

# APSCUF NEWS ITEM

November 24, 2009

## Implementing Facilities Changes -- How NOT to start



**By Mark Cloud**  
**LHUP APSCUF President**

The continuing saga over the implementation of the facilities changes— including consideration of demolition of buildings, moving offices, and altering the library casts both a positive and negative light on our administration.

The positive light comes from the fact, with the help of the Provost, they have paused in moving forward in implementation of any plan until the new Facilities Implementation Task Force has reviewed the options and makes a recommendation.

That does not mean that any normal culling of the library archives does not continue for example. The key word is normal. We have been assured that any culling will be based on academic considerations and not on a management derived number goal. I am wary of any red Kool-Aid that they may

be providing, hence, we will be diligent in assuring that this is the case.

We have four faculty and one coach representing APSCUF interests on the task force (Stan Berard, Rick Lilla, Tamson Six, Cathy Traister, and Heather Leverington). With such a small number, it is impossible for a representative group to be identified. However, I am confident that they will remain very cognizant of the need to be transparent and to seek input from the many constituencies not represented amongst themselves.

The negative light has been communicated to management personally by me, through a motion by our APSCUF Executive Council, as well as through the recent letter to the President from our members. The focus of the first two communications was on the poor way in which the process of facility change implementation was initiated.

The claim by management that because we had faculty and coaches represented on a committee that worked with hired consultants (architects) to develop a 20-year facility plan, we should have known about the demolition of buildings.

They further claim that they must not be reporting back to the rest of the faculty if we didn't know of the forthcoming demolitions and changes to the library. Both claims are incredulous. We certainly had faculty and coaches working with those architects to

provide some input to plans 5, 10, 15, and 20 years down the road.

However, a 20-year facility plan does not equal a short-term 2009-11 facility plan. They are extraordinarily different. The master plan has many options and describes a specific order of implementation. For example, Step #5 recommendation was demolition of some buildings. Management on their own, without any further consultation with APSCUF, decided that should be step #1.

Further, nowhere in the master plan is the library mentioned other than we still need MORE library space as recommended in the previous 20 year plan. There was no campus community grown plan that they were following to change the library. Fortunately these decisions are on pause.

It is my view that the Provost understands and truly attempts to engage in shared governance since her arrival. Unfortunately that is insufficiently articulated throughout the administration. It is well reflected in a response to an inquiry from me about our standing Facilities Committee and when they had met and why they were not part of this process. I noted that that they had not met since 2007. The response was that management did not see any reason for them to meet. That attitude needs to change. I encourage you to help APSCUF in communicating that need to the President and his staff.