

Administration & Finance, final report to the Faculty Senate AY 2017-8

Faculty Members	
Susan Fahey	Chair (2016-2018)
Kerrin Wolf	Vice Chair (2017–2018)
Beverly Vaughn	ARHU (2017–2019)
Carla Cabarle	BUSN (2017–2019)
Ron Tinsley	EDUC (2017–2019)
Peter Cho	GENS (2017–2019)
Mary Kientz	HLTH (2017–2019)
Christy Goodnight	Library (2017–2019)
Joseph Trout	NAMS (2017–2019) and Union representative
Robin Hernandez-Mekonnen	SOBL (2017–2019)

Ex Officio Member	
Michael Wood*	Associate Director of Budget (Vice President for A&F designee)

*Note: Jennifer Wood attended as our ex officio member for most of FY17-8

In AY2017-8, we met 6 times. We discussed the following subjects in those six meetings:

1. Funding arrangement to build the Atlantic City Gateway campus (residential building, academic building, parking garage (9/27/17)
2. Travel money spent through the schools / the Office of the Provost for faculty travel and results of the faculty survey on travel funding (10/20/17, 2/2/18, & 3/8/18)
3. Process of programs requesting and being awarded faculty lines (10/20/17)
4. Campus accessibility gaps (12/7/17 & 4/13/18)

Funding arrangement for AC Gateway campus (9/27/17)

Stockton attorney Brian Kowalski presented on the innovative financial arrangements used to finance the AC Gateway campus, including the academic and residential buildings and the parking garage. This included the amount paid in debt service to repay the loans. This was for informative purposes.

Travel money through the schools, the Office of the Provost and the results of the faculty survey (10/20/17, 2/2/18, & 3/8/18)

Michelle McDonald, Kelly Oquist, Theresa Marinelli and Provost Vermeulen presented information on funding from the Office of the Provost and through the schools. One thing that emerged from the discussion of travel funding by schools is that the aggregate amount spent by the schools actually went down from FY15 to FY18. In addition, there was much discussion of faculty preference, discovered from the faculty survey, to have the overall school funding increased rather than having to take the additional step of applying for PFOF (or other) competitive funding and potentially not receiving it. The majority of faculty reported spending greater than \$1000 on conferences for AY16-17. In addition, the majority reported spending personal funds on such travel (75%). Committee members took an informal census of their counterparts at a variety of university settings and reported that the vast majority were funded at a higher rate than Stockton currently provides through the schools. There was consensus reached on the committee that it would be better for more “guaranteed” funding through the schools and less funding directed through the competitive PFOF (or other) funding. The committee suggested that funding of at least \$1200 would be a big improvement.

Process of programs requesting and being awarded faculty lines (10/20/17)

Provost Vermeulen has created a template for program coordinators to use to request a new line. The deadline for requests will be in February and the decisions will be made in June. Further, when retirements occur, deans will have to argue for retaining the lines as they may be moved around based on need. There was some discussion of paying search chairs to compensate them for the hard work to create larger, more diverse pools for hiring.

Campus accessibility gaps (12/7/17 & 4/13/18)

1. Parking
 - a. With the construction of USC2 and the Classroom Building, 500 more spots were removed, which put more pressure on our existing ADA spaces
 - i. Lot 7 was opened for commuter only parking in Fall 16, including its ADA compliant spaces

