Facilities Subcommittee of the Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment Council

Meeting Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>IEAC Facilities Subcommittee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>January 25, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Cheryl Hanson, Facilities Assoc. VP</td>
<td>Time: Start</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>President’s Large Conference Room</td>
<td>Time: End</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members Attending: Deb Easterly, Karen Appleby, Brian Hickenlooper, John Gribas, Cheryl Hanson, Todd Adams, Jason Adams, Vince Miller, Mark Norviel, Lowell Richards, Nancy Devine, and Karina Rorris.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item(s)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Approval of previous minutes</td>
<td>Previous minutes approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PSR 17-058 – Shubert Stairs</td>
<td>Jason Adams • This project is to replace the two outdoor exit stair towers. The stairs are structurally deteriorating. o The reason that this project has come to the committee early is because this is a safety issue for the students that live at Schubert Heights. • A Fast-Track Form has been used for this project. o These stair are currently closed to everyday use, but can be used in case of emergencies. o We will need to check with DBS and determine the process for getting this project done. We will see if we can do them both at the same time, or if we need to do them one at a time. o Schubert is filled year round. • This project will be centrally funded. o It was approved for funding by the Provost and President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fast Track Request Form</td>
<td>Cheryl Hanson • This Fast-Track Request Form will be used for projects that are over $30,000. • Suggestions o “Project” on the first line is spelled incorrectly. o The Fast Track Request Form should be reviewed and approved by Facilities Services before it is brought to the committee. o We should add check boxes for the scenarios located in the LOI Fast-Track Project definition. This will make it easier for the customer to show which scenario applies to their project. o It would be more user friendly if it was a Word document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Workload Report</td>
<td>Cheryl Hanson • The workload report shows that we do not have enough staff to compete all of the requests that we have been getting. o In the recent past we have received funding from multiple sources to complete projects. It is great that we have funding, but we have found that the current staff cannot keep up with the increasing number of requests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the projects over $30,000, our project manager team receives approximately 160 projects a year that are under $30,000.

Attached to our PSR form we have a Project Flow Chart which shows the timeline of projects. With the amount of work coming in, we are not able/will not be able to keep to this schedule.

An ideal amount of projects for a project manager is 15-20 at one time. In this past year our project managers have had 35 projects assigned to them at one time.

According to the numbers we are short 1.7 FTE.

If something does not change we are going to have to start refusing work, putting projects on hold, letting customers know the project will take longer than usual.

- It was brought up that it would be terrible to refuse money because we don’t have enough staff to complete projects. If we have money to use, we need to find a way to use it.

- Solutions
  - A consultant came in and analyzed Facilities Service and determined that we are understaffed. One solution is to hire additional help to get the workload back to a manageable level for everyone.
  - There were multiple suggestions on how Facilities Services could obtain additional help.
    - We could hire a temporary project manager. This issue with this is we do not see a drop in number of project in the foreseeable future.
    - We could hire an outside project management consultant. It was discussed that this may be a very expensive option. The good thing about the option is that if we do have a drop in the number of projects, we do not have to use them anymore.
    - We could hire on full time Facilities Services project managers. It was discussed that we may not get these positions approved.
    - It was suggested that we utilize student workers to help or manage projects. We determined that there is too much fiscal responsibility and required training and experience for the project manager positions, and would not want to place that burden on students.

- Chargeback rates for Project Manager time
  - Is there a reason that Project Managers do not charge for their time?
    - For internal funded projects, it would be like we are charging ourselves.
    - If it is an external funded project, we may be able to charge for the Project Manager’s time. We would have to discuss and approve an hourly rate.

- Other discussions
  - For Facilities Services the workload is not dependent on enrollment. Whether there are 50 students in a classroom or 100, we still need to make sure the HVAC system is working, and the room is maintained.
    - It is difficult when Facilities Services has cuts in staff and funding because our work is not lessened. Facilities Services just has to find a way to do more with less.
• It was mentioned that the administration may be reallocating University resources in the future, and Facilities Services’ dilemma could be brought up.
  o Impact of Facilities Services
    • The work that is done by Facilities Services has a direct correlation with retention and recruitment. If the facilities at Idaho State University are not attractive or have issue, students are not going to want to come here. A committee member had the opportunity to ask about how some students attending a debate tournament felt about the University. The response she got was they were not impressed. There are many places on campus that are not up to date.
    • It was discussed that we should have a way to communicate with the students, staff, and faculty, and find what they are expecting and what standards they believe the facilities should have.
  • The committee would like to send a memo to Laura Woodworth-Ney which outlines the staffing issues and resulting consequences for Facilities Services, and the proposed solutions we discussed.

5 Other Discussion

• If a project is approved for fast-track do we need to fill out a rubric? We will not be comparing it with other projects, so is there a purpose?
  o The Shubert stairs project had a very low score.
  o The committee agreed that we should still have all projects fill out the rubric. The score will still help the committee prioritize the most pressing or most important projects.
  o The rubric helps us to look at projects from a different angle. It helps us to know why the project is important and how it compares with other requests on campus.
  o We may want to think about putting more weight on specific items on the rubric.

Handouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PSR 17-058 IEAC Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fast-Track Request Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Meetings:
February 22, 2018
March 29, 2018