

SCFP SUBCOMMITTEE ON TWIN CITIES FACILITIES AND SUPPORT  
SERVICES (STCFSS)  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
MARCH 20, 2007

[In these minutes: General-Purpose Classroom Update and Office of Classroom Management Overview, HEAPR Funding Process Update]

[These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration or the Board of Regents.]

PRESENT: George Wilcox, chair, Anne Falken, Sean Hanner, Michael Berthelsen, Steve Fitzgerald, Denny Olsen, Laurie Scheich, Bernadette Corley Troge, Calvin Alexander, Gary Jahn, Lyndel King, Patrice Morrow, Howard Towle, Daniel Malmö, Jonathan Pritchard

REGRETS: Lorelee Wederstrom, Judith Martin

ABSENT: Gary A. Davis

GUEST: David Crane, facilities coordination manager, Office of Classroom Management

I). Professor Wilcox called the meeting to order.

II). Professor Wilcox noted that the first item on the agenda was a general-purpose classroom update and Office of Classroom Management (OCM) overview. With that said, he turned the meeting over to Steve Fitzgerald. Mr. Fitzgerald introduced his colleague in OCM, David Crane, the facilities coordination manager.

The Office of Classroom Management was formed in fall 1999. Its formation was the result of major studies to assess the significant problems that existed in central classrooms across campus.

Mr. Fitzgerald turned members attention to a handout that was distributed and highlighted the following:

- There are two types of classrooms:
  1. General-purpose classrooms, which are also called central classrooms or centrally scheduled classrooms. These classrooms are the Provost's central classroom resources, which serve as a common good for all departments and programs. There are approximately 300 general-purpose classrooms located in approximately 55 buildings on the Twin Cities campus. This equates to 300,000 square feet of space and 22,000 student seats. Central classrooms generate a tremendous amount of tuition.

2. Departmental classrooms, which are designed to meet the specific and more specialized needs of a given department or program. Examples include studios, class labs, special use classrooms, etc. The Twin Cities campus has approximately 268 departmental classrooms, which are department funded and managed.
- The mission of OCM is to support the teaching and learning by faculty and students in classrooms and to be the single point of contact and accountability for all issues attached to central classrooms.
  - Examples of major OCM initiatives include, but are not limited to:
    - Improve the classroom physical environment.
    - Upgrade classroom technology.
    - Develop problem response capability.
    - Improve upon classroom scheduling and space utilization.
    - Implement standards and metrics in all areas.

Next, Mr. Fitzgerald turned the meeting over to David Crane who will address classroom facilities issues. Mr. Crane spotlighted the following:

- Two primary areas of focus for OCM are classroom planning and projects and classroom facilities coordination. An example of this is a partnership with Facilities Management (FM) to provide systematic lighting replacement in classrooms.
- Examples of physical classroom environment initiatives by OCM include, but are not limited to:
  - Development of classroom standards.
  - Construction/renovation projects.
  - Strategic planning around classrooms.
  - Partnerships with FM such as Custodial Service Delivery, Facilities Condition Assessment, and Classroom Work Order Tracking – FM INFORM.
- OCM uses the following programs to address larger classroom issues beyond single room issues:
  - Capital projects or building renovation and rehabilitation projects e.g. Nicholson Hall.
  - Systemwide classroom capital projects e.g. accessibility of classrooms. In 2001/2002, approximately 25% of classrooms were accessible based on code. Naturally, this represented a serious concern for OCM and a functionality issue for the University in general. As of this summer, with the work that OCM has done to address this issue, accessibility of classrooms will be at approximately 60%.
- OCM has a unique relationship with University Services, which is essential in supporting teaching and learning in central classrooms. This relationship is key to OCM's success.
- Examples of OCM/FM partner projects:
  - FM INFORM project, which is an initiative to track service requests and work order processing across campus.
  - Review of custodial and maintenance periodic services.

- Developing emergency notification protocols, which may potentially impact academic activity in classrooms, e.g. power outages, fires/fire alarms, water leaks, etc.
- OCM is an active and motivated customer seeking positive outcomes/results, e.g. defining gaps between service delivery and classroom service expectations; OCM and FM work to close the gaps, and not lower the bar.
- OCM supports the Service Level Agreement (SLA) process being undertaken by FM. OCM measures service level performance through observation, inspection and documentation. OCM works with FM using this performance data to identify and resolve service delivery issues and to uncover service delivery trends.