- ii. Accomplishment: Lot 6 had the tennis courts removed, with extra ADA compliant spaces installed there.
 - iii. Recommendation: provide more ADA compliant spaces at pinch points on campus and nearest the compliant outside paths, such as Lot 7 nearest the building, Lots 0, 1, 2 and 3
 - 1. There is a plan to open up more parking by the lacrosse fields
 - 2. Restriping some ADA spaces in lot 5 in Summer 18 to move them closer to Big Blue
- 2. Public-side drop-off for employees, students, visitors and PAC patrons
 - a. Several of the concrete paths leading from the parking lots to the main buildings are too steep and need regrading, particularly around the PAC and West Quad
 - i. No progress on this project
 - ii. Recommendation: Make outside paths compliant (Lot 1 and the grassy paths in front of Lot 6, near the PAC)
 - 1. Accomplishment: outside ramp from N-wing up to M-wing. With expanded ADA parking in Lot 6, there is a more accessible route from Lot 6 up to PAC/M-
 - iii. Design a public-side drop-off between WQ and PAC
 - 1. This was not practical and cost-effective given the grading deficiencies in the grassy area in front of the PAC
 - 2. The PAC has instead requested that Lot 6 parking be limited to PAC patrons on performance nights/days
- 3. Signage: Many campus signs do not meet minimum requirements for visually impaired – Font size, size of placard, placement of placard and Braille provided
 - a. And many of the inaccessible restrooms/services/stairs are not marked with the appropriate location of accessible versions as they are required to be
 - i. See also M-wing stairs below
 - ii. Potential accomplishment: Wayfinding signs for internal campus as well as on the roads to ADA spaces
 - 1. \$300,000 allotted for design and construction, request for funding submitted, likely will be accomplished in Summer 19
 - 2. Internal signs out of compliance or missing must be placed at the top of the list
 - a. Inaccessible restrooms and staircases
 - iii. Recommendation: remedy the internal sign situation quickly
- 4. M-wing stairs/elevator & lack of sign
 - a. To pass through M-wing, past the PAC and get to the N-wing cafeteria (a vital service to which students must have access) and office spaces internally, there is a staircase with no ramp
 - b. Externally, there is no sidewalk on the Lakeside Lane side
 - i. Accomplishment: a compliant ramp to bypass the steep hill outside opened in Summer 17
 - c. Currently, this situation is dealt with by taking an elevator from 100 level M-wing to 300 level, crossing the bridge over into N-wing and taking the elevator down from there in N-wing BUT this is unadvertised
 - d. Recommendation: The inside path sign situation will hopefully be remedied as part of the internal signage project with all quickness
- 5. Restrooms
 - a. A-D wing alternates the male and female restrooms vertically in the building or at a large distance horizontally

- i. Accomplishment: A-D restrooms were redesigned and are ADA compliant now
 - b. Many or most restroom lack push buttons on what are sometimes quite heavy doors
 - c. Several restrooms do not provide accessible toilets (are inaccessible to individuals who use manual or electric wheelchairs)
 - d. Looking for the next bathroom to be renovated, likely H / J
 - i. Hopefully, summer 19
 - e. Recommendation: put openers on bathroom doors or fix the overly heavy ones
 - i. Facilities also wants individuals who discover any doors that are too heavy (>5 lbs) or close too quickly (<5 seconds) to have their administrative unit (school / office) submit a work order using the room number
 - ii. Design a new restroom arrangement in A-D and/or currently design properly formatted/compliant signs to inform individuals of it
- 6. Evacuation plan in booklets and maps placed throughout campus
 - a. The evacuation plan for individuals who cannot negotiate stairs is marked in an obscure page but not on the campus evacuation map in the emergency booklets in classrooms and hallways
 - b. This plan is supposed to be that those individuals would travel to the breezeways and await assistance from emergency personnel from there to complete the evacuation (main building); evacuation plan unknown for other campus buildings with more than one floor
 - i. No “area of refuge” signs to direct people to the breezeways nor directional signs in the halls
 - ii. Recommendation: review the status of this evacuation plan and place it in the emergency booklets – for all campus buildings
 - 1. What is the evacuation plan for the rest of the campus buildings with more than one floor?
 - iii. Add “area of refuge” directional signs in the main building and “area of refuge” signs in the breezeways as well as the second floors of the other campus buildings where needed
 - iv. Need evac maps in non-ground floor classrooms, halls and the library to note how individuals who cannot negotiate stairs should evacuate noted in an easier way to find than currently
 - v. Hall evacuation maps need to be updated on non-ground floor halls to explain how to evacuate if unable to negotiate stairs
 - vi. Need more Evac Chairs for all over campus, including at each “area of refuge” at the end of the wing doors, A and S, WQ, USCs, Health Sciences
 - vii. Need promotional campaign and training on how to use Evac Chairs
 - viii. Need to redo fire system and alarms need to be redone and an enunciator added so announcements can be told to shelter in place or evacuate or whatever the instructions must be.
 - ix. Need to refresh emergency operations and brief individuals – send an email on evacuation procedures. How to / when will this happen?
- 7. Wayfinder maps, signs & or app
 - a. The campus, although laid out in many ways more sensibly and more accessible than many campuses, still requires Wayfinding signs, an app and a map
 - i. Accomplishment: SF and former parking / transportation manager Chris Jurek designed a Wayfinder map. This map should be updated and provided through the CC Information desk.

