

UPC
4-25-05

Minutes: The minutes of March 28, 2005: it was moved to append the written questions/answers to Dean Bloniarz and Dean Wick-Pelletier to the minutes and the minutes were approved.

The minutes of April 18, 2005 were approved.

Discussion on the academic calendar:

There was discussion on creating policy for calendar planning and Professor Spanier suggested that possibly UPC might consider creating policy next year. Professor MacDonald noted that UPC can bring a motion to Senate for the 2006/2007 calendar year at this point. Interim Provost Mumpower agreed that UC should recommend not changing the calendar at a late date.. Carlyn said the only way to have the 06/7 calendar set in stone, is for upc to bring a motion to senate.

UPC will bring the 06/7 calendar to the floor –

After thorough discussion, a motion was made that UPC will recommend to the Senate at the May 2, 2005 meeting, that the academic calendar approved by UPC on April 18, 2005, for 2006/2007 remain in effect. The motion passed.

Proposed New School of Business Building:

Professor McCaffrey reported that Dean Leonard said it isn't substantial if upc votes on this at this meeting or one in the fall semester... ask David McCaffrey for wording from email dean sent to him. It is likely that a good deal of the issues will be clarified over the summer - -

Frank Hauser: recommended that we support a resolution of the important contribution the school of business makes to our community - thinks we should voice our support for their efforts at this point... SBK seconded Frank's recommendation.

Carolyn – there is still an issue – of us making an agreement without knowing costs

MOITON is to support the school's efforts in planning and fundraising.. ALL IN FAVOR

Frank – UFC Report: (ask Frank to send me his report via email) Here's Frank's report:

Facilities meeting of April 18, 2005.

Attendees: Jonathan Bartow, Rachel Baum, Steve Beditz, Raymond DeSantis, Elizabeth Gaffney, John Giarusso, Jill Hanifan, Frank Hauser,* Floyd Henderson, Sung Bok Kim, Stacy Stern.

Christine Haile (CIO) presented a brief overview of the development of smart and technology classrooms on the campus. The installation of these facilities was performed in 2002 through a one time capital funding. At this point, some 44% of the teaching spaces are either smart or

technology classrooms. (The attached sheet shows the rooms that currently do and do not have technology.) This funding is running out and the issues facing ITS are how to raise money for refreshment of these facilities (software upgrades and new equipment) and to go beyond the current 44%. The committee was asked for input, so that she can make a recommendation to the president for the 05-06 year.

Carole Sweeton and Pete Connolly of ITS then presented the general themes that resulted from a classrooms needs assessment survey conducted by ITS and the attached document lists their findings. Most notable is that the faculty feel that all teaching spaces need technology and that it should be uniform across all teaching spaces. BA, Social Sciences and the performing arts center were specifically identified as needing technology as well as certain spaces on the downtown campus.

In addition to these topics, there was a brief discussion on the need for more technical support.

The committee unanimously voiced its support for continued enhancement of technology on the campus.

The committee then heard a report on the planned renovation of a number of classrooms on the campus and specifically rooms on the first and second floors of Earth Sciences. Some of these changes are major renovations in that walls are being removed and classroom space is being expanded. More specifically, long narrow classrooms where it is difficult to get a reasonable arrangement are being combined with an adjacent room. In so doing, these rooms now meet fire code in that they have two exits, rather than only one. The renovations are being patterned after those that were done in Social Sciences, in which the lighting was changed, rugs were removed and replaced with bright floor tile, and acoustical baffles were installed to prevent sound from returning from the vaulted ceilings. In addition, sound absorbing wall materials will be added to reduce noise. Although we did not get into a great deal of detail about room arrangements, the committee was uniformly impressed with the proposed changes.

--

Frank M. Hauser

– regarding upgrades in software and equipment --- about chris haile...
Committee unanimously supported continued support of technology on campus

(People here: mcaffrey, spanier, hauser, mumpower, macdonald, henderson, stern, murray, bartow, hanifan, sbk, wulfert, geer)

floyd henderson: comment - - furniture – where this equipment is placed – is an issue also....furniture items should be in the proposal too....

Paulette McCormick and Rick Cunningham, associate director of the ??center?

Paulette had the latest financial plan, basically expenditures for gen amounting to \$ Annual operating expenses. On time \$180,000. moving expense -- she will send this by email. \$25 mil passed in capital budget – if not vetoed, will come out of that...plus new equipment will come out of that

Yearly operating cost: \$100,000. For mice; have \$50,000.00 to 60,000.00 already budgeted for mice w/grants.

Asked for 2 staff - \$90,000.00 a year, one lab assistant, one administrative position.

Have 8 current faculty - -

***Ask paulette for a copy of what she read from

asked for 4 grad student stipends....

Have asked for seed money for \$50,000.00 for pilot projects –

-\$12,000.00 – new equipment and service per year

-journals \$15,000.00 per year –

Geer – asked about numbers she gave us... some went down – more accurate...

There were a few questions on amounts.

Carolyn asked about faculty / researchers ---- there's only one lab assistant – Paulette said the faculty are regular state-line faculty.

Sbk - - asked if she had plans to provide assistance to undergrad students..... paulette said the faculty are very interested w/working with undergrad students, they already work with some and also some high school students...too.

Mccaffrey asked – her to send a written document to him on this....

Asked about potential worst case scenarios: what are we on the hook for --- she said currently 6 faculty members –

Main thing is can we maintain our grants – so far we have been continuously successful.

Mccaff: In terms of upc making a recommendation is there some way you could convey the level of certainty on this – give us confidence that things will go more right than wrong... she said she could...

Ques from carolyn: Cost for running the new building – paulette said it comes from rents from other tenants..... they rent it at \$33. per sq ft. – rents go to the facility – not back to the academic side. Green building/energy costs are lower...

Paulette & rick left the room.

Frank suggested it would be good to defer until we received written documents on the numbers...cost...etc....

Discussion continued...

On cost of running new building....

Spanier asked how nano school/center get approved??....

Elga – what is the advantage of forming a center, is there an economic advantage?

Kim said change will be coming on indirect costs returns...

David: we will get the written figures from paulette – and it would be good to get the answer to “what is the advantage of having a center” - -

---he would like to be more confident that there is a good reason to believe that they will pull in the grants they will need.

Stacy – what will happen w/the spacio and cfg will vacate? We haven’t discussed that....

She said that is a very desirable piece of real estate – that will go fast...we will profit from that.

David will write email to paulette - - asking for written documentation, what the advantages of having vs. not having the center, what are the finances – cost return, what additional resources if any, are being requested, what are the costs, etc....