At the conclusion of this presentation, the floor was opened up for questions/comments from members:

- Is it an accurate statement that OCM has a calculated budget of \$5 million but is only funded at approximately 60% of this requirement? Mr. Fitzgerald referred members to a chart on page 10 of the handout before them, which outlines OCM funding requirements and compares it to funding received. In 2007, OCM had a funding requirement of slightly over \$5 million, and was funded at about \$3.7 million. While still short of its funding requirement, the funding received represents a dramatic improvement compared to previous years. OCM has worked creatively using leveraged partnerships with departments, one-time funds, and other creative funding mechanisms to shore up its funding shortfalls in order to upgrade classrooms. OCM is in the position now where it is better able to shift from improving classrooms to sustaining the improvements that have been made to classrooms and policing the areas where classrooms are still substandard, e.g. lighting and acoustics.
- Is there a lot of unaddressed backlog in terms of classroom maintenance? Mr. Fitzgerald noted that there are some backlog areas. Major renovations/improvements are done with capital projects funding, e.g. Nicholson Hall; while smaller projects are funded through systemwide capital classroom improvement projects, e.g. Blegen Hall. Due to competition for funds with other resources, the systemwide capital classroom improvement projects funding has dwindled. With this said, OCM has started to compete for HEAPR funding as a means to fund smaller renovation projects, e.g. fire/life/safety. The goal, however, is to re-establish the systemwide classroom projects in the capital programs in the future. OCM is still very dependent on HEAPR and RR funding and partnerships with FM.
- What is the deferred maintenance on projects that classrooms used to have versus items that classrooms never had such as adequate lighting. A lot of the legacy inventory that was turned over to OCM in 1999 was never designed to be used as classrooms noted Mr. Crane. Steve Fitzgerald added that the dollar figure is clearly in the millions. Examples of legacy buildings include Tate/Physics and Science Classroom Building. OCM understands it still has a significant number of legacy buildings/rooms in inventory, and the price tag to upgrade this space is astronomical.

- Many architects are not particularly good at designing functional classrooms noted a member. OCM in partnership with FM, CPPM and with input from the University community have, as a result, developed classroom performance standards to help architects understand the unique design requirements of classrooms noted Mr. Fitzgerald. He added that during the design phase and throughout the entire building/renovation process, OCM is at the table as an advocate for classrooms.
- What is the major acoustic problem in classrooms? Reverberation time and noise transfers through walls stated Mr. Crane. Performance standards are not meant to tie architects, but rather to ensure that the performance that is specified in these guidelines is met.
- Are classroom occupants asked to provide feedback about the condition of the classrooms they teach and learn in? Yes, stated Mr. Fitzgerald. He added that comments are also solicited on the OCM website at <http://www.classroom.umn.edu/RoomComments/index.aspx>.
- Does OCM have a standard seating configuration for all classrooms? Mr. Crane noted that OCM is looking for value in the seating systems it uses. It would be difficult to look at a standardized approach to classroom seating systems as variety adds an important element to the inventory. Mr. Fitzgerald added that the furniture inventory value in classrooms is significant and is in the \$13 million range. Functionality of a room and aesthetics are taken into consideration during the consultation process. OCM has seating standards, which dictate tablet size, number of left-handed seats in a classroom, etc. The pedagogy in classrooms is changing away from lecture style teaching to team teaching and moveable furniture. Also, the requirement for station size is increasing along with the use of laptops, etc. Ergonomics is an interesting area and always a challenge when designing classroom space.
- A member complimented OCM on the improvements that have been made in classrooms over the years.
- Was the Mayo renovation an OCM project? Mr. Fitzgerald noted that all the AHC's classrooms are departmental classrooms, which are resourced, maintained and scheduled by the AHC. The Mayo project is not reflected in the OCM funding requirements and funding received slide that was reviewed earlier.
- Is the AHC responsible for the maintenance of the projectors it installs in its classrooms? Yes, stated Mr. Fitzgerald. Departmental classrooms are the total responsibility of the departments that own them.
- How much revenue do central classrooms generate for the institution asked a member? Mr. Fitzgerald noted that approximately 70% of the University's tuition is generated by classrooms. OCM think of classrooms as a teaching and learning resource versus an income generator. The reality is, however, that a tremendous amount of tuition is generated in classrooms, and, hence, the view that classrooms are an income generating resource. It is for this reason that these rooms need to be properly maintained.
- How much longer will OCM maintain slide projectors in classrooms? Mr. Fitzgerald noted that 35mm slide projectors are no longer manufactured. Departments have been advised for the past three years or so to convert their

slides libraries to digital media. Other classroom technologies that are becoming outdated include overhead projectors, document cameras/projectors, VHS recorders, etc.