1. Darnley Biddle in Facilities has started to update the maps with the new buildings and lots
2. Further updates are needed
- b. Recommendation: Campus Wayfinding signs that are compliant should be designed and placed internally and externally on campus
 - i. Consider the acquisition or building of a Wayfinding app; this is in the long-term strategic plan for E-Learning

Meeting minutes:

Administration and Finance Committee

Meeting

Thurs, 9/28/17

Members present: Carla Cabarle, Peter Cho, Susan Fahey, Christy Goodnight, Robin Hernandez-Mekonnen, Mary Kientz, Brian Kowalski, Jennifer Potter, Ron Tinsley, Beverly Vaughn, Kerrin Wolf

- I. Introductions
- II. Presentation on Atlantic City Campus Project Plan of Finance by Brian Kowalski and Jennifer
 - PowerPoint discloses sources of funding for the three buildings (academic building, residence Hall, parking garage)
 - o Academic building - \$40 Million to build.
 - ⌘ \$18 Million from university equity
 - ⌘ plus \$22 Million grant from the Capital Improvement Fund (CIF), 1/3 of which Stockton must pay back – totals \$12 million over 20 years, including interest
 - o Residence Hall – 100 M total to built
 - ⌘ Stockton must pay back ACIA Lease Revenue Bond (\$70 Million) and \$2,000,000 to Devco Equity
 - Kind of like lease to own. Once the lease payments are complete to repay the debt, Stockton will own the residence hall and title transfer will occur
 - ⌘ \$28 M in Atlantic County Improvement Authority Tax credit bonds
 - University does not need to repay this
 - They were sold to Stonehenge Capital Company, LLC, a private company
 - o 10 years of tax credits (lowers their tax obligation)
 - All were purchased
 - o The amount of Tax Credits Bonds were determined based on the annual purchase price for the tax credits, since the source of repayment on those bonds will be the proceeds received from the sale of the tax credits.
 - AC Devco will assign payments from the state of the tax credits to pay principal and interest on the bonds
 - Atlantic County guaranteed this so if any of the parties were to default, Atlantic County would take on the repayment obligation
 - o Garage –

- \$8,300,000 equity contribution from South Jersey Industries.
- \$2,100,000 equity contribution from DEVCO.

The sources of funds will be applied to finance the following Project components:

	<u>Academic Building</u>	<u>Residence Hall</u>	<u>Parking Facility</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Source of Funds:</u>				
CIF Grant	\$22,000,000			\$22,000,000
University Equity	\$18,000,000			\$18,000,000
ACIA Tax Credit Bonds		\$28,455,158	\$22,162,004	\$50,617,162
ACIA Lease Revenue Bonds		\$70,324,842	\$6,937,996	\$77,262,838
SJI Equity			\$8,300,000	\$8,300,000
DEVCO Equity		\$2,000,000	\$100,000	\$2,100,000
TOTAL	\$40,000,000	\$100,780,000	\$37,500,000	\$178,280,000

**Administration and Finance Committee
Meeting
Fri, Oct 20, 2017**

Members present: Mike Wood (as Administration and Finance rep), Peter Cho, Susan Fahey, Christy Goodnight, Joe Trout, Kerrin Wolf

Presenters: Michelle McDonald, Lori Vermeulen

- I. Introduction
- II. Presentation by Michelle McDonald on Travel Funds
 - a. Reviewed FY17 numbers
 - i. Incomplete data as of now
 - ii. Asked if we could track money awarded versus money spent. Need to discuss with those who run the numbers. Going forward, may be able to more easily track this with change in accounting set up (new "org" or "orgs").
 - b. Provost is asking deans to be more deliberate/provide more information on how they spend money
 - c. Need to get a sense for how many faculty are not traveling due to lack of funding
 - i. Potential survey to see how money is being spent and how much more money is desired

- d. Discussed funding at other universities
 - i. Susan Fahey indicated that she received less than all other schools consulted
 - ii. Over email, some others indicated to Susan Fahey that Stockton's \$900 in travel funds were less than others they polled.
 - e. Discussed alternative funding sources
 - i. Some faculty don't think to apply for Provost Faculty Opportunity Fund and R&PD grants for travel
 - ii. Some faculty don't apply due to grant cycles versus conference cycles
 - iii. Some were told that R&PD was not often approved for travel, but R&PD will pay for travel to conferences
 - f. Discussed need for more funding as student population grows
 - g. Discussed need for more funding as research demands grow
 - h. Further discussion postponed until the full travel money numbers come in from the Office of the Provost in a spring meeting (will provide that in minutes in future meeting)
- III. Assignment of Faculty Lines
- a. How does a program successfully argue for a new line?
 - i. Template was offered by Provost Vermeulen
 - 1. Questions are trying to get deans to think of "bigger picture", such as the strategic plan and the new campus in AC
 - ii. Provost attempted to create a process so that these requests were considered at the same time
 - 1. Request by February, decision by June
 - iii. Also asking deans to justify request for lines when retirement occurs (why not move it elsewhere if there is need?)
 - b. Lines may be moved based on need going forward
 - c. Dean Wagner crunched numbers regarding faculty, focusing on faculty types, credit hours taught, student enrollment, etc.
 - i. Using this data to help analyze line requests (does the data match up with your claimed need for a line?)
 - ii. Provost recognizes that data is not the only story
 - d. STEM council has an academic committee focused on how increased enrollment is affecting academic program need
 - e. External research company is being used to analyze questions regarding program needs
 - f. Discussion of what to do with low enrollment but essential programs
 - i. Still very much supported at Stockton University
 - ii. Smaller programs may need to demonstrate how they otherwise contribute to Stockton's mission and/or signature programs
 - 1. Such as heavy community engagement or large presence in the satellite campuses
- IV. Discussion of paying search committee chairs to enable larger, more diverse searches
- a. Chairs don't have time to expand their searches/be proactive

