. Lacy, who is our AVP for Academic Fiscal Management—is that what your title is? Is that correct? Close enough—is here to run this discussion along with Cheryl Fogler. And did you bring other individuals? Huachen Gao and Gig Supanichrattana. Okay. Excellent. Thank you for being here.

A couple things—please just make sure—tomorrow is the beginning of the interviews for the successor to Dr. Lacy. So please make sure, if you can, to attend the interviews for the new AVP candidates. It’s always very difficult to schedule so that everybody can attend. We tried to make sure to invite the whole Caucus this time. And if you have suggestions about how we could make that process better so that more Senators can make it to those meetings,that would be terrific. Send them on to acsenate@ilstu.edu. And I will hand it over to Alan to give us our 2010-2030 Master Plan Update.

***Advisory Item:***

***2010-2030 Master Plan Update discussion***

Dr. Lacy: Okay, thank you. You recall that in the fall, Chuck Scott came in and visited with you. He visited with 19 different groups in the fall, and we are circling back to some of the groups, one of which is this one. We were charged by President Dietz to produce an update to Master Plan 2010-2030. This team was further charged to consider the realities of operating a public institution in the State of Illinois during lean financial times. So, we have gathered information from a wide variety of constituents. The Master Plan Update team has worked very hard at developing a draft, and the draft was disseminated last week. I saw it go out on the faculty listserv. I think it came out to the Senate. There is a website for that, MasterPlan.IllinoisState.edu.

There are many things that have been accomplished in the original Master Plan. I think it’s really remarkable, some of the things that have been done, given the financial situations that we’ve been through for the last decade. And so, there are updates on those original 67 recommended actions in this progress report. The Steering Team is now soliciting input on this draft during the remainder of the spring semester. We plan to have the final report to the Board of Trustees in July. The draft plan and the survey are available at the Master Plan website. I know it’s quite late, so I’m just sort of guessing you don’t want to have an extended conversation about this tonight; but we are happy to answer any questions you may have. Just remember that the survey is out there. It is a two-question survey. Really, what we’re trying to find out is, does the Master Plan Update for 2010-2030 accurately capture Illinois State University’s priorities over the next 5-10 years, and, secondly, any additional comments that you would like to provide can be made on that survey. So, with that, I will ask if there are any questions.

Senator Horst: Yes, I discussed the description of the problems with Cook Hall with my chair, and we both felt that it was somewhat understated. So, I would encourage you to potentially say this “deteriorating” historic building, because I understand that a faculty member, for instance, could not hold lessons in their office today because there was a real problem with the air quality, for instance. So, we just felt the language could maybe be strengthened.

Dr. Lacy: Okay, thank you.

Senator Ferrence: So, in the interest of March Madness and brackets and predicting the future, I saw the survey. It’s nice. It’s short. Any thoughts on what you’re hoping to see in terms of a response rate and what would be the ideal outcome when you start reading the responses from the survey?

Dr. Lacy: Well, obviously, we cannot control the response rate. We would hope for a lot of responses, but we’ll take whatever we get. Sometimes, if you don’t get a lot of responses, then you assume people are satisfied with the Master Plan. We are charged with making a final report, and so we will go with what we get.

Senator Ferrence: Thank you.

Senator Aduonum: Yes, so back to Cook Hall. I’m looking at the last two sentences where you say, “…significant interior renovations would aid in recruitment of College of Fine Arts students.” What about faculty? Because faculty is left out, and I’m wondering why.

Dr. Lacy: Could you tell us what page you’re on?

Senator Aduonum: I’m sorry. I’m on page, is it 5? Under Cook Hall, the right column, the last few lines where you’re talking about “improved HVAC and humidity control systems and significant interior renovations would aid in recruitment of College of Fine Arts students.” Why not faculty? Could we include faculty as well?

Dr. Lacy: Absolutely.

Senator Aduonum: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Lacy: Thank you.

Senator Haugo: I would just add that that might also be a useful addition to the Fine Arts Complex language, which right now says “recruitment of students,” but you could add faculty there, too, for the same reason.

Dr. Lacy: Very good point.

Senator Kalter: Other comments?

Senator Evans-Winters: Is there anything in here on parking?

Senator Kalter: I feel like there was, wasn’t there?

Dr. Lacy: Parking has a reference in the left-hand column on page 8, Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation. There’s a section on parking. It’s a little bit difficult to say what you would do with parking until decisions are made about facilities, but it’s certainly recognized that if you build facilities, you’ve got to provide appropriate parking for those facilities.

Senator Evans-Winters: I was just asking because, at this point, it’s become a safety concern. I think when we heard from Facilities a couple of weeks ago, they made some clarification, especially as it relates to access. In some cases, for example, if we take DeGarmo Hall, it’s quite a walk at night to get to our parking spaces. Second, as the faculty finds out at some point, parking in very tight spaces actually—students, if they are in a hurry—we can actually get nicks and dings and bangs that young people may not think about as much as we do. And sometimes, I think for some of us, it seemed kind of ironic, if not contradictory, that state employees are paying high fees for parking that’s really not convenient, but we’re seeing buildings going up all around us that are private buildings. So, I just wanted to put that out there.

