**College of Micronesia FSM**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee Minutes Reporting Form** |  |
| **Committee or Working Group** | *Facilities & Campus Environment* |  |
| **Date** | **Time** | **Location** |  |
| 10 January 2014 | 13:00 | Board Conference Room  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Members Present** |  |
| **Titles/Reps** | **Name** | **Present** | **Absent** |  |
| Chair | Dana Lee Ling | X |  |  |
| Vice Chair | Raphael Pulmano | X |  |  |
| Secretary | Cindy Pastor | X |  |  |
| CRE representative | Jackson Phillip |  | X |  |
| Chuuk staff maintenance | Benjamin Akkin |  | Technical problems, the teleconference line was down. |  |
| National faculty | Don Buden | X |  |  |
| National faculty | Reynaldo Garcia | X |  |  |
| National faculty | Roldan Laguerta | X |  |  |
| National Staff LRC | Bruce Robert |  | X |  |
| National maintenance | Alfred Olter | X |  |  |
| National faculty | RinglenRinglen | X |  |  |
| Pohnpei faculty | Semens James | X |  |  |
| Pohnpei faculty  | Jean Ranahan | X |  |  |
| Yap staff maintenance | Moses Faimau |  | X |  |
| FSM-FMI maintenance | Christoper Igem | X |  |  |
| Ex officio/non-voting | Francisco Mendiola |  | Unavailable due to schedule conflict/meeting with an external entity |  |
| Ex officio/non-voting | Warren Ching |  | Unavailable due to security related issues  |  |
| **Additional Attendees** |  |
|  |  |  |
| | |  |  |
| **Agenda/Major Topics of Discussion:** |  |
| * Approval of minutes from 15 November 2013
* Old business
	1. Update, if any, on securing funding for gates in FSM-China Friendship Center ground level hallway to secure ground floor at night
	2. BECA update, if any.
	3. With thanks to security personnel the parking lot lines at the south faculty building in Palikir were repainted.
	4. Initial comments on the draft terms of reference for the committee.
	5. Pohnpei campus has placed thatched study huts around campus.
	6. Update, if any on the following committee recommendations:a. The area directly in front of the Palikir LRC should be designated a taxi pick-up and drop-off zone. b. Signs should be posted noting the taxi zone and noting "no pick up/drop off" areasc. Painted lines could be used to reinforce the messaged. A letter should be drafted to the taxi company owners asking them to work with and train their drivers on this matter. A college campus is not a factory, and the entrance road is a quiet zone due to the orientation of the B building. The drivers should be instructed not to honk on campus. e. Students will have to be informed that taxi pick-up and drop-off is in front of the LRC only.
* New business
 |  |
| **Discussion of Agenda/Information Sharing:**  |  |
| The meeting attained quorum and came to order at 13:04.The minutes of 15 November 2013 were approved with modifications. 1.Funding has yet to be secured for gates in the FSM-China Friendship Center ground level hallway.2 The BECA report has yet to be transmitted to the Facilities and Campus Environment committee.3. By consensus, the FCE committee asked that thanks be passed along to the security personnel who painted the parking lot lines at the south faculty building in Palikir. A member noted that the FCE committee agenda items tended to be national campus centric. The chair responded that any campus can submit agenda items. The chair polled the remote sites for items and learned that FSM-FMI has an issue with traffic, some of the traffic moving at a high rate of speed on the road through the middle of campus. The projects coordinator said that the director of maintenance is looking at options including diverting the road around the campus. The chair asked about land issues. The coordinator answered that the land is state land, the project appears feasible and achievable.4. Comments on the draft terms of reference.Sections A and B state that “Recommendations from the committee are submitted through the Director of Maintenance, Facilities, and Security (DMFS) to the Vice President for Administration (VPA) for approval by the president.” A member asked how recommendations get made to the state campus directors and whether the committee should also be reporting through the state campus directors.In the discussion that followed the chair was guided in his thinking by a distinction a director had once explained. The director noted that their role was to carry out and implement the policies and decisions made by the cabinet with the approval of the board. Thus in the mind of the chair, participator governance decisions have to flow up to the cabinet and then back down to the directors if action has been approved. The chair explained in committee that for non-governance matters, such as routine facilities maintenance issues, the DMFS has authority over all six sites of the college. Reporting through