Administration and Finance Committee
Meeting
Fri, 12/7/17
CCMR1
Minutes

Members present: Young Doo (“Peter” Cho), Robin Hernandez-Mekonnen, Jennifer Potter, Christy Goodnight, Kerrin Wolf, Joe Trout, Ron Tinsley, Beverly Vaughn, Susan Fahey
Guests present: Laurie Griscom, Jon Heck, Don Hudson, Skip West, Jonathon Johnson, Stephen Davis

Recommendations made by the Accessibility Task Force.

a. Parking

- i. Minimum number of spots does not necessarily meet the need; provide more HC parking spots, including van accessible spots
 - i. Existing HC spots and how they are distributed in lots 0-7
 - ii. Lot 6 update

Added ADA parking to Lot 6

- iii. How to increase ADA parking in the light of increasing enrollments and decreased supply of parking with USC2 and HSCI building

Valet parking idea to utilize valet parking in Lots 2 and 3:

The campus was split so decided to abandon the idea

No more campus area for parking lots: Pinelands, Wetlands, Endangered Species Commissions

Have a design to expand lot 8 – still in concept

all freshmen to be parking in lot 8, want to pave lot 9 and 8, will be commuter, staff, faculty lot for Fall 2018

Shuttle service – trying to supplement the shuttle service as there are complaints about full shuttles at peak times

Parking garage – Walker Parking Consultants study just came in last week, includes a feasibility study on the most practical options, because of soil and land issues in Lot 0 and Lot 5

Probably will go with Lot 5 – will cost ~\$30 M (maybe through ACIA) – early stages of calculating how to pay for it – annual debt service of \$2 M estimated – Committee meeting again in January – wish to go before the February Board meeting to seek a go-ahead

Would likely be net 1000 spots, 1500 gross, with 500 lost from taking Lots 2 and 3 off-line

Enforcement – will not need permits anymore – license plate readers, will register your car and park in designated lots and reader vehicles will ride around

Will be sent warnings and violations over email

Timeline – Active for fall 18

b. Distance for disabled people to reach the main academic building

- i. Ramp near Lot 6 update

- ii. A drop-off area be designated
 - i. Employee-side drop-off now exists
 - ii. How do faculty, staff and administrators gain access to this?
 - 1. This still needs to be clarified
 - 2. Contact Mike Sullivan or Cynthia Gove-Cullers?
 - iii. What about a front-side drop-off?
 - 1. West Quad or Campus Center?

Parking & Shuttles - Shuttles are only supposed to be going to the N-wing ramp and A&S, not front side of Campus Center – seeking to improve the shuttle system in general in terms of number of shuttles and timing as there are complaints of many full shuttles

3rd party professionals being RFPed for AC to Galloway shuttles

Eventually, lots 2 and 3 will be taken off-line once parking garage gets built, and made into ADA, visitor and a front-side drop-off

See master plan for buildable space on the campus

Timeline – 3 years off or more

- iii. What is the status of the relining project? (for relining HC parking to allow van accessible spots where necessary/missing). SF and DH corresponded about this in Spring 16)
 - Update on the status of the relining project?

Don Hudson and Skip West to check on the relining project in F 17 – Summer 17 for completing it?

No new update on this

- c. Signage
 - i. No signs at all inaccessible areas, like restrooms, directing users to an accessible restroom. These signs will need to be properly formatted (size, placement, font size and placement and Braille)
 - ii. Update on signage project, including signs noting the areas of accessible entrances/bathrooms at inaccessible ones.
 - iii. Signage on where the Evac Chair is.

