

Thursday, February 14, 2013

3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

CSU 238 (Nickerson Room)

In attendance: Linda Baer, Miriam Porter, Lynn Akey, Jean Haar, Steve Smith, Ron Fields, Henry Morris, Warren Sandmann, Paul Schumann, Becky Schwartzkopf, Mahbubur Syed, Deb Schulz.

Notes:

Facilities Master Plan Update

- Ron Fields provided an introduction and general update on the facilities master planning update process.
- Facilities Master Planning Consultants from Cunningham Group Architecture, Inc. joined the sub-meet to provide an update on the Facilities Master Plan Update. The update included: major themes for the future of the campus, campus physical identity features and community connections, transportation and circulation, and renovation and new construction.
- The current update process/task force is at the stage of considering future options.

Feasibility Study for Sports Bubble

- Ron Fields provided a brief introduction to the feasibility study that is currently being conducted examining the addition of a bubble on campus.
- Several members of the sub-meet expressed a concern that the implications of a bubble added on campus be considered in conjunction with the facilities master plan update.
- The sub-meet requested an update at the Planning Sub-Meet meeting scheduled in April.

Calendar: Academic and Student Affairs Staffing Plans

- The calendar for submission of staffing statements plans for 2014-15 was distributed. The calendar and process is in keeping with previous years.
- A concern was raised regarding the length of time between the staff planning process and when funding is available, and how to deal with rapid changes/needs during the in-between time.
- Particular staff planning questions or concerns can be directed to Warren Sandmann.

Strategic Priority Funding Process Review

- The faculty planning committee expressed its appreciation for the opportunity to fund new ideas on campus through the strategic priority funding process.
- It was noted that participation by sub-meet members in the process was low.

- Several members of the sub-meet had conflicting interests.
- The presentation times were challenging for members to attend.
- Some members could not attend all presentations so they chose to attend none.
- Suggestions for improving/changes to consider:
 - Could presentations be video/audio taped
 - Could presentations be open for others to attend
 - Could presentations be done as an open “poster-session”
 - Need to require a stronger link between proposals and strategic plan
 - Could funding focus on a priority within a given year instead of all priorities to concentrate energy in moving forward
 - Scoring guide needs more clarification
 - The Sub-Meet needs to spend more time discussing what the scoring criteria mean
 - Use the median score to evaluate a proposal instead of the average score
 - Make proposal review results available to the sub-meet a day before meeting to discuss