CAMPUS FEEDBACK

Comments from the Campus Communities

During the spring of 2014, the Administrative Review Team for Facilities Management visited at least one campus of each of the seven Universities in an effort to gather information and engage the communities in dialog about the project. A public forum was held at each of these visits, and participants from all areas of campus life were encouraged to attend and participate. Comments, questions, suggestions, and other feedback was heard by members of the team and carefully documented by the office of Organizational Effectiveness. This document is a compilation of that feedback.

After careful consideration of each comment, the Administrative Review Team for Facilities Management has established five distinct categories to help them classify this input from across the campuses. They are expecting to address the feedback from each category and incorporate it into their recommendations. Moreover, a second round of campus visits planned before the end of this year will ensure the opportunity for additional collaboration between the Review Team and the University community.

Administrative Review Category #1:
Keep focus on strong customer service & relationships

1. Students perceive space differently than the square footage reported (i.e.: if the door is locked so we can't access, than the area is not available).
2. Have had tremendous support from UM facilities - great response.
3. UM has solid partnerships: 1) Could not do job without this type of collaboration; 2) Students come daily to organize events that need ST organization.
4. Q: How to factor in human element: faculty preferences & student choices/trends (relative to disabilities) A: Utilize discussions open enrollment - need quicker disability assistance - have knowledgeable folks and don't want to lose them.
5. Concern: Maintaining the human factor (connection/rapport)
6. Academic mission: 1)Come back from mud-so comes into buildings; 2) Space issues are mostly a match issue; 3) Lacking good music practice space; 4) Want/need more learning spaces in residential hall
7. Classrooms – mostly appropriate size and have necessary equipment.

Use data appropriately & cautiously; do not assume that data tells the whole story

1. Is it a reasonable position to believe that right-sizing will help reduce our budget?
2. Must look at economic setup of UMS.
3. Do usage numbers reflect external community use?
4. What is included/not included in the data: Summer usage & density? Daytime/evening use?
5. Is density really a good proxy measure?
6. Should we exclude full time online students from the figures?
7. Why used data - No criteria (secondary report).
8. Methodology - did not consult with users.
9. We have concern if you use this data in decision-making.
10. How are we using Total Cost of Ownership to look at decisions? - see Leo's opinion (A: Not well, but will incorporate as suggestion)
11. Access to Sightlines reports (posted on BOT slide - now in two other places as of 5/5/14)
12. Presented on ft. squared - but usage is important - should be considered as primary driver.
13. Survey of buildings over 50 years by fac. office - Usage #'s - not reviewed by campus and this is a concern.
14. Please post on website where we can conveniently find.
15. Density is the # of square feet divided by the # of users.
16. Metrics - Accuracy system or local level?
17. Recent data - if spend no $ over next x years, what does % come to? A: Have not done this analysis, but will submit as a suggestion to the team to look at it.
18. How much did Sightlines cost? A: Full engagement for last year was about $107,000. Comment: did we contract for a 100% guarantee (like LL Bean)?
19. Data too broad.
20. Guidelines for evaluating buildings - do we compare to consumer marketplace? Peer institutions/competitors? Thinks we should.
21. Still an opportunity to correct data - so can improve for next cycle.
22. To what degree is energy efficiency used? Should be incorporated into the scoring matrix.
23. How do we get expertise?
24. If campus is used differently by community than other campuses, then will make a difference in space allocation and ratios.
25. Total enrollment across UMS does not reflect enrollment picture at UM - need to consider.
26. Asked for report clarification on the slide dealing with density improvement.
27. Clarify "density" - Doesn't feel like this in my world (seems overly dense)
28. Understanding that UM ratios are better than average
29. Data is wonderful & useful but averages can equal "one size fits none". So please be careful with data & drill down to detail to make decisions.
30. Suggestion: Use data to get classrooms density & consider the 1-time events (graduation). Asked if peer evaluation would get at this - mostly classrooms.
31. Space allocation now vs. in 5 years as metro University
32. How is usage determined? students – FTE equivalent
33. Sitelines – What is the relationship? a) 2006 – 2009 individual campus consultation/contracts; b) 2009 – UMS contract
34. Density: Can/should it include outside visitors and event participants?