\$1 M for signage project, just about out of the \$1 M to create the branding and external signs (though these signs are quite a bit better than the old signs in terms of readability and visual design)

Phases 2 and 3 – internal signs

Want to bring back external wayfaring signs

Signage on where the evac chair is in each place it is.

No progress on the internal signage project / any of the above

- iv. Many campus signs do not meet minimum requirements for visually impaired – Font size, size of placard, placement of placard and Braille provided
 - a. Placement of signs – many are at ceiling
 - b. Update on the signage project?

- v. Wayfinder maps need to be updated with Lot 0 and the new buildings in the parking lots
 - a. The current Wayfinder maps that note the location of HC parking, accessible building entrances, bathrooms, elevators, the placement of LAP and the PAC
Are there copies at the information desk?

Is it possible to design a QR code responsive app for wayfaring on campus? Need to discuss this further

- d. Another area of concern is the access to N-wing from K-wing; not only is no access provided on the main level, but there is no signs directing individuals to how to travel to N-wing via the elevators
Update on this project?
External ramp exists now.
F-wing ramp – designed it but it's complicated to design, still studying, money to do some sidewalk work. Might not be worth doing because there are options between Campus Center and Main Building.

External ramp exists now.

- e. Doors
 - i. Many doors require > 5 lbs. of pressure to open
 - ii. Timers on the doors need to provide sufficient time to pass (5+ secs)
 - iii. Update on the Door project
 - iv. Wing doors -
 - a. L-wing still no opener on a heavy door and I receive complaints about this about once a semester

Update on the status of checking the door report. Tasked to John Fritsch in Facilities. Will look for update at next meeting.

USC2 – will be automatic slider doors

- f. Performing Arts Center and Experimental Theatre
 - i. Insufficient ADA parking outside the PAC
 - a. More ADA parking added to Lot 6
 - ii. Vestibule area is graded too steeply and needs handrails
 - a. Ramp added to
 - b. Any updates on the external grading project?

No improvements to external path area – need to add signs to direct people towards N up ramp or towards WQ. What will be the timeline on this?

- iii. Drop off area needed

- iv. There is no easy access to the Experimental Theatre, dressing rooms or educational spaces, no ramps, open chair lift too narrow, riding on the chair lift is a “terrifying” experience.
 - a. Update on plans to replace chair lift?

Looked at it, will need to be replaced, 50-75K dollars to replace, putting it on priority list to be followed up as we go forward.

- g. Rest rooms
 - i. Push buttons on restrooms
 - ii. Restroom arrangement in A-D, only male on the ground floor etc.
 - a. New ADA compliant bathrooms opened in A-D
 - b. Signs noting this do not meet ADA standards
 - iii. Restrooms in several places, including H/J which are close to LAP are entirely inaccessible
 - a. Need appropriately formatted signs next to restroom with locations of accessible restroom

Next bathrooms to be renovated is H/J, in concept/design Timeline – potentially a summer 18 or 19 project.

- a. Evacuation and evacuation maps
 - a. Campus evacuation plan – areas of refuge (need a phone in each one) – plan needs to be updated and advertised
 - i. Need properly formatted area of refuge signs for the areas of refuge
 - ii. Perhaps CERT folks can assist?
 - b. Need evac maps in non-ground floor classrooms, halls and the library to note how individuals who cannot negotiate stairs should evacuate noted in an easier way to find than currently
 - c. Hall evacuation maps need to be updated on non-ground floor halls to explain how to evacuate if unable to negotiate stairs
 - d. Need more Evac Chairs for all over campus, including at each area of refuge at the end of the wing doors, A and S, WQ, USCs, Health Sciences
 - e. Need training on how to use Evac Chairs
 - f. Need to redo fire system and alarms need to be redone and an enunciator added so announcements can be told to shelter in place or evacuate or whatever the instructions must be.

New search for Director of Public Safety – will oversee PD and security guards. New design system for Public Safety. Director of Emergency Management. This individual will be responsible for updating emergency procedures and documentation.

Timeline for hiring – hiring process for around Spring Break.

Need to refresh emergency operations and brief individuals – send an email on evacuation procedures. How to / when will this happen?

Need email promotional campaign and trainings on the existence and use of the Evac Chairs. Signage on where they are. How to make this happen?

