

College-wide Facilities Planning Committee

Review of Facilities Master Plan, April 2013

This report is a review of the Facilities Master Plan, completed in April of 2011, by the College-wide Facilities Planning Committee (CFPC).

Each of six subcommittees reviewed the Master Plan recommendations, and then consulted with the full CFPC before submitting recommendations relevant to the subcommittees' individual areas of concern. Each subcommittee was asked to review the Facilities Master Plan, playing close attention to Phase V (Final Recommendations and Sequencing) section, reaffirm recommendations that remain valid, and determine what might be changed or added.

This report is composed of individual subcommittees' reports organized by topics:

Communication Strategies

Financial Planning

Learning Environment

Project Impact

Quality of Place

Space Management

College-wide Facilities Planning Committee

Leah Barrett	Karen Riotto
Robert Henry, <i>Ex officio</i>	Craig Ross
Peter Dowe	Brad Schreiber
Sandy Evans	Frank Short
Johnna Frosini	Rick Smith
Stephen Godleski	Susan Stites-Doe
Pamela Haibach	Paul Tankel, <i>Ex officio</i>
Kim Haines	Dave Turkow
Scott Haines	Wanda Wakefield
Erick Hart	Beau Willis, <i>Ex officio</i>
Kristin Heffernan	Frank Wojcik
Frank Kuhn, Chair	Dana Weiss, <i>Ex officio</i>
Mark Noll	Susan Arno, Recording Secretary
John Osowski	

Communications Strategies

Subcommittee Members: Joe Chesebro, Kim Haines (Chair), Brad Schreiber,
Dave Tyler

In general our subcommittee's recommendations are related to how best to communicate the components and overall vision of FaMP. As plans move forward, our feeling is that CFPC will need to consider the following recommendations in relation to FaMP:

1. Rebranding FaMP – does the general population understand what FaMP is? Can we simplify language to better incorporate the community?
 - Provide a website link to the FaMP Executive Summary
 - Work with College Communications to place articles on Facebook, Daily Eagle and the website. The FaMP is a foundation from which this campus will grow and develop and we have already started that process.
 - Facilities & Planning, when FaMP was first released, had intended to produce a full-color brochure with highlights of the final recommendations and to better explain what FaMP is and how it will impact the campus. This was tabled due to time and budget...can it be something we look at in terms of a progress report.
2. Develop project timelines for the 15 final recommendations outlined in FaMP, assuming those 15 remain. This will help our subcommittee to build a strong communication plan, energy surrounding the progress happening on campus and collaboration amongst all parties involved.
 - a. Project communication timelines would include:
 - i. Planned live wired chats
 - ii. Regular updates on a website, Daily Eagle, Facebook, etc.
3. Include/Incorporate FaMP into College 2025 conversations as means of articulating the FaMP vision.
4. Consider adding a College Communications representative to the CFPC in an effort to increase communication about FaMP to the campus and greater communities.

Financial Planning

Subcommittee Members: John Osowski, Karen Riotto (Chair), Craig Ross,
Brad Schreiber

Overall the committee views the recommendations as solid and making sense based on Brockport's strategic plan and institutional goals.

Highlights

The Financial Planning Subcommittee noted the following highlights of the plan:

- Opportunities for collaboration within the College and between the College and other organizations;
- Opportunities to increase College's connection to the Erie Canal;
- Opportunities to encourage community interaction, using outdoor space.
 - How closely are we aligning with the campus pedestrian circulation recommendations?
 - Are we considering secondary and tertiary pedestrian circulation as well?
 - Are bicycle and fitness pathways being integrated?

For Further Consideration/Action

Based on funding availability and amount, the college may need to re-evaluate the priorities and/or ranking of the 16 final recommendations. Some very hard decisions may need to be made on some of these projects. We recognize the possibility that all recommendations may not be fulfilled.

In all capital program efforts, opportunities (State University Construction Fund, Dormitory Authority of New York, New York Power Authority, local funds, restricted and unrestricted funds, grants, etc.) should be pursued to maximize the impact of investment needed to move the Facilities Master Plan forward.

Learning Environment

Subcommittee Members: Sandy Evans, Pamela Haibach, Charles Miles, Frank Short,
Wanda Wakefield (Chair), Frank Wojcik

The Master Plan envisions the development of more North-South connections across campus, including the construction of a new pedestrian railroad crossing Northwest of the Allen Building. We encourage the installation of public art at that crossing. The public art should be a permanent feature of the crossing and other railroad crossing (such as the Bridge to the library) should also be enhanced with art.

Students often remark how everybody keeps their heads down, hurrying down the sidewalks from the residence halls to the classroom buildings. Since the Mall is going to be rebuilt as part of Phase V we believe that renovation should include benches, tables and other outdoor seating areas to allow students to gather before and after class along the walkways. Some of these outdoor seating areas could be clustered with one such cluster situated near to the proposed new science sector of the campus, allowing, for example, nursing students and biology majors to meet to talk about their mutual interests.

The Learning Environment subcommittee strongly urges the development of dedicated bicycle paths on campus. The College should connect those paths to proposed bike paths being developed by Walk/Bike Brockport for areas around campus. Working with the School of Health and Performance, we suggest that those bicycle paths and other walkways around campus should have signage advising students and faculty of distances from point A to point B allowing them to know the extent to which they are working on fitness by walking/biking. In addition to the bike paths we encourage Residence Life to create dedicated lockers within the residence halls where student bicycles can be stored during the winter months.