- It is very difficult to teach and learn in a classroom when the windows are open and lawn maintenance is occurring. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that the classroom standard calls for air-conditioned classrooms. There are several legacy buildings on campus, however, without air conditioning that need to have their windows open when the temperature is warm. HVAC is a major component of building infrastructure that ties itself to classrooms; HVAC upgrades are expensive.
- How much of the information shared today is brought to the Classroom Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) asked a member? All this information is provided to CAS, which serves as a resource/advisory body to OCM. OCM uses the governance system as a two-way communication vehicle to understanding classroom issues. Other Senate committees that receive regular periodic OCM updates are SCEP, SCFP and SCIT. It is not redundant to also share this information with STCFSS, which has a different focus than the other committees, and that is facilities.

Professor Wilcox thanked Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Crane for their presentation.

III). Next, Mike Berthelsen provided members with a brief update on the HEAPR (Higher Education Asset Preservation and Replacement) bonding effort. He noted that every other year the University puts forward a capital request, the biennial budget, with a focus on operating needs one year and a capital focus the next year. This year, 2007, is an operating year, and the University is trying to secure its 2-year operating budget from the State.

This year the University has submitted a large request in the range of \$350 million for a bioscience building initiative. This component of the request is in addition to the normal request. The University is also asking for an emergency request of \$22 million for items that are extremely high-priority.

Mr. Berthelsen distributed a couple handouts to supplement his presentation. He noted the improvement categories used to address the three basic types of HEAPR projects:

- Health & Safety – conditions representing an imminent risk to the health and safety of building occupants such as fire alarms, emergency lighting and indoor air quality improvement.
- Water Infiltration – water current entering buildings and causing damage to the building envelope, interior and structure. Projects in this category include repair or replacement of roofs, exterior walls, windows and paved plazas above occupied space.
- Building Systems – repair and replacement of building systems that have failed or are expected to fail in the near future, e.g. elevators, HVAC systems and structural repair.

Building deficiencies are tracked through the Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA). Using this assessment, the University prioritizes its most urgent needs. The goal is to minimize risk to the institution, facilities and programs.

Soon efforts will be underway to pull together the 2008 legislative request. Over the eight years or so the University's biennial request has been approximately \$80 million, and has been funded, on average, anywhere from \$20 - \$40 million.

When the University receives its funding allocation from the State, how does it decide how to spend this money asked a member? Mr. Berthelsen stated that items are identified based on what creates the most risk to the institution, facilities and programs. Strategic planning also plays an important role in deciding, which projects are undertaken.

A member asked whether it was possible for the University community to submit their requests for how HEAPR funds should be spent at the institution. The new FM structure expects to have key people responsible for the various buildings across campus. These individuals will be expected to develop a capital plan for the building(s) they oversee. Once this new FM structure has been established, these individuals would be the contacts for buildings on campus. Alternatively, Mr. Berthelsen noted that people could email him with their requests. He reminded members that this money disappears quickly.

Are flat roofs a good idea in Minnesota asked a member? They can be noted Mr. Berthelsen. Pitched roofs with a steep scale can be a safety issue and are generally more expensive to build. Flat roofs can last on average 20 – 25 years.

IV). Professor Wilcox asked for member's input on items they would like to see on the agenda in the future. The following items were mentioned:

- Graduate and professional student housing. Will the Sarita Wetland project have an impact on the graduate and professional student housing or vice versa?
- Storm water management at the University.
- Andersen Library facilities update.
- Capital Planning and Project Management (CPPM) update.
- Learn about initiatives related to "greening" the campus.

If members have other ideas for agenda items after this meeting, please forward those ideas to Renee Dempsey, Senate staff at [demps005@umn.edu](mailto:demps005@umn.edu).

V). Hearing no further business, Professor Wilcox adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey  
University Senate