Administration and Finance Committee

Meeting

2/2/18

CCMR1

Minutes

In attendance: Susan Fahey, Joe Trout, Beverly Vaughn, Ron Tinsley, Christy Goodnight, Carla Cabarle, Kerrin Wolf, Young Doo Cho, Jennifer Potter

Guests: Theresa Marinelli, Kelly Oquist, Michelle McDonald, Lori Vermeulen

- A. Discussion of most recent travel money statistics. Data and presentation provided by the Office of the Provost
 - a. Columns of the report were discussed (see report)
 - b. Beyond common internal grants, faculty can also be supported from other sources, such as Service Learning
 - c. Junior faculty funding is in column D (not column B)
 - d. The report also includes other professional development awards (non-travel) in column G.
 - e. There was approx. \$40,000 drop in funding from schools from FY16 to FY17. Deans tried to stabilize their spending on travel and encouraging faculty to look to other awards.
 - f. A discussion was held that applying for internal grants is generally much more work than requesting money from Schools (yet the trend is the money is moving out of the schools to the internal grants).
- B. Discussion of results of the survey of faculty on travel funds led by Joe Trout
 - a. Joe Trout authored and administered the survey
 - b. Results of survey were reviewed (see reports)
 - c. Noted that many were not applying for internal grants (PFOF, R&PD)
 - d. Many respondents offered written comments focused on need for more money and simpler application process to get those funds
 - e. Discussion of confusion over various issues (e.g., trying to stay at less expensive hotels)
 - i. The travel office is changing their policies and trying to streamline the process with electronic forms.
 - ii. The committee requested that the Travel Office and Admin & Finance (the division) be encouraged to reach out far and wide to the faculty to best communicate these changes.
- C. Open discussion following presentation of survey
 - a. Discussion of ongoing revision of travel policy and a new travel system

- b. Discussion of need to have a session for faculty to learn travel policies and this would help staff
 - c. Provost would prefer to make funds available up front
 - i. Provost would like a much more transparent process regarding funding of schools and travel money from schools
 - d. Some schools require faculty to find funds elsewhere first
 - e. Some faculty do not use funds that are available
 - f. Discussion of how the budget is determined for each schools' travel fund
 - g. Deans have control over their non-salary funds in their budgets, so they determine where the money goes
 - h. Provost's office is trying to figure out how much has been spent by each school on travel to see if that amount needs to be increased
 - i. Recommendation that travel money be more predictable (guaranteed amount at beginning of year, more than \$900)
 - i. Provost's office is trying to work towards that, with an equal amount available for each faculty member who chooses to travel
 - ii. Question about whether set amount could be controlled by the university instead of the school
 - iii. Concern over current process in which dean's make decision about money, based on uncertain standards/processes that are different by school since it introduces inequity by school
 - iv. Discussion of what to do with money that is not spent by faculty
 - 1. How can it be fairly reallocated to support those who are traveling and might need more money? Can there be an open call once the unused funds are determined? Or be used to reimburse association fees?
 - j. Next meeting – formulate a more certain plan for funding with discussion of amount, additional data on who applies for internal funding
 - k. Call for data from colleagues at other school regarding base travel funding
- D. Staff travel funding
- a. One person emailed the survey author about staff travel. There does not seem to be a uniform process for staff travel.
 - b. Some staff receive travel funding and have to submit proposals to get it

Administration and Finance Committee

Meeting

3/8/18

CC

Meeting Minutes

Members in attendance: Susan Fahey, Mike Wood, Robin Hernandez-Mekonnen, Carla Cabarle, Peter Cho, Mary Kientz, Kerrin Wolf

Guests: Lori Vermeulen, Kelly Oquist, Theresa Marinelli, Karen Lutgen, Michelle McDonald

- E. Continued discussion of most recent travel money statistics.
 - a. Update on data
 - i. First half of this year is being compiled now
 - ii. Library faculty will be added
 - b. Provost's office has requested deans to provide their policy/practice for travel funds
 - i. Responses have not been gathered and analyzed yet
 - ii. From survey – about 35% of faculty respondents were not sure about how travel funds were distributed and only half felt funds were distributed equitably
 - c. Spending went down from '15 to '17 – explanation from some deans is that travel spending was too large a piece of budget
 - d. Claim was made that budget by the university on internal grants has increased, but the actual spending decreased. This is possibly due to the fact that not everyone uses all the money that they are awarded.
 - e. Provost is encouraging deans to be more proactive in budgeting – “truth in budgeting” – instead of the fluid budgeting practices that have been used in which budget projections are not based in reality and funding is shifted around throughout the year
 - f. Budgets also need to be updated to reflect change in faculty size
 - g. Some faculty find it difficult to forecast their travel needs because of unpredictability of acceptance at conferences and unplanned invitations to presentation opportunities
 - h. It was suggested that faculty need to better plan travel over the year
 - i. It was suggested that faculty need more information about all of the possible pots of money
 - j. Professional staff (e.g., clinical instructors) are having difficulty accessing additional funding beyond \$900, which typically only covers one conference
 - i. It was suggested that additional options for funding, like the adjunct fund, can be explored
- F. Discussion of faculty census of colleagues at other institutions' travel budgets.
 - a. Based on convenience sample of Admin and Finance committee members' colleagues from other universities, it was found that faculty colleagues' mean travel budget was \$1700 and median was \$1500
 - b. These results suggest, along with faculty survey on travel funding, that funding increase is necessary
 - c. It was suggested that internal grants could be used more often for travel
 - i. Many faculty spend their own money to support travel
 - ii. Many do not know to apply for these funds for travel
 - d. It was suggested that applying for grants for standard, expected travel seems burdensome. A higher base travel fund amount seems necessary to support faculty in their effort to meet tenure and promotion standards.

