

UFFAB Meeting Minutes
Thursday December 5, 2013
303 GSB

Members Present:

Jenna Muniz, ULC, Chair
Lexi Evans, Warner College of Natural Resources, Vice Chair
Riley Smith, College of Health and Human Sciences
Michelle Staros, College of VMBS
Jeff Cook, Graduate School
Amber Weimer, College of Natural Sciences
Matt Lancto, College of Liberal Arts
Lance Oles, College of Agricultural Sciences
Kayln Miller, College of Business
Alex Brown, College of Engineering

Members Not Present:

Members at Large Present:

Sam Guinn, ASCSU Representative

Members at Large Not Present:

Associate Members Present:

Associate Members Not Present:

Ex – Officio Members Present:

Steve Hultin, Faculty Advisor
Becca Wren, Staff Support
Lindsay Brown, Staff Support
Cassidy Collins, Staff Support
Andrew Olson, SFRB Liaison
Kristi Buffington, Manager for Space and Information Management, Facilities Management
Patrick Burns, Ex – Officio Member
Tamla Blunt, Ex-Officio Member

Ex – Officio Members Not Present:

Visitors:

I. Call to Order at 5:04

- a. Meeting called to order by Jenna.

I. Approval of Minutes from November 21, 2013

- a. Motion made to approve minutes by Jeff . Motion seconded by Alex .
- b. Minutes approved.

II. Discussion/motion to meet weekly

- a. Jenna started formal vote to proceed with the fee increase process.
- b. Motion by Jeff, second by someone. All agreed. Motion passes.

A second vote was taken to meet weekly for the rest of the year.

- a. Lexi moved to meet every week at 5:00 pm.
- b. Alex's associate second
- c. All agree

III. Update on conversation with Dr. Frank from Lexi.

- a. While the Board knew Provost Rick Miranda was in support of a facility fee increase, Dr. Frank's opinion was unknown. Lexi reached out to Dr Frank via telephone call.
- b. Dr. Frank was very happy to hear that the board is being proactive and is very enthusiastic about his involvement with UFFAB.
- c. He also mentioned that the Biology building and the Warner College project are both on his priority list.
- d. He explained that the fee should be considered an investment in the future of the university and he urged the Board to make the bigger picture of the long-term benefits to students clear.
- e. Dr. Frank will attend January 30th meeting and talk to the Board about the fee increase.

IV. Discussion of fee comparison, bond adjustments, and classroom utilization sheet.

- a. Many handouts were distributed at this meeting. The first handout was a rough schedule outlining the fee increase process, and when the open forums are going to be held.
- b. Jenna mentioned that the majority of this process will happen within the next two months, meaning the UFFAB will need to make many decisions rather quickly.
- c. Steve thought that the Board should focus on the general months listed because there is some uncertainty of exactly when some items will take place - such as the survey or open forum
- d. Becca added that the student survey would look very similar to the transportation survey sent earlier in the day.
- e. Tamla mentioned that last year's open forum was held around 3 or 4 in the afternoon, and advertised in the Collegian

- i. During the last facility fee increase process, all presenters to the UFFAB Board came to the Open Forum to present, but there was not much student participation.
- f. Steve asked for more ideas about how to get more participation from students.
 - i. Jenna suggested that Board members should attend other student groups for an opportunity to present the fee adjustment process and how it will benefit students.
 - ii. Sam offered to send a press release through ASCSU regarding the Board's facility fee adjustment.
 - iii. Steve stated that staff support will continually revise the process schedule with firm dates and action items.
- g. Jeff argued that we should not have presenters at the open forum as that could lead to a bandwagon effect and lose the focus on student opinions.
 - i. Tamla countered that in the past, the students that did show up were very interested in the presentations, and it gave them the opportunity to get them more involved in details.
- h. Matt suggested that the Board video tape the proposals and launch a social media outreach campaign.
- i. Steve called for a UFFAB subcommittee to help facilities support staff set up the open forum and begin the fee adjustment process.
 - i. Ashley Weimer, Matt Lancto, and Sam Guinn offered to help out.

Fee Comparison

- a. Becca explained that she looked at the fees generated by 5 other state funded universities to compare to that of CSU. No other universities have some type of facility fee that is comparable to CSU's, so the fee comparison was difficult to tabulate. However, this comparison gives a better understanding of how other institutions charge students.
- b. Lindsay added that according to the websites of the other universities, CSU's facility fee is the only fee that uses the facility fee to fund new projects.
- c. Steve asked if there are other universities delegating student fees towards construction.
 - i. Lexi answered that Dr. Frank mentioned that CSU is one of the only universities that he knows of that has a student run fee advisory board like UFFAB.

Fee adjustments matrix

- a. The spreadsheet shows the debt proposals for the three projects and what the board could fund for these projects.
- b. If student population increases, the Board should anticipate more dollars, and if CSU reaches a 35,000 student enrollment by 2020, the fees will bring in 3.2 million at today's rates.
- c. Lexi asked how the Biology building would find additional funding if UFFAB chose to not fully fund the project.
- d. Ashley spoke with Mike Antolin and mentioned that there are other, less expensive design plans that could be used if the building did not have a donor. The state legislature is funding the Chemistry building, and they heard about the Biology building and wanted to do it at the same time.
- e. Ashley offered to inquire about any potential Biology building donors.