Specific tactical suggestions

1. Make surplus property more of a systemwide process so smaller campuses can benefit from the cast-offs of the larger campuses.
2. Develop a process for sharing information about how each campus is contracting for various services (i.e. snow removal, hvac) so that smaller campuses in particular can take advantage of the contracts without needing to bid on their own or pay too much for those service providers to travel to more distant locations.
3. University Collaborations may use more technology (UC Centers)
4. Must preserve the ability of campuses to react to the market.
5. Technology spends are at the "expense" of brick & mortar (maintenance, upgrades, etc.)
6. Not using bonding for technology due to low lifecycle for technology
7. It is sometimes hard to get parking outside of centers due to quality of wireless.
8. How can UMA help support this moving forward?
9. Realistic regarding geography of the state.
10. Share "k" ok; sharing human resources is harder.
11. Collaboration - What are the incentives and disincentives for collaboration?
12. "The pride of UMPI" - A lot of student and visitor traffic. [Normal, Preble, & South Hall]
13. Renovations for accessibility - up to code but no change to the "envelope" (outer walls, windows, doors, etc.)
14. Probably difficult to convert to suite style.
15. Possibly tear out one (outer) wall to make suite-style or singles.
16. Students now want singles, as that's what they're used to from home.
17. Auditorium, floor, & lockers all need replacing.
18. This would be really good for our students; supports our proficiency based education efforts. [UMPI Library; current plans to repurpose]
19. Perhaps different furniture to make classrooms more conducive to group work (i.e. square tables/chairs vs. tablet desks).
20. Small "nooks" for informal groups.
21. Must also make decisions on technology.
22. Many students don't have a computer or it is not compatible with the programs we need to use. Consider requiring or providing technology?
23. Technology in K-12 schools is better than technology here. It is embarrassing that our education students go into the schools unfamiliar with typical K-12 technology.
24. Covered parking/increasing the parking capacity - serious issue here.
25. Are we thinking about "sexy" buildings (attractions for enrollment)?
26. Concerned about the switch to natural gas prior to this review.
27. Physical plant & energy closely related - obvious to wait for the two to come together?
28. Team thinks 1) In good shape for age; 2) Alumni Hall - critical facility.
29. OSHA requirements of max size in classrooms from 24 -> 16. Need to consider.
30. Extreme importance of clubs - make sure that is regarded highly in review.
31. During the summer of 2013 Facilities renovated a undergraduate laboratory for Electrical and Computer Engineering. Facilities staff was very easy to work with when addressing the needs, purpose of the room, and budgeting. They were on budget and on time completing the work. I am very pleased with work they do despite the campus budget issues we are all facing. I hope to

continue working with them in the future as we hope renovate more of our undergraduate lab space.

32. It is very hot in most buildings all winter. I think a lot of energy is wasted.
33. Reducing offices and labs for faculty. Increasing space for non-academic "experts"
34. Parking is a huge issue (expansion reduces space) - consider a parking garage.
35. One parking garage would solve lots of the issue.
36. Talk more about housekeeping
37. Working w/ system teams - often called out as benchmark - can we consider internal advice?
38. Hang on to this valuable resource (facilities)
39. Lots of hidden stuff under grounds or behind walls - have to do piecemeal.
40. Need real focus on this underground
41. Orono: Town/University overlap in numerous areas - please consider.
42. Best practices and collaboration => encourage that more (centralization to one large auxiliary was a good thing).
43. Chief of UM Police - facilities a true partner (investigation/crime prevention). Total buy-in, caring, investment, customer service level.
44. Echoed the ability to work with facilities
45. Q: Utilizing our (UM) services to assist at other campuses?
46. Energy Cost Containment: a) UMS Energy team will advise the AR Facilities Management team; b) This team must address this
47. Summer online: Summer energy savings by lowering facilities use [control systems] (large areas floor/wing)
48. Q, Can it be used for offices? A. Yes - in accordance with established priorities. (May need to revisit established priorities from time to time) [Wishcamper Building]
49. Central heat plant >50 years (25 year expectancy)
50. Repurposing dorm space to office space?
51. Get out of some of the little houses
52. Forms & Info flow for tactical projects should be reviewed – too much paper, no ability to get info (regardless of governance, workflow can/must be improved)
53. More students willing to pay for single rooms.
54. Idea: Senior housing

Administrative Review Category #4:
Quality and type of space that the campus community wants/needs to carry out the mission

