

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING
Thursday, March 6, 2014
Student Union Sunflower room at 3:30 pm

Present: Lynn Carlin, Joel DeRouchey, Diana Farmer, Steven Graham, Heather Reed, Eli Schooley, Jim Sherow

Proxies: Barbara Anderson, Chairat Chuwanganant, Drew Smith

Absent: Jim Bloodgood, Jason Brody, Brad Burenheide, John Devore, Drew Smith, and Mark Weiss

Guests/Visitors: Cindy Bontrager, Ryan Swanson, Mary Todd, Evan Tuttle, Jake Unruh

1. Jim Sherow called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm
2. The February 6, 2014 minutes were approved as submitted.
3. New Business
 - A. Proposed changes to Smoking Policy – Eli Schooley (20 minutes)

Eli Schooley and Jake Unruh were present to discuss the resolution that passed student senate the second week in February regarding the smoking policy. Schooley gave a brief background as to how this resolution came about. Student Senate has suggested designated smoking areas rather than the current policy of 30 feet away from a building. This serves as a compromise for those who smoke and those who do not. The keeper of the policy is in Environmental Health and Safety, therefore, Jake Unruh and Kaitlin Long met with Steven Galitzer, chair of the Environmental Health and Safety committee, to propose these changes being made. The changes would not be high cost, however, they would be more of a culture change. It is hoped with support of all three shared governance bodies this policy will change. Student Senate would like to receive Faculty Senate's endorsement of the resolution they passed. FSCOUP members briefly discussed the request. Sherow asked if there were any concerns about not endorsing the resolution. None noted. A motion was made by Reed and seconded by Farmer to endorse the resolution of Student Senate and have it placed on the next Faculty Senate agenda for endorsement by the full senate. Motion carried.
 - B. Capital Improvements – Ryan Swanson, Cindy Bontrager

Sherow thanked Swanson and Bontrager for their visit. Bontrager noted they are trying to be more transparent. Therefore, they are in the process of producing guidelines for how these projects get started and who needs to be involved. Swanson is in charge of a website and forms. Capital Improvement projects are now defined as projects \$750,000 or higher. Soon though, this number may change to \$1,000,000. There are many projects that go on that are under this threshold. Our environment has changed in which the state no longer supports the university as in previous years with funding for building projects. Most future building projects will have a private funding component. Bontrager asked for input from FSCOUP as to what they envision their role to be in this process. Members began first by asking if there are any specific guidelines for persons before they even begin the brainstorming phase that can assist them prior to work beginning rather than *after* the fact. Right now there is nothing formally in place. Of course, there needs to be justification or rationale for the project. Committee members voiced the concern that there needs to be a central place where communication occurs as to

what is being proposed, fundraised, etc. There was discussion about whether conversation should occur when conceptualization takes place, or later. Also, it was recommended a checklist should be made available so that when people are imagining a new building they can go through a checklist to make sure they're on the right track and the appropriate people are notified.

It came down to the need for better communication and transparency about projects being considered. Swanson discussed briefly his experience in other institutions and what worked. However, so much has changed in the last few years in state systems. The thing we do have right is the Campus Master Plan, which allows for open spots, so to speak, for future building sites. What we don't have is a program plan that could drive fund raising.

FSCOUP is an advisory committee. They also have representation on the Campus Planning and Development Advisory committee. Perhaps there should be more of an interchange between that committee and FSCOUP via their representative.

Sherow thanked Cindy and Ryan for their attendance at the meeting and the committee looks forward to continued work with them on to how best to address this issue.

C. Presentation regarding violence (domestic and sexual) on and near campus –

Mary Todd – Director of Women's Center and Evan Tuttle - Director of the Aggieville Business Association were in attendance. Sherow conveyed to committee members how important this issue is and he invited Mary Todd and Evan Tuttle to give information to the committee regarding the violence that occurs in and around Aggieville as well as on campus. Various laws that have come into effect recently have had an impact on the K-State campuses. Cultural changes are necessary in addition to educating people. Mary provided a copy of materials they provide to incoming students as well as to residence halls and dorms regarding this subject. Mary showed a video of a reconstructed interview which Dr. David Lisak conducted with an anonymous individual that well illustrates the mentality behind acts of sexual violence; how an individual rationalizes and minimizes the offense. Members discussed how they felt seeing this interview. Methods of awareness were discussed. Here at K-State the Office of Student Life and Women's Center work diligently to educate students. In connection with these acts of violence is a tendency to over drink or binge drink, as well as drug use, though it was openly acknowledged these are not the only reasons behind these acts of violence. Mr. Evan Tuttle spoke to the fact that much has been swept under the rug and ignored. It is clearly an issue, not only with heterosexual, but also with gay and lesbian individuals. The committee on Nonviolence was discussed.

It was noted this is a vicious cycle because when an act of violence occurs, the victim often does not want to talk about it for a variety of reasons. Different aspects of these issues were discussed... emergency room visits, the victim being dragged through the court system, etc. Mary reported that the Kansas Victim Assistance is a wonderful resource for those who are willing to get help and noted the Counseling assistance at K-State is available for students and is very beneficial.

Graham suggested sharing and publicizing the effects of these violent acts more. Todd noted there isn't an issue with having the information - they have a *wealth* of information to share, it's finding the opportunities to share it. DeRouchey commented that those who run meetings, etc., if they're receptive to the idea, would be one avenue of distributing the information and making people more aware of the issue. A reminder was given that each year there is a new group of students and therefore this is ongoing education.

Sherow thanked both Mary Todd and Evan Tuttle for visiting the committee.

4. The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Next meeting: Thursday, April 3, 2014; 3:30 pm; Union room 205

Action item: Discuss recommendations for City/University Projects Fund committee