Flipped classrooms

- a. The classroom utilization sheet represents the next group of classrooms that did not get renovated in the 10 million dollar order.
- b. The document also shows the foot traffic in the room, the cost to renovate the room, and the ability to flip the room.
- c. Flipped classrooms entail two phases of renovations - technology, providing the professor to lecture online - and the furniture, Herman Miller.
- d. Jeff added that he feels strongly against the ideal of “if you build it they will come”, and that feedback from professors would be helpful in this decision.
- e. Steve addressed that CSU’s Classroom Review Board is already pursuing this feedback. Stephanie Clemons, an Interior Design Professor, has already received comments from 40 professors across the University who are in favor of the flipped classroom model and believe this model will only enhance student learning.
- f. Steve encouraged the Board to get involved with the Classroom Review Board and agreed to send more information to all UFFAB members.
- g. Jenna called for thoughts about general renovations and flipping classrooms
 - i. Michelle asked if these renovations could be completed over the summer, in order to avoid displacing students. Kristi answered that the scope of work on a renovation project can vary. For example, some of the Chemistry classrooms were renovated over the entire summer, while others only took a few weeks.
 - ii. Jeff asked if the Board could offer the classroom remodels as leverage for the facility fee increase. Lexi added that we have to approve the projects before we approve the fee increase.
 - iii. Ashley Weimer added that she would prefer to see classrooms renovated that genuinely need it, rather than only flipping classrooms.
 - iv. Jeff agreed
 - v. Steve said that to supplement this classroom utilization sheet, he will add information about the incremental cost of each flipped classroom.
 - vi. Ashley asked if there are currently any flipped classrooms at CSU.
 - vii. Steve answered that the classroom in Aylesworth, toured by UFFAB earlier in the semester is currently the only flipped classroom on CSU’s campus. Herman Miller donated that furniture for flipping the room.
 - viii. Ashley asked if the students or professors have commented on how they like the furniture.
 - ix. Kristi heard comments from students and professors that it takes time to adjust to the difference in the classroom with flipped furniture but they are beginning to enjoy it.
 - x. Steve added that the whole effort is looking at WDF, and those show up in a certain curriculum or class type. the mission of the university is retention, and if these classrooms will help improve test scores, we should take a good look at that.

IV. Consideration of Bylaws and submitted projects

- a. The funding rules of the bylaws state that projects funded by UFFAB must academically benefit the students.

- b. With that funding rule in mind, Pat questioned the water bottle fillers and recycle bins proposals. While they are great projects, would either of them academically benefit the students?
- c. Jenna asked if the Board decided that both of these projects did not meet that criteria, could the Board illegitimatize them now, foregoing a presentation.
- d. Tamla answered that normally, projects in question should be legitimized, but not approved on the final vote which doesn't mean that the Board must wait for their presentation.

Filling Stations

- e. Jenna called for a vote to hear the filling station and the recycling bin presentations.
 - i. Jeff drew everyone's attention to item 9 of the filling station proposal which outline many potential benefits to students. Jeff feels that the project could benefit students in both the academic and research realms.
 - ii. Lexi added that this could propose opportunity for research.
 - iii. Amber added that the filling stations could only be considered "research" if students were using this data.
 - iv. Jenna added that this is just a vote to see the presentation.
 - v. Motion by Jeff. Second by Lexi. Motion passes.

Recycling Bins

- f. Jenna did not see the alignment of the recycling bins project and the Board's Bylaws.
 - i. Jeff asked if there is any way we could ask the proposer to defend the project. Matt answered that they already did have a chance to state their case on their proposal form.
 - ii. Tamla added that even if it the project does not fit into the UFFAB Bylaws, the Board could point them in the direction of the Student Sustainability Center for this project.
 - iii. Matt added that without the unified bins, CSU's recycling stream are often contaminated and discarded.
 - iv. Michelle mentioned that the proposal is a good idea, but it not in accordance with the bylaws and is invalid.
 - v. Lindsay suggested that we could send them a letter asking for clarification on several points.
 - vi. Jeff said that he would support hearing a presentation, having them aware that they need to answer the questions.
 - vii. Amber added that it doesn't make sense to approve the project, and Sam agreed.
 - viii. Motion to vote to see the presentation by Matt, second by Jeff.
 - ix. None in favor of seeing the presentation.
 - x. All those opposed – All - The Board will not see the presentation of the recycling bins.

V. General Assignment Classrooms, Visual Arts, Natural Resources Building, and TRIO.

- i. Motion to vote to see the presentation by Matt second by Jeff.
- ii. All in favor - None opposed
- iii. Passes

VI. Next meeting January 30th – Tony Frank to attend.

VII. Adjourn 6:09 PM