1. Need to ask what kind of campus facilities are needed to carry out the mission - what facilities will support CAO's more collaborative efforts?
2. This team needs to look at distance education vs. on-site classes (current and future needs): 1) Use caution - online has been up 15% semester over semester, but we don't know if this will continue. 2) Where will this trend go? 3) Could over or underestimate. 4) Students want both live and distance ed classes.
3. Different use of space (i.e. library use). How many come in to use library space? How is it being used?
4. Still need flexibility - for example, Aeronautical program.
5. Some need for residency to support certain programs (like Architecture). Probably a limited need, but still a need.
6. Distance ed still requires space! For example, online students are still often required to sit proctored exams; need exam space and group study space.
7. When students opt for the technology option of class delivery we may need more smaller classrooms and meeting space.
8. Student behavior has changed. Students may not have adequate technology at home, so they go to centers (or campus) to study, do coursework, and research.
9. Kaplan is upping virtual space.
10. Campuses - building - technology. Little discussion of Virtual Space.
11. Have been silo 'ed: 1)Strategy plans, 2)Master plans, 3)Capital plans (update this and how to tie into strategy plan)
12. Deferred maintenance must be planned
13. What does it mean to highlight 50+ year old buildings?
14. Multi-occupancy rooms, shared bath (62% occupancy rate).
15. *Perception* is huge - it is an embarrassment when performers come in. Won't use it anymore. [Wieden Hall]
16. No sound equipment.
17. No theater seating in alternative space (Owl's Nest, Student Center).
18. Single entrance/exit - must go outside.
19. Ventilation issues.
20. Library is critical to proficient education. It is the center/hub for all services and integrates with IT.
21. NO buildings could be eliminated on this campus.
22. May be underutilized by students.
23. "Community space" for on-campus needs vs. "External Community space".
24. Owl's Nest used so much for outside groups that residential students don't use it.
25. Energy usage - leave windows open because can't control heat well in residence halls.
26. Funding levels are such that chose to renovate vs. better decision of demolish/rebuild.
27. Wishcamper building not fully used.
28. Are there restrictions on our use?
29. Primary use is Muskie & OSHER lifelong institution (priority) – We can and do also use it for other purposes
30. Cost of being remote (mobilization costs): #of bidders is lower, anyway to solve that?
31. (Elevator contract: UM)
32. Can you partner with community College?
33. Plumbing discussion as an example

34. Trades, how do you utilize:
35. Use a primary & then w/projects utilize others
36. Electrical – we do by discipline
37. Some we only use "on as-needed" basis
38. Full cost of contracting (repair, etc.)
39. Asbestos in Powers Hall
40. Need sidewalks, signage (working on this)
41. Still some handicapped issues (One building w/out elevator, etc.)
42. Safety – Card Access
43. 8 doors w/only 1 or 2 w/card
44. No cameras on campus
45. Propping doors
46. Comprehensive system for door access is needed

Administrative Review Category #5:
Review team should have good communication & avoid surprises in its final recommendations as much as possible

1. Should this review team include technology in its review work? YES. Facilities and technology are linked.
2. What assumptions do we make? What are the parameters?
3. Roll-up on campus, then roll up to UMS
4. Where is the investment in technology?
5. Who makes the decision regarding renovations or other actions?
6. What about campus decisions/what we think needs to be done?
7. [President Hess] Increasing FTE - the balance of enrollment in addressing budget gap and/or density issues is also a campus role.
8. Concerned about premature removal of assets.
9. [Referencing slide 12] UMFK portion may be an increase of 168 FTE in 2 years. This may be doable.
10. Are you considering the impact of public opinion on any recommendations to take a building down?
11. Leo: Renovation - how is it defined?
12. Are you going to listen to our expert (Paul), and will you consider reversing this decision?
13. How do we get report to you?
14. Who will you talk to over months of ART?
15. Q: Goal #2 - Is the team looking at allocating additional $ or just mandate benchmarks which the campuses will have to struggle to meet? I have a concern, if based on equation and then mandated and forced to comply.
16. Seems like this will be an on-going process over the next 20 years.
17. Possible outcomes of this administrative review?
18. With facilities some of defensiveness is because UM is older, biggest, and has the most square feet. So, impact could be felt more here.
19. Q: Uncertain where headed. Will we see detailed plan? Share/vet with the community. A: More probable that recommendation will be broader goals/benchmarks rather than detail on campus level.
20. Q. What is the timeline for additional input into this process – A. Fall
21. Timeline to take facilities off line (essential for use during semester)
22. How do you feel facilities is supporting the mission? 1) Substandard at best; 2) Improving 3) Gut reaction in recruiting efforts
23. Will it touch on the way we do business/touch human capital?