the DMFS should be sufficient as the DMFS would then work with maintenance on the campus at issue, and the director of that campus could remedy the issue. The state campus directors, in turn, must work with the DMFS on facilities issues on their campus. The state campus director cannot make a decision regarding facilities without at least informing the DMFS.A member asked about the flow chart at the end of the present terms of reference. The chair noted that the flow chart would probably be deleted as flow charts are not, to the best of his knowledge, part of the current template for terms of reference.The chair also noted that the statement, “The secretary of the committee then distributes the official minutes to all committee members, the Director of Maintenance, Facilities, and Security, the Security and Safety Supervisor, and members of cabinet,” and the later statement, “the chairperson shall ensure that the Student Body Association, campus directors, faculty/staff senate, and offices that will be impacted by the recommendations are informed” are met only in that the minutes are posted to the publicly accessible committee minutes section of the college wiki. In the past minutes were circulated by the use of group email addresses. The chair noted that studies have yet to be done on how effective the Wiki is at providing information to the college community and on how broadly the wiki is accessed. The chair expressed the fear that he can name most of those who regularly access the wiki.Under Section C, Membership, a member noted that the word “must” might be changed to “should” or “ought to”. The member noted that their own campus did not have a staff representative. The chair noted that one campus is missing both a faculty representative and a staff representative, but that he is in contact with the director at that campus and the director is working on a solution to the situation. For a smaller campus only one representative might be possible because staff members often have computer access issues, which impedes their ability to participate.A discussion then followed about whether the most appropriate staff member would be a member of maintenance at that state campus. The chair countered, noting that the committee was a body that made recommendations and not decisions. On the contrary, the chair argued, if a state campus has substandard maintenance, then the member would have a vested interest in playing down the maintenance issues. The member could conceivably be part of the problem, rather than the solution. There is a benefit in checks, balances, and broadening awareness of facilities and campus environment issues to having non-maintenance staff representatives.Under membership the term “technology wrangler” may be misunderstood. This phrase should be rewritten. (Dana, this is what Jean suggested as the edited form: The committee chair will appoint a committee member to handle technologically related issues such as setting up teleconferencing and posting of minutes.  ~~The technology wrangler is not an officer of the committee.)~~**New Business**A member noted that his division had three broken shredders. The amount of sensitive documents that a division has to dispose of each term is beyond the design capacity of a small office shredder. The member asked what options faculty have for destroying sensitive documents. The business office occasionally burns documents under the supervision of a business office staff member. The process is long and slow, as the paper is hand fed in small batches into a trash bin. The member asked whether a solution might be found. The chair concurs. The Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics bought a shredder last fall and the machine is already having functional difficulties. Faculty generate a fair amount of papers protected by the Family Rights and Privacy Act, yet there is no mechanism assuring proper destruction of these documents. The member suggested that there be a secured drop off location for sensitive documents. Maintenance might need an incinerator of some sort depending on the load. There are also environmental considerations associated with incineration. The chair asked if there are other options, suggesting in jest that papers be added to the land fill word across the road. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **College Web Site Link:**  |  |  |
| **Prepared by:**  | Cindy Pastor | **Date Distributed:**  |  |  |
| **Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:**  |  |
| | |  |
| **Submitted by:**  |  | **Date Submitted:** |  |  |
| **Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline & Responsibilities** |  |
| | |  |
| **Action Items and follow-up** |  |
|  |  |
| **Action by President** |  |
| Item #: | Approved: | Disapproved: | Approved with conditions: |  |
| Comments: |  |