- e. The provost suggested that there should be a mix between standard funds available and funds that are available based on competition, but unsure what the appropriate balance is.
- f. It was suggested that it might be better to increase base amount to reduce competition since the current funding does not even cover one annual national conference
- g. It was also suggested that there needs to be some standard for the travel funding so faculty simply don't use it to travel and not actively participate in the conference.
- h. The need for some faculty to attend professional conferences along with conferences at which research is presented was discussed. Current travel funding makes attending both difficult without spending personal money.
- i. The Provost's Office for Budget and Accounting indicated that soon school budgets will be monitored more closely to find leftover/unspent funds that could be devoted to travel later in the year
 - i. It was pointed out that this still does not help some faculty, particularly tenured faculty, who have such small base travel amounts and often spend beyond that amount before the extra money would become available
- j. Provost pointed out that an increase in travel funding means money has to be taken from some other source.
- k. Provost also explained the two schools of thought in university budgeting for travel, which include a centralized system in which the university controls the travel budget for faculty, and a decentralized system in which schools have greater control over faculty travel funding.
- l. A discussion was had about outside funding. Can we expand faculty's applications for external grants? Can faculty be better supported in their applications for such grants?
- m. A discussion was had about what base amount would be enough to make a difference
 - i. It was suggested that \$1200 would be helpful, but really \$1500 is needed to cover national conferences

Administration and Finance Committee

Meeting

Fri, 4/13/18

CCMR1

Minutes

Members present: Christy Goodnight, Susan Fahey, Mary Kientz, Kerrin Wolf, Young Doo Cho

Guests present: Skip West, Jennifer Potter, Don Hudson, Bob Haviland, Laurie Griscom

h. Parking

- i. Minimum number of spots does not necessarily meet the need; provide more HC parking spots, including van accessible spots
 - i. Existing HC spots and how they are distributed in lots 0-7

- ii. Lot 6 had additional ADA parking added near N-wing
- iii. How to increase ADA parking in the light of increasing enrollments and decreased supply of parking with USC2 and HSCI building
 - 1. Still expanding lot 8?
 - 2. Parking garage update?
- i. Distance for disabled people to reach the main academic building
 - i. Ramp near Lot 6 update
 - ii. A drop-off area be designated
 - i. Employee-side drop-off now exists
 - ii. How do faculty, staff and administrators gain access to this?
 - 1. This still needs to be clarified
 - 2. Contact Mike Sullivan or Cynthia Gove-Cullers?
 - iii. What about a front-side drop-off?
 - 1. West Quad or Campus Center?
- iii. What is the status of the relining project? (for relining HC parking to allow van accessible spots where necessary/missing). SF and DH corresponded about this in Spring 16)
 - Update on the status of the relining project?

Parking concerns:

New parking will be opened off lacrosse fields (North athletic fields) to relieve some pressure on parking on the main campus. These will be mostly residential parking spots.

Restriping project:

Swapping some ADA parking in lot 5 – bring it from the fence by lot 5 and closer to the main buildings/Big Blue

Lot 6 parking idea:

to create a permit only lot to get rid of the waitlist for faculty and staff

No gates, ADA spaces will remain open for general public usage.

- j. Signage
 - vi. No signs at all inaccessible areas, like restrooms, directing users to an accessible restroom. These signs will need to be properly formatted (size, placement, font size and placement and Braille)
 - vii. Update on signage project, including signs noting the areas of accessible entrances/bathrooms at inaccessible ones.
 - viii. Signage on where the Evac Chair is.
 - ix. Signage from external ADA spots along admin lot up to PAC?
 - x. Signage from the roads to ADA spots
 - xi. Many campus signs do not meet minimum requirements for visually impaired – Font size, size of placard, placement of placard and Braille provided
 - a. Placement of signs – many are at ceiling
 - b. Update on the signage project?

