

**Planning Day 2004**  
**Discussion Group on Campus/Facilities**

Conveners: Ray Guydosh and John Homburger  
Recorder: Sue Spissinger

**1. What should be the priorities for capital improvement and equipment funds?**

Jose DeOndarza asked how facilities outdated for modern instructional methods could be updated to meet state-of-the-art instructional needs.

John Homburger – With all studies done, we need to find balance between antiquated facilities and critical maintenance. Embedded in that is the criticism that we underutilize facilities...for example, we may have a total of 12 labs but only use 6 because the others are so outdated/not conducive to effective instruction...we need to articulate what our real needs are.

The new facility committee is exploring what are the academic and student needs for 5-10 years down the road...lack of technology; size and fit (scheduling); dedicated space issues.... the committee is reaching out to understand program needs.

**Process:** **In the past:** guidebook based on engineering studies, architect, interview campus groups, campus plan, academic plan (new programs, mix of programs), trends (long-term)...

Now...asking all those questions....and looking at \$34 million capital plan:  
-\$14 million in plans presented to Executive Staff  
-\$20 million plant adaptation still under review

John Homburger noted that we can modernize a specific facility...and do not have to wait for a full building rehabilitation in order to do so. All facilities and needs for academics, students and support areas are under review. John Homburger also stated that we have asked for \$6 million in additional funding for electrical infrastructure needs as a consequence of the power failure last December.

**2. Do campus buildings and other facilities need to change to accommodate new and existing programs?**

Ray Guydosh asked about the appropriate use of space/dedicated space – How could we improve allocation of space....

John Homburger responded that space assigned to Deans (Dean/Administrator in charge) who can assign space as appropriate (office space); classroom space is assigned through registrar, hopefully to assure most efficient use. Dedicated space needs to be identified and then fairly allocated and utilized. There will always be dedicated space due to physical needs: arts, sciences, etc.

Committee will inventory all space and what it is used for...not in space assignment function.

### **3. What changes would we like to see in student support/student services facilities?**

G. Withrow noted that the Bursar, registrar, financial aid and academic advising were meeting to better serve student needs...common web page, cross training, etc. Need to be physically co-located for at least “front office” operations. G. Withrow also noted that each office believes current structure is not effective...need for colocation of facility to better serve students.

John Homburger noted no facility available right now but cross training to start this summer; create front end and move either front end or back office somewhere else in the future.

### **4. How much emphasis should be given to strengthening the technological superstructure?**

John Homburger stated that technology funds would be embedded in everything we do in terms of planning for facilities.

### **5 & 6. How can we better use the city and our surroundings? Should we relocate any programs or offices into downtown buildings?**

John Homburger reported that the Mayor approached the College and asked if TAC/SBDC could create a presence in downtown area (Federal Building). It would help increase access and positive presence downtown...somewhat postponed and heading toward January 06 potentially.

Several faculty raised the issue of clinics and serving external communities, etc. and increased pressure/demands on space. How do we plan where we need to be in 3-5 years? John Homburger responded that past practice was political and silo building; new facilities planning process open, based on planning, and looking for knowing where we are able to go programmatically for 5-10 years.

E. Brohel stated that we have operated on a closed campus mind set; will that change and be more focused. D. LaPorte raised the work of prior committees such as the Sibley Hall Committee – clinics and outreach plan...where is/are the plan/s... John Homburger – prior plans and proposals are still available and Capital Planning Committee are reviewing all previous plans....slow down caused by leadership, campus climate and change in Fund. It was noted that enrollments drive programs...assessment of programs – what’s shrinking – can we still do all and add more programs. He also indicated that we need to evaluate where we are, where we need to go and how...Information will go to all and Capital Facilities Plan.

Ray Guydosh stated that the recurring theme seems to be how are decisions are made?

John Homburger noted it flows through chairs, supervisors, deans, vice presidents and executive staff.

**7 & 8. How can we encourage appropriate community use of our facilities? How should we utilize our financial and human resources to achieve these goals?**

7 & 8 were not specifically addressed save for the notion that more systematic planning is needed and that proposed uses (by campus or anyone else) must be fully vetted.