

FACILITIES PLANNING SPACE SUB-COMMITTEE to University Space Committee

MEETING NOTES

March 16, 2017

Members in attendance: Kris Willis, Rich Bretz, Mark Storz, Tom Bonda, Debbie Nixon, Connie Brookes, Martha Wong, Rory Hill, Gretchen Weitbrecht, Jennifer Dillon, Jim Burke; *absent:* Carol Dietz, and Nick Santilli

Action items are highlighted with this symbol: ●

1. Meeting Notes from the previous meeting were accepted. No additional comments.
2. We reviewed an article in *Facilities Manger* published by APPA (and association known for “leadership in educational facilities”), titled: “*How to Structure an Effective Space Committee*”. A few key points:
 - a. Two key statements from the article:
 - “Institutions can keep space committees on track by creating a tiered review process to vet requests and send the most important ones to a senior space committee.”
 - “...clarifying the decision-making process is crucial for success. When people don’t understand how the process works, they are more likely to use informal channels and circumvent the space committee.”
 - b. We are currently operating roughly according to the “Gate Keeper Model”, but want to evolve to a “Bicameral Space Committee” [two-tier or dual committee] process.
 - c. question: “How many space requests do we get now, and how many are anticipated in future on a typical basis”?
 - d. After development of a Space Policy, we have work to do regarding procedures. It is difficult to answer the question above because we do not have a consistent path or set of procedures for space requests.
3. We reviewed a draft of a University Space policy that is shared with committee members on Google docs. No additional comments were posted since last meeting.
 - a. ● Jim will review the entire document for better integration language relating to ITS. Deadline of March 31st was established for the ITS department to comment or provide suggestions. Jim will review the document prior to April 6th.
 - b. ● Jennifer has some suggestions regarding incorporating language to include specifics around space that is donor funded (or funded with external resources) and will edit accordingly.
 - c. ● Rory will review and edit the scope section pertaining to Facilities Scheduling.
 - d. ● Rory will meet with Tom and Kris on April 7th at 11a to review the whole document.
 - e. ● All members should review and suggest any final suggestions for edits.
4. We reviewed a draft of the summary assembled to date of data collected from the Faculty Survey on Classrooms. A few relevant questions or comments:
 - a. Do we know the average age of those responding for the preference of chalk vs. markerboards?
 - b. Markerboards may be perceived as more contemporary, whereas chalk is perceived to be more grade school level, despite the practical arguments presented for the preferences.
 - c. The Education Dept needs more classrooms with Smart Boards where they are assigned for classes. ED Faculty must demonstrate and teach students how to proficiently use Smart Boards. Education Dept also needs to show how technology is integrated into their curriculum for program accreditation.

Facilities Planning Sub-Committee | MEETING NOTES, March 16, 2017

- d. It was noted that the use of technology [in the classroom] is not required in any way by JCU (i.e. for promotion or for faculty evaluations).
- e. Also noted is the estimate by ITS that 98% of current students BYOD -- bring your [their] own device.
- f. We had discussion around the topic of teaching style and classroom set-ups.
 - Student focus: is it because student want to learn in a particular way?
 - Faculty focus: are faculty comfortable presenting in a particular way?
- g. ● Kris will continue to assemble the data. ● Denise Gialamas is assisting with correlating some questions relating to technology.

Next meeting: TH, April 20, 2017 | 1:30-3p, LSC Conference Room

Meeting Notes recorded by Kris Willis. Please review and notify of any necessary corrections.