- xii. Wayfinder maps need to be updated with Lot 0 and the new buildings in the parking lots
 - a. The current Wayfinder maps that note the location of HC parking, accessible building entrances, bathrooms, elevators, the placement of LAP and the PAC
 - Are there copies at the information desk?

Wayfinding campus signs:

\$300,000 has been allotted for design and construction

Request for funding has been submitted. Signage will be addressed next year (FY '19), most likely during summer '19.

Request was made to get rid of outdated signs

Point was made that signage priority should be inaccessible bathrooms, stairwells, and outside near parking

- k. Another area of concern is the access to N-wing from K-wing; not only is no access provided on the main level, but there is no signs directing individuals to how to travel to N-wing via the elevators
- l. N-wing ramp designed to meet the external need in this area
- m. F-wing ramp?
- n. Doors
 - v. Many doors require > 5 lbs. of pressure to open
 - vi. Timers on the doors need to provide sufficient time to pass (5+ secs)
 - vii. Update on the Door project
 - viii. Wing doors -
 - a. L-wing still no opener on a heavy door and I receive complaints about this about once a semester

Request for lower L-wing opener to be placed on door:

This is a FY19 budget request. There needs to be an upgrade to the electrical substation to allow for additional power for a door opener

Looking to complete the electrical upgrade over winter break 2018/9

Could the doors just be taken off? This idea will be looked into.

- o. Performing Arts Center and Experimental Theatre
 - v. Insufficient ADA parking outside the PAC
 - a. More ADA parking added to Lot 6
 - vi. Vestibule area is graded too steeply and needs handrails
 - a. Ramp added to
 - b. Any updates on the external grading project?
 - vii. Drop off area needed
 - viii. There is no easy access to the Experimental Theatre, dressing rooms or educational spaces, no ramps, open chair lift too narrow, riding on the chair lift is a “terrifying” experience.
 - a. Update on plans to replace chair lift?

M-wing chair lift:

No current plans to replace it

But very long deferred maintenance list – added to the list

p. Rest rooms

- iv. Push buttons on restrooms
- v. Restroom arrangement in A-D, only male on the ground floor etc.
 - a. New ADA compliant bathrooms opened in A-D and F-wing
 - b. Signs noting this do not meet ADA standards
- vi. Restrooms in several places, including H/J which are close to LAP are entirely inaccessible
 - a. Need appropriately formatted signs next to restroom with locations of accessible restroom

Restroom renovations:

H/J restrooms renovation plans are approved

But tabling it until next fiscal year – hoping to complete the work in Summer 19

Design includes lactation room, gender-neutral restroom and accessibility compliance

b. Evacuation and evacuation maps

- a. Campus evacuation plan – areas of refuge (need a phone in each one) – plan needs to be updated and advertised
 - i. Need properly formatted area of refuge signs for the areas of refuge
 - ii. Perhaps CERT folks can assist?
- b. Need evac maps in non-ground floor classrooms, halls and the library to note how individuals who cannot negotiate stairs should evacuate noted in an easier way to find than currently
- c. Hall evacuation maps need to be updated on non-ground floor halls to explain how to evacuate if unable to negotiate stairs
- d. Need more Evac Chairs for all over campus, including at each “area of refuge” at the end of the wing doors, A and S, WQ, USCs, Health Sciences

Placement of Evac Chairs in H/J-wing and D-wing:

Put them near elevators. Overall discussion supported their placement near the elevators in those areas. Budget requests discussed on how to pay for more Evac Chairs.

- e. Need promotional campaign and training on how to use Evac Chairs
- f. Need to redo fire system and alarms need to be redone and an enunciator added so announcements can be told to shelter in place or evacuate or whatever the instructions must be.

Fire alert system/alarms:

Budget request has been made to redo the alarm systems from A-N, to add enunciators, add an announcement PA system. Deferred to FY20.

- USC2 and HSCI both have a strobe and a voice, possibly USC1 and possibly CC
- g. Need to refresh emergency operations and brief individuals – send an email on evacuation procedures. How to / when will this happen?

Emergency operations/evacuation procedures:

Need annual training, marketing for the emergency plan, and to run drills

Faculty and students don't know what to do in an emergency, even with text messaging

Campus police can provide training

Training at faculty conference should be considered

New Student Orientation twice a year does a training for active shooter and fire safety and personal safety training, Title IX, sexual assault awareness.

Checking whether grad students get that training

Podium override and gallery TVs override in the case of a lockdown