Dr. Lacy: Okay, thank you for your comments. We’ll take that into consideration.

Senator Kalter: Other comments?

Senator Meyers: I noticed in the discussion of DeGarmo Hall it talks about how having the Psychology Department in there doesn’t “meet the needs of the College of Education. Efforts will be made to move the Psychology Department someplace that better meets its needs.” What is the plan for assessing those needs?

Dr. Lacy: Those are comments that were made in some of the focus groups that we had in the fall about Psychology. I don’t know that there’s any particular plan about where they might move or how those needs would be assessed. We just reflected that, and then in future planning, I would assume that our facilities planning people would determine the best way to assess that and also what the options are. It’s a rather large department. If you’re going to move them, where are they going to go? In Facilities, everything is like a domino. You say, well, Psychology would like to move. They’d like to go to Williams. Well, who else needs to be in Williams? Where do they go? And there are a lot of ripple effects any time you start moving anybody. So those are all the kinds of things that would be assessed, and there is discussion about a space analysis. I think that kind of thing could be assessed through that activity.

Senator Dawson: I told myself I was going to be quiet tonight. I never keep my promises to myself. In regard to parking, Senator Nikolaou and I are both on the Parking Committee as faculty representatives and happy to answer questions or take opinions, whatever. If you see a rough spot in your particular area where you park, let us know, and we can bring it up at the Parking Faculty Advisory Committee, Parking & Transportation. Sometimes we can put a little shove on it, and sometimes we can say, “Oops, well, things cost money.” We have one gravel lot left, and it will get paved, we hope, within the next two to three years, perhaps. Just an aside on that.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Other questions or comments or feedback?

Senator Evans-Winters: May I have one more?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Senator Evans-Winters: I usually don’t get this talkative at night. I’m actually falling asleep, but one more point for DeGarmo Hall. I’m in EAF where we serve many adult students. In fact, most of our students are adult students, and I think sometimes when we think about facilities and capacity, we’re thinking from the perspective of undergrads. We literally have adult students who may not be able to fit into our chairs and desks and tables, so that’s really something we need to think about in DeGarmo Hall, especially as we serve a non-traditional population more at ISU.

Dr. Lacy: Thank you for that comment as well. I know that there are studies being done on classroom furniture. It is a part of Facilities, and there are more tables and chairs and flexible spaces and those sorts of things, but we do need to take those kinds of things into consideration as well.

Senator Kalter: Perhaps for the Bone Student Center and its chairs right in this room. Do we have other comments? Other feedback? I just had a couple of things. First of all, I’m so grateful—and I said this at the Capital Planning and Budget Meeting, but I’m just going to repeat it—to see the space utilization as one of the top things in this report, evaluating existing space. Since I think it’s actually long overdue, we should put it in as a pattern to do every x number of years. I don’t know what that x would be, but it seems like something that a university should do every once in a while.

The other thing that I said at that meeting was—and I didn’t have time to review the new draft— but I had said that in what was Section 6, it needed to provide clarity and to highlight the successes in that section regarding whether the projects in what was their Section 5, what had happened with them with status updates, whether they’re done or not done, if they’re in the queue, if they’re a priority, if they’re being dropped, if something else has happened, and that in some cases, some of the things that did have status updates, not everything that was listed in what was planned was actually addressed in the status update. So, making sure that we are hitting those boxes. When something is mentioned in the original vision, did we mention whether or not it had been done in the status update? It may already have been done, I just didn’t have a chance to—

Dr. Lacy: Yes. The progress report starts on page 9, our status updates are throughout that. That was added after your comment.

Senator Kalter: Oh, terrific. Wonderful.

And then the only other thing that I had, there have been discussions in some years about things like, for example, whether CTLT is in the right place. Is it in the best place for the faculty? And I wanted to ask the faculty here, what do you think about that question? And if it’s not in the right place, where would the best place on campus be, or is it in a good place?

Senator Ferrence: I’m going to address that one head-on because I’m in the Science Lab Building which is about as far as you can get from CTLT, and I do a lot of Opscan exams, and I have lots of reasons to go there. And quite honestly, it doesn’t bother me. If anything, it gives me an excuse for a little bit of exercise. From that point of view, as a faculty member, they usually have a parking spot if I need it, so if I really am in a hurry, I can stop in. And I’d rather make sure that things closer into the Quad are most accessible by students for their needs, and it’s really not a bad thing to make me walk across campus four times a semester.

Senator Kalter: Other people have ideas about that one, CTLT?

Senator Dawson: This was a topic at our parking meeting last week, too. Parking is a problem at CTLT, a severe problem. It would sure be nice to consider an expansion at the Alumni Center and at least moving the education portions, the training and stuff, out to that area, where, at the moment, there’s plenty of parking. I know that there’re issues with leases and things like that, too. But if you’re just going to run in for Opscans, that’s one thing, and it might be nice to have a satellite office for that. But it needs more space and parking, for sure.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Other thoughts? And if not on CTLT, are there other things that are not in the right place on campus, where you’d rather see it somewhere else because it would be more convenient or less convenient, as the case may be? I’m going to take Senator Mainieri’s shaking of her head as blanket no.

