

Facilities Advisory Committee Meeting
Joint Meeting with the Research Advisory Council

Thursday August 10, 2017

- I. Time, Location, and Attendees
 - 3:00 – 4:10 P.M. Administrative Center – Plaza Room
 - Facilities Advisory Committee Members present: Curtis Crespino, Lawrence Dreyfus, Sean Grube, Linda Mitchell, Deborah Phillips, Robert Simmons
 - Research Advisory Council Members present: Anthony Caruso, Brenda Dingley, Robert Goene, Mark Johnson, Kathleen Kilway, Anil Kumar, James Murowchick, Jeffrey Price
 - Staff present: Chad Bristow, Patricia Kohlscheen, Karen Lavendusky

- II. Motion to Approve Minutes – June 14, 2017
 - Sean Grube motion and Linda Mitchell second the motion to approve minutes as modified by the correction of several typos. Approved.

- III. Flarsheim Hall Update – Space Allocations for Research and Equipment
 - The current Research Space Policy was adopted by the Research Advisory Council (RAC) in 2004 and in 2009 was adopted by the Facilities Advisory Committee into the Space Management Policies and Procedures with no changes.
 - A critical need for research space has arisen in the past few months in the School of Computing and Engineering for a faculty member who has received a NSF equipment grant and doesn't have the space for that equipment. They have received the grant and have ordered and received the equipment. They need to show progress on the grant, and they are unable to show progress without a place to put the equipment. The department has now looked at space in and around campus and have identified space in Flarsheim Hall that they would like to have which is currently assigned to the College of Arts and Sciences Department of Chemistry.
 - Bob Simmons and Dr. Dreyfus shared that, when we reach these types of conflict points of competing interests for research space, the Research Advisory Council and Facilities Advisory Committee are being asked to act and we don't have a good mechanism or process to do so.
 - Bob Simmons provided an update of where the Flarsheim Hall space request is now. At the last several meetings of the Facilities Advisory Committee, research space in general and the Flarsheim Hall research faculty need in particular have been discussed. Dr. Dreyfus and Bob Simmons were asked to work with the Deans of both units to come up with a short-term solution while the Facilities Advisory Committee and the Research Advisory Council worked on the long-term solution for future actions.

- After several meetings this summer, we do have a framework of a short-term agreement. We are waiting for input from the lab planners who are looking at the equipment needs of the space. We are not close to even a framework for a long-term agreement.
- Dr. Kilway noted that the Flarsheim Hall issue has exposed some flaws in our grant writing process. When you submit a grant, you attest to have the space and the infrastructure for the grant needs, but she feels that this was ignored in this instance. In addition, there were facilities infrastructure requirements (clean rooms and specialty fume hoods) that were far beyond the grant request. Since these requirements weren't identified in the grant request, there will be facilities infrastructure needs that will have to be addressed.

IV. UMKC Research Space Policy Discussion

- Dr. Dreyfus shared that, as discussed in previous RAC and FAC meetings, the current Research Space Policy is a really good preamble with strong guiding principles, but is lacking in how you implement those principles. How do you pull the data? What data do you use when you want to decide whether a research faculty should be assigned space and if space should be retained, reduced, or given up?
- Bob Simmons stated that there is no unassigned research space on campus. That is different from space that is underutilized or obsolete space, of which we have a lot.
- Dr. Dreyfus indicated that we need to have a forward-looking conversation on the Research Space Policy by looking at the processes that will lead to transparency and the common understanding of what a research space use program involves. It is also important to have a mechanism in place to make the decision of when a space no longer has the research activity it should have.
- Bob Simmons shared that we have a very small amount of Class A research space on this campus, yet we don't fully utilize that space. He shared an example where a lab module with fume hood capacity in one of our newest science buildings was being used as a storage room because the grant for that researcher had gone away. These underutilized spaces can be found in all departments and schools.
- There was a discussion of the policies and procedures to consider to provide the University with a robust and fair policy
 - Dr. Caruso indicated that the policy should include checklists that are mandatory and cannot be ignored by grant requestors
 - Dr. Mitchell indicated that this process should improve the transparency and reduce subterfuge by Deans and faculty.
 - Dr. Caruso indicated that we should institute a program to record and analyze research space as to its usage and productivity
 - To be done on a predetermined schedule – yearly, 2 years, 5 year, etc.

- Who would be in charge and what data would be used?
 - Who would be responsible for sign off on a request and what are the consequences for subterfuge?
 - Do we have the backbone to implement this?
 - Dr. Johnson stated that the checklists and signoffs for grants are key and that they must be consequences for grants that do not adequately reflect their space and infrastructure needs if not funded by the grant. A process must be put in place to make sure this is correctly reflected. A policy that would promote collaboration between departments for use of grants for specialized equipment would also be important.
 - Dr. Mitchell stated that the criteria to be used for the release of space must be reasonable and equitable to encourage the release of underutilized space.
- Bob Simmons affirmed that we are not writing or approving policy at this meeting. This is a preliminary meeting to get agreement that we agree there is a need to move forward, and to set the parameters on what our processes are going to be.
 - Many very robust research institutions have strong research space policies. We have started doing some research into those policies to be used as models for our future policy.
 - Next step will be for the two committees to work together to do some benchmarking towards some best practices, to pull together some of the things we don't have to reinvent that will begin to be the framework for of our policy.
 - The two groups will reconvene in October to review the information garnered from Dr. Dreyfus, Bob Simmons, Dr. Caruso, Karen Lavendusky, and others research into policies from other institutions.
- The question was asked if the Faculty Senate needed to vote on the completed policy. Faculty Senate representatives were unsure if they had to vote on it, but they would want the policy information presented to them prior to adoption.

V. Motion to Adjourn and Next Meeting

- Next meeting October 12, 2017/ 3:00 PM – 4:30 PM, ACCF Brookside Room
- Consensus motion to adjourn joint meeting.