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 31, 2019</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 Small Conference Room</td>
<td>Time: End</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members Attending: Cheryl Hanson, Todd Adams, Robert Houghton, Dorothy Lohse, Lowell Richards, Joseph Simonson, Tony Lovgren, Deb Easterly, Brian Hickenlooper, Kathleen Kangas, Karen Scott.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PSR 18-017**

- #1 - Reduce score from 3 to 2 since this project is directly benefitting only the College of Technology.
  - Approved (-4 points)
- #2 - Reduce from 3 to 2 because this project only benefits the University as a whole indirectly through CoT.
  - Approved (-4 points)
- #12 – Reduce from 2 to 1 because this project will only increase effectiveness for a limited group of students.
  - Approved (-2 points)
- #13 – Reduce from 2 to 1 as this project will only affect ~10% of faculty.
  - Approved (-2 points)
- #17 - Reduce score since only CoT will be using the room. Support to the University is indirect.
  - Approved (-2 points)

The new rubric score was approved at 54.

**PSR 19-004**

- #6 - Cost savings need to be quantified. I would only rate as 0
  - Approved (-5 points)
- #8 - Does this project improve a weakness in the testing center's security? If not, reduce to 0 as it would not be necessary for security.
  - Approved (-6 points)
- #11 - Stretch to say is will attract and retain students?
  - After discussion the committee agreed to leave the rating as a 2.
- #12, #13, #14 - Reduce because the project affects a smaller proportion of the University than is indicated.
  - Approved (-6 points)

The new rubric score was approved at 73.
| PSR 19-008 | • #11 - Increase from 0 to 1 because failure to offer ADA accessible bathrooms could deter people needing those facilities from starting/continuing a program in the building.  
  o Approved (+3 points)  
• #7 – Increase from 2 to 3 because an ADA restroom is essential for the safety of those with disabilities.  
  o Approved (+6 points)  
• The new rubric score was approved at 74 |
| PSR 19-015 | • #4 - Reduce to 0. While appropriate colors are discussed in the University's Style Guide, they don't have the weight of policy or mandates.  
  o Approved (-10 points)  
• It was brought up that the space is relatively nice compared with some other areas of campus.  
• The new rubric score was approved at 78 |
| PSR 19-016 | • #7 – Increase from 2 to 3 because an ADA restroom is essential for the safety of those with disabilities.  
  o Approved (+6 points)  
• The new rubric score was approved at 76 |
| PSR 19-036 | • #6 – Reduce to 0. This project appears to not yet be sponsored by a Vice President, even if it is in line with stated ideals.  
  o Lyn Redington is very supportive of this project. The score will remain at 1.  
• #7 - Reduce from 2 to 1. As far as physical safety, I think there is a potential, but not moderate, risk in this scenario.  
  o The committee agreed that a gender neutral bathroom would address a moderate physical safety risk. The score will remain at 2.  
• #9 - Other projects have been rating this question as 0 because the department can continue to operate without the project. Should we down score this one or raise the others?  
  o Counseling and Testing serves a variety of students. They need to make sure to have proper accommodations. If they do not provide for the needs of the students, they cannot do their job.  
• The rubric score will remain at 84 |
| PSR 19-050 | • #9 - Highest score is 2 in this category.  
  o Approved (-4 points)  
• The new rubric score was approved at 91 |
| PSR 19-053 | • #4 - I would think if the building is condemned this could be scored higher.  
  o The committee agreed that it was appropriate to raise the rating to 2.  
  o Approved (+10 points)  
• #11 - Increase from 0 to 1. The removal of an eyesore and the first step in redeveloping the land has potential to affect the attractiveness of the University.  
  o Approved (+3 points)  
• The new rubric score was approved at 52 |
| PSR 19-063 | • #1, #2. Reduce from 3 to 2 because it contributes to the University but is not a University-wide initiative.  
  o The committee agreed that this project support the University as a whole. It is a very visible and can be seen from the interstate. It provides an image of ISU |
as a whole. The scores on 1&2 will remain at 3.

- #4 - Reduce to 0. While appropriate branding is discussed in the University's Style Guide, it doesn't have the weight of policy or mandates.
  - The committee agreed to keep the rating at 2.
- #15 - Reduce from 2 to 1. The functionality of the system is not affected, but it sounds like the previous fixes are no longer sufficient.
  - There were some comments on Box that say that the paint is showing its age, and in some areas it is peeling.
  - The committee agreed to keep the rating at 2.
- The rubric score was approved at 59

| PSR 19-078 | • #6 - Increase from 0 to 1. With so many events held there, not fixing the problem could result in loss of revenue if it becomes a venue people avoid.
  - Approved (+5 points)
• #14 - Reduce from 3 to 1. It will improve staff's effectiveness, but only for a limited number of staff.
  - Approved (-4 points)
• The rubric score was approved at 96 |
| PSR 19-083 | • No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 75 |
| PSR 19-103 | • No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 50 |
| PSR 19-111 | The package was not available for review yet. |
| PSR 19-117 | • No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 68 |
| PSR 19-120 | • No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 70 |
| PSR 19-133 | • No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 64 |
| PSR 19-138 | • No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 75 |
| PSR 19-142 | • No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 91 |
| PSR 19-148 | • No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 72 |
• No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 84

PSR 19-150

• No comments
• The rubric score was approved at 84

PSR 19-151

• Work needs to be done so welding can be done safely in this building.
• The rubric score was approved at 94

PSR 19-152

• #1 should be a score of 0
  o Approved (-4 points)
• #2 should be a 0
  o Approved (-4 points)
• #7 should be a 0. There are other alternatives such as the President's office kitchen which is on the same floor.
  o Approved (-18 points)
• #14 should be a 0
  o Approved (-4 points)
• The rubric score was approved at 10

Next Meeting

• We will discuss capital projects in the next meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
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Next Meetings:
February 7, 2019