Senator Ferrence: This is just a brainstorm comment, and I don’t know where it would go, but I think it’s worth capturing. One of the issues on something like CTLT is there are some individuals for which it isn’t convenient to walk across campus, maybe for health reasons, or what have you. When you’re talking about a day-long workshop, there isn’t necessarily enough parking. But it strikes me that we’ve moved into an era where services like Lyft and Uber are becoming common. To what degree should we be thinking about having a couple campus drivers and cars that, for faculty that need to get from point A to point B, you dial a service, and they just pick you up and take you from point A to point B instead of assuming that you need to have a parking spot where you are and a parking spot wherever you need to go?

Senator Kalter: I think the things that I would wonder about—various things, not just at CTLT, but other places—is winter walking. In other words, the hazards of walking on ice across campus and especially when you’re maybe going to a session somewhere and you’ve got a class that same day, so you’re in a hurry, and it can lead to that kind of hazard. But maybe that’s not a big issue. Any other comments about the update?

Senator Aduonum: So on page 6, I see a note about the Multicultural Center, and yet when I look at the list on pages—I’m probably missing it—on pages, where it starts with the rating of which of the buildings goes first. I see that Mennonite College goes first, and then it goes down to… I don’t see the Multicultural Center listed. Could you show me where to find that, please?

Senator Evans-Winters: Page 6 under Bone Student Center. On the right hand…

Senator Aduonum: It’s on page 6? Right. I see that. But then when you go to page—there’s no number. Right. Or am I missing something? On page 14?

Senator Meyers: There’s no recommendation number, is what you’re saying.

Senator Aduonum: Right. Right. Right. I don’t see it listed again. It doesn’t come up again, and I’m wondering why.

Senator Kalter: So, I believe that the reason for that, and Alan can confirm this, is because it was not in the original Master Plan. It’s a new thing since the update. Is that correct?

Dr. Lacy: Yes.

Senator Kalter: So, in other words, only the things that were existing, whatever it was, ten years ago, when this Master Plan was originally created, have next to them the parentheses that says Master Plan 2010-2030 Recommendation Number 6 or Number 1. It was not one of those, and so it’s being added as a priority. Yeah. Is that right?

Dr. Lacy: Yes, and those numbers in the original Master Plan, they were just numbers in the plan. They didn’t necessarily indicate priorities, either. So, the Multicultural Center is an example of something that has occurred since the original Master Plan was written and one of the reasons that I think the President wanted this revision to be done.

Senator Kalter: Other input.

Senator Mainieri: I have one, and it’s probably more just out of curiosity. How does the Quad and Fell Arboretum and that part of our campus—would that fall under the purview of this plan, when we’re thinking about Master Planning?

Dr. Lacy: Yes, I think it absolutely would. I think if Chuck were here, he could give a lot more specific answer, but I’ve heard him say every time we’ve ever done surveys of alums or students or anybody that the strongest thing that comes out of it is don’t mess with the Quad.

Senator Mainieri: Sure.

Dr. Lacy: So, I don’t think we’re going to build anything out in the middle of it.

Senator Mainieri: No, certainly would hope not. I was just more thinking about ways to provide better interaction with the Quad or things like that. I just wasn’t sure if that had come up in discussions at all.

Dr. Lacy: I don’t recall anything in the groups that we met with in the fall, anybody mentioning interaction with the Quad, but I know that the Quad is a pretty special place that is the character of the campus.

Senator Kalter: Are you suggesting that something be added, Senator Mainieri?

Senator Mainieri: I think as we learn more about outdoor space and ways to invite people into outdoor space and interact with outdoor space, just thinking about that as an option. I just wasn’t sure if that would be considered as part of the purview of this plan.

Senator Kalter: On page 19 of the draft, there is a section called Green Areas. And it may be that it would be appropriate to add Fell Arboretum and the Quad to that section in some way. In fact, the Quad is already on there, but it’s only a very restricted mention.

Dr. Lacy: Senator Mainieri, I know that is an area of your expertise. If you have time to reflect on it and you could add something in the survey, that would really be helpful to us.

Senator Kalter: All right. Anything else? Any other input? Believe it or not, we actually hit our hard stop time, except for Senator Lucey would like to say something.

Senator Lucey: I just noticed under the section under Street Closures, you are closing University Street from Hale Street to Dry Grove, and I would like to applaud the decision to do that. I think the campus needs to be much more pedestrian, and I think having a pedestrian campus creates much more of a community-centered University, and I think this is a step towards that process. So, thank you for that.

Dr. Lacy: Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Other comments? Repeat what he said? He thanked the group for the street closures part that closes University Street from Hale Street North to Dry Grove because—let me try to get your eloquence right—that it’s important to have a pedestrian campus and to have safety, essentially. Does that capture it? Anything else?

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Marx, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Thank you, again, for your patience. I know it was a long night, but we were doing some important stuff, and we only have one or two more meetings to get it done in. So, have a good night.