Minutes for the Campus Concept Committee Meeting

July 18, 2017
9:15AM
Fallbrook Lodge

Present: Mitch Fields, Lisa Glidden, Rich Weyhing, Chris Hebblethwaite, Peter Cardone, Miranda Kryskow, Adrienne McCormick, Earnest Washington, Pam Caraccioli, Julie Pretzat, Linda Paris (not a committee member)

1. Welcome & Call to Order:
   a. Co-Chairs Lisa Glidden, J. Mitchell Fields
      i. M. Fields

2. Approval of the Minutes:
   a. Approval of amended May 12, 2017 meeting minutes: M. Kryskow approved, C. Hebblethwaite seconded
      i. C. Hebblethwaite approved the amendment, Pm. Caraccioli seconded, all approved

3. Sub-Committee/External Committee Reports:
   a. None

4. General Housekeeping
   a. None

5. Old Business:
   a. None

6. New Business:
   a. Facilities Master Plan (FMP)
      i. M. Fields - There was a 2000 & 2010 FMP conducted
      ii. Campus planning and priorities: How are they determined?
         1. Simply put, campus planning and priorities comes from the Facilities Master Plan.
            a. SUNY FMP is completed every four years.
         2. All monies are given to SUCF who disperses the money.
            a. Personal income tax bonds pay for the large capital projects.
         3. See attached document for the process involved in establishing capital priorities.
      iii. The five sections of the FMP are: campus profile, existing conditions, space assessment, concept development, and preferred option. Facilities Services staff has reevaluated the current existing conditions already.
iv. CCC’s role in the FMP is to have a solid direction for what facilities the campus needs. “To have the art of being vague.”

v. L. Glidden – Suggestion of having a few focus groups to hear what is needed with the facilities and where the campus is headed with instruction.

vi. Who are we?
   1. R. Weyhing - We are an extension of the State of New York’s people. Oswego as a gathering place historically.
   2. “To let each become all they can be.”

vii. This FMP is to look at the 2018 – 2024 years.

b. Hewitt Quad
   i. R. Weyhing - Could Hewitt Quad could be fixed without the FMP because it was damaged and needs to be repaired? M. Fields - Somethings, such as roofs, parking lots, and steam lines just need to be repaired unlike a $55 million science building which needs to be proved that it is a need.
   ii. There is a consensus that the Quad is not appealing nor functional as a classroom or relaxation space. There should be a Quad beautification project which would allow for relaxation space and space for classes to meet outdoors. SUNY Oswego is a residential campus and a new Hewitt Quad would provide a social area for classes and the home life.
   iii. It was consistently brought up that Lake Effect Café is being used as a non-traditional classroom a lot including professors holding their office hours here. The idea of having a non-traditional classroom is appealing to a lot of professors and students. Hewitt Quad could be one of these spaces if it was programed correctly.
   iv. R. Weyhing – Suggests having a “village green” with Hewitt Quad and being able to take advantage of the Oswego winter but have pond hockey, snowshoeing, and sledding.
   v. E. Washington – Hewitt Quad could be the psychological center of the campus.

c. Vision
   i. SUNY Oswego is an inward looking college and doesn’t include the lake.
   ii. Students just being here on campus as a residential campus isn’t enough. Students want 24/7 access to their department’s facilities. The campus needs to have interdisciplinary collaboration, flexibility, and an increased quality of life for all commuters, faculty, staff, residential students, and the community members of Oswego.
   iii. A. McCormick - The direction of the campus should be a combination with traditions that are successful and have proven to work while pushed the limits of where and what the campus can do.
   iv. L. Glidden - The community of Oswego, scholars, and building education (more than just student centered).
   v. J. Pretzat – The campus needs to be a good citizen of our community.
   vi. CCC is not a project management committee but a vision committee with input and output of goals and direction for the campus.
   vii. Shared goals of other departments and committees will help to build a stronger community and campus.
viii. By getting more information in and reporting out more (better website), CCC will become more accessible and valuable.

ix. Overall, the themes that came out of the discussion were interaction, community, and interdisciplinary.

d. Tyler Hall Interactive Soundscape (J. Pretzat)
   i. The Soundscape is transportable (6’ x 12’ x 4’) with sounds that would be related to Tyler Hall and made by the music students. It would be located most of the time on the north east end of Tyler and owned by the music department. Signage would be located on the Soundscape and travel with the Soundscape.
   ii. J. Pretzat also would like to install outdoor, interactive instruments near the iron pour location of Tyler Hall (north end). The instruments are fairly quiet and Zen-like. M. Fields suggested also putting them along the spine.
   iii. Approval for the Soundscape and interactive instruments was given.

e. By-laws review and re-write
   i. Discussion on if standing committees should be ex-officio members or invited on an as needed basis.
   ii. CCC reports out to standing committees. Standing committees have the opportunity to speak on the topics which CCC can take or not.
   iii. Addition of CTS representative as #6 under membership was motioned by C. Hebblethwaite, seconded by M. Kryskow.
   iv. No changes were made to the function.
   v. M. Kryskow reports out to SA the on goings of CCC and L. Glidden reports out to FA.