



April 27, 2012

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor Hollie Swanson, Chair  
University Senate Council

FROM: Alice Christ, Chair  
Senate Academic Facilities Committee

RE: 2012 Report of the Senate Academic Facilities Committee

**Charges:** The Senate Academic Facilities Committee received the following charges from the Senate Council for 2011-2012.

1. Examine the procedures by which PPD provides cost estimates and charges to units under the Provost's purview.
2. Investigate current procedures for setting building priorities and recommend, if necessary, new procedures to increase transparency and faculty representation in setting those priorities.

The committee addressed the second charge first because it is a direct continuation of work begun the previous year.

### **2. Recommendations on Building Priorities**

The committee divided the charge into separate components.

#### **A. Identify useful indices of the academic "value" of a facilities project and, if possible, metrics that may quantify that index.**

In response to the difficulties the first committee had in determining academic merit based on the variable quality and quantity of information provided in project proposals from different units and offices, sometimes evidently descending from previous versions more than 10 years old, the committee developed a checklist of academic criteria:

**Criteria of Academic Merit in Capital Projects Planning** (submitted by Chair John Rawls in January 2012 and attached below). The intention of the checklist is

- a. to encourage including explicit information about academic impacts of a proposal in its rationale
- b. to make clear and public the criteria the SAFC will use to rank its recommendations on academic merit of proposals.

Because the next planning/review cycle will likely commence during the summer of 2012, proposals will be created/revised over the next several months and the SAFC wishes to ensure that academic impact be adequately addressed in those proposals. To that end, we recommend the Senate accept and post the **Criteria of Academic Merit**

**in Capital Projects Planning** as a Senate document. We hope the Provost will include it in the Call for Proposals, summer 2012.

**B. Determine how to enhance faculty awareness of campus facilities planning and to promote the role of SAFC in the planning process.**

The committee determined that to serve effectively the functions in our charter (quoted below), SAFC needs a regular role in the 2-year capital planning cycle. There are 2 points during the planning process when the SAFC should make substantive contributions.

One is late in the process: evaluation of academic merit in proposals to the Provost or President, as detailed above, when proposals have been submitted. We recommend the Senate Council and SAFC consult further with the President and Provost on how to incorporate this in the regular capital construction calendar.

The other point is early in the process, as needs are being identified and proposals are beginning to be developed within separate units. Because of the complicated routes by which proposals are initiated and promoted, we have not identified a workable process for earlier engagement of SAFC in fostering academic facilities proposals from the units. It is unclear whether pursuing this, for example by consultations with Deans or other unit heads, or by making SAFC a resource for proposal writers, can be fruitful.

(Committee Charter: A. Serve the administration as a source of faculty information and opinion about the need, design, and priority and construction or renovation projects. B. Inform the Senate at least annually about problems relating to the alteration, construction, or allocation of academic facilities and about future plans and priorities for them. Whenever necessary, the SAFC may initiate action by preparing a recommendation to the administration, which should be routed through the Senate Council for Senate approval. D. Study the use, renovation, and need for space (including classrooms) and equipment relevant to academic programs and functions. [US: 3/12/84])

**1. Recommendations on PPD Procedures**

At our December meeting, the committee heard an explanation of procedures from PPD Director for the Lexington campus, Kevin Kreide, P.E. and Dawn Barkley, Manager of Planning, Design and Construction. We are grateful for their information and clarifications. From the thicket of UK, Lexington, state and federal regulations governing different scopes of project, we identified the following issues for report to the senate as possible concerns. These are informational points.

1. Different formats and levels of detail in estimates and billing statements for projects of various kinds have led to perceptions of opacity in the costs to units. SAFC might help communicate the fact that Budget Officers presently are entitled to access to the complete itemized accounting information through SAP.

2. Renovation costing \$100,000.00 or more must be pre-funded by the unit transferring funds into A Plant Fund Account through General Accounting. Although all projects can only be billed for actual costs (State law), money in a Plant Fund might not be returned to the unit. It reverts to the Provost. This potentially means 1 unit's money could be applied to a project for a different unit.

3. UK internal labor rates are lower than market; salaries for architects, engineers, managers and skilled trades are not competitive, causing more use of outside contractors and Unit Price Contracts with long-term accepted contractors for established types of job (if over \$40,000).

2011-2012 Roster

Chair: John Rawls, '13, retired December 2011; Alice Christ, S 2012

David Hulse, '12  
Gary Shannon, '12  
Tim Stombaugh, '13  
Rebecca Kellum, '13  
Rick Durham, '14  
Alice Christ, '14  
Alyssa Eckman, '14  
Rich Schein, '14  
Hubie Ballard, '14  
Debra Anderson, '14  
Ned Crankshaw, ex officio  
Michael Speaks, ex officio

### **Criteria of Academic Merit in Capital Projects Planning**

Project Description/Justification\* should address benefit of the proposed project to the academic missions of the University. Criteria of academic merit should be addressed as quantitatively as possible, using the most current information as well as projections. Descriptions of the inadequacies of current facilities as well as benchmark comparisons are useful. Relevant information from recent programmatic reviews should be cited. The following are examples of information that is especially helpful:

1. Impact on instructional missions
  - a. Courses and enrollments
  - b. Degree program(s) affected (numbers of majors; degrees awarded annually)
  - c. Trans-University impact (contribution to University Core Studies and other majors)
  - d. Tuition revenue generated
  - e. Relative requirements for lecture, laboratory and other instructional space
  
2. Impact on research missions
  - a. Rankings in relevant national comparisons
  - b. Research grant revenues (including indirect costs)
  - c. Impact on graduate and undergraduate programs
  - d. Extramural economic impact

3. Impact on service/outreach missions
  - a. Role in land-grant mission of the University
  - b. Contribution to the economic, environmental and health well-being
  - c. Public education and enlightenment

\*Section of Form SYP-P2 or other proposal format.