In order to encourage the use of the outdoors as a Learning Environment there should be an investment in public art and signage around the campus. Students could read signs explaining the particular types of trees and ornamental plantings on campus. Students could also read about the history of the various buildings on campus and how they fit in with the college's overall education mission. In every way, students should be made aware of the totality of their environment as a place of learning.

Finally, we support the inclusion of the South side of the Canal as an integral part of the Campus to be used by students and faculty as another Learning Environment.

Project Impact

Subcommittee Members: Jennifer Ashbaugh, Steve Godleski, Mark Noll (Co-chair),
John Osowski (Co-chair), Rick Smith, Karen Schuhle-Williams,
Paul Tankel,

FaMP and project impact:

1. It was determined that FaMP does address project impact, although on a high level, in broad terms. For instance, FaMP does discuss the impact that the new liberal arts building will have on the campus. With multiple departments moving into the new building, opportunities are created with space available in the vacated building areas. FaMP does recommend on a broad scale which subsequent departments should move into the vacated spaces at Hartwell Hall, Brown Building, Tower Fine Arts.
2. FaMP intentionally does not address the details of departments moving into the vacated spaces. Space was looked at on a gross square foot basis for reasonableness of fit, but not exact headcount or office count basis. The communication of these subsequent moves, the sequencing of these moves, the detailed planning of these moves, changes and costs involved, all need to be reviewed in much more detail by appropriate project specific planning teams and planning/architectural consultants.
3. FaMP does not need to be changed to better address project impact. Communication of the details of impact needs to be conveyed in a timely manner to affected parties.

Impact details to be addressed:

1. Long term details – annual update to FaMP sequence plans as projects are planned and approach viability and action.
2. Short term details – periodic (biweekly?, monthly?) update to accessibility issues, pedestrian detours, mapping of routes, parking curtailments, noise issues, as affected by projects under construction.

Other issues to be considered:

1. Impact of NYS/SUNY constrained capital/cash flow situation on FaMP and on our capital plans. Potential for no new building additions, no new buildings, delay of capital allocations for critical maintenance work.

Quality of Place

Subcommittee Members: Leah Barrett, Kristin Heffernan (Co-chair), Maryellen Post,
Susan Stites-Doe (Co-chair), Paul Tankel , David Turkow

Charge for this Report:

1. Read FAMP paying close attention to Phase V section.
2. Be prepared to answer three questions from the perspective of Quality of Place:
 - a. Can we reaffirm that our plans still make sense?
 - b. Would adding more detail be appropriate?
 - c. FAMP was essentially a framework, and can we add any value to what we see as a subcommittee?
3. What is MISSING from what we read?

After reading FAMP and meeting to discuss the aforesaid, the Quality of Place subcommittee believes that the current FAMP plan still makes sense. The language used by the consultants in FAMP mirrors that of our Vision and Proposed statement regarding measures (please see below). The committee, however, feels that the process for reaching our goal/vision needs to be explicitly defined so that it is structurally embedded in our practice via deliberate procedures. As such, a method to systemically measure the specific attributes of *Quality of Place* should be established.

At this point we suggest that we need to develop a rubric based on the five elements suggested in the mission statement: comfort, accessibility, engagement, interaction, and inclusion

Vision Statement:

The College at Brockport strives to create an atmosphere that engages, students, faculty, staff and the larger community, and that promotes comfort, accessibility, and interaction. We will create spaces and a quality of place that encourages connection, that removes barriers, and that is inclusive. We want to recognize our significant history and build an important future in intentional ways that create quality, and that celebrate what it means to be part of the College at Brockport.

Statement regarding measures:

The standard by which any quality of place project or planning process will be assessed will be rooted in the level of comfort, accessibility, engagement/interaction, and inclusion that is being added to the college environment. Statements or suppositions of value added along each of these facets of our campus climate will need to be supplemented by evidence. Data should be gathered from multiple stakeholders and via the employment of "ambassadors" of student opinion to determine whether or not proposed actions will add or subtract from the primary vision statement elements we have elucidated. It is expected that the subcommittee will serve as reviewers of proposals made regarding building and renovation projects as it works to establish and maintain standards regarding quality of place.

Space Management

Subcommittee Members: Peter Dowe (Chair), Erick Hart, Dave, Turkow

Phase V of FaMP calls for the “right sizing” of departments through a combination of moves, renovations and new construction.

There are several projects already underway that will support student success and physically enhance the campus. The newly opened Special Events Recreation Center and the new Liberal Arts Building, currently under construction are the most noteworthy examples. In addition, the planned renovations to Lathrop Hall will allow the momentum of revitalizing space to continue.

Upon completion of the new Liberal Arts Building 5 academic departments will move into the building resulting in vacated office space in Brown, Dailey, Hartwell, and Tower. In addition, the Language Lab in Tower is vacated and any departmental computer labs in the above mentioned buildings are vacated. At approximately the same time, the Nursing department will move from Tuttle North to Lathrop Hall.

The repurposing of vacated space resulting from these moves needs to meet the current and future requirements of the College. It would seem appropriate to facilitate other moves as soon as possible so that squatting in vacated space does not occur.