Meeting Minutes of the University Senate Physical Plant Planning Committee

Friday, March 26, 2021

Members present: Jim Boulter, Karen O’Day, Peter Hart-Brinson, Jill Markgraf, Katie Wilson, Jackson Schmidtke, Sean Hartnett

Members absent: Sasha Showsh, Renee Strehlau, Tammy Perzichilli, Trenton Phillipi, Linda Pratt

Meeting called to order at 3:33pm

1. Meeting minutes approved for 3/12/21

2. Debrief and discussion of Senate first hearing of tobacco policy proposal
   a. Expression of disappointment in how the senate meeting transpired.
   b. Presumably we will have a vote at the next senate meeting with the second reading; remain open to amendments from the floor.
   c. Discussed possible amendments that might strengthen support:
      i. Remove personal vehicles and smokeless tobacco language
      ii. Strike disciplinary language because it is no change from current situation.
      iii. Clarify designated sites language
   d. Discussed implications for locations outside of main campus, such as Pablo – which is leased periodically, Priory, branch campuses, Putnam Park, etc.
   e. We should emphasize that this policy is aspirational and leaves room for an implementation team to work out the details. Not every question can be answered on the senate floor.
   f. We should clarify that “exception” sites to be determined from existing sites
   g. Reflected on arguments of smoking as “free choice” – what is the meaning of this? Discussed “freedom framing” as political communication. Balance between public safety and personal freedoms.
   h. Discussed question of whether or not the policy is trying to address a problem that doesn’t really exist. Contrasted this question with setting norm for future Blugolds - creating a climate that encourages, not discourages, healthy behaviors.
   i. Given that discussion points about the policy were largely about free choice, health, quality of work, etc., committee members discussed whether this remains a physical plant issue, although smoking policy has traditionally been its purview. Regardless of vote outcome, it may be time for this committee to seek some clarity on its scope.
   j. Discussed whether there are more meaningful, significant ways to improve working conditions for staff other than by providing access to smoking sites.

3. (Robust) discussion of PPPC scope and responsibilities
   a. Lack of clarity regarding the scope of this committee, especially considering growth of campus (Pablo, Barron, Sonnentag, etc.) and continued exclusion of committee from significant campus physical plant activities: grand entry, water feature, Hibbard parking update, Welcome Center, Science Building, Sonnentag Center, Governor’s renovation, Haas Fine Arts improvements, etc.
   b. Discussion about revising FASRP language to clarify and update what this committee is and what it should be. Among issues that this committee could/should be involved with:
      i. New office of sustainability, risk management.
      ii. Question raised about specified (departmental) personnel on committee
iii. More involvement in building projects, infrastructure decisions, ADA accessibility of facilities, impact of facilities on environment, amplifying concerns of faculty/staff,

iv. We need to mandate that administration/facilities work with this committee – who in Facilities will work with us? Part of problem is that governance has become advisory in State statute under Act 10

v. Recognizing that shared governance has little role in decision making, this committee may serve most effectively as communication body, raising and amplifying questions. This could include IAQ (mold, etc.) water damage, accessibility, etc., advocating on behalf of faculty/staff with Risk Management, for improved teaching environment on behalf of faculty

vi. Transportation and bicycling infrastructure – advocating on behalf of the Bicycle Pedestrian Committee (bike land integration N &E of campus)

4. Adjourn at 4:43 pm

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by Jill Markgraf