

# University of Houston Clear Lake

## Space Allocation and Utilization Subcommittee

January 16, 2019

3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

SSCB 1.202.07 (Student Orgs Meeting Room)

### Minutes

**Present:** Lisa Coen, John Decman, Derek Delgado, Mark Denney, Samuel Gladden, Eric Herrera, Allen Hill, Rebecca Huss-Keeler, Mike Livingston, Daniel Maxwell, Andrew Reitberger, Debra Ross, Gavin Steiger, Mary Washington, Chloris Yue

**Absent:** Kim Edwards, Nicholas Kelling, Ju Kim, Pam Groves, Tonya Jeffery, Russell Miller, David Rachita, Miles Shellshear, Alix Valenti

#### 1. Call to order/Opening remarks

Dr. Huss-Keeler called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

#### 2. Action Items

- a. Minutes from December 11, 2018 were approved as presented.

#### 3. Old Business

- a. Update on Previous Proposals

FSSC reviewed the three proposals from the previous SAUS meeting and voted to support all three without rankings. The proposals were then sent to the provost for additional comments prior to forwarding to the president for a decision. The provost recommended that the Human Sciences and Humanities PsyD and Human Factors Psychology proposal be approved to occupy the space in SSCB 2.102 due to its ties with accreditation; however, he also noted that the committee should continue to search for an appropriate space for the Disability Services Office. It is unknown whether Dr. Blake has made a final decision regarding the space in question.

#### 4. New Business

- a. Pros and Cons for FSSC

During the FSSC meeting, a request was made to present future proposals with a list of pros and cons. Mr. Denney made that list for the two competing proposals presented at

that time, but suggested that the subcommittee members complete this step together prior to submitting anything to FSSC for recommendation.

b. Utilizing the Master Plan/Strategic Plan with Space Requests

Although we have a new master plan, it does not give a clear picture on which items are priorities. Dialogue will need to take place to establish a plan on how to get to where the master plan proposes based on where we are now. The master plan will be shared with the members of SAUS. This will allow us to make a long-term plan on which to base approval of requests moving forward.

A request was made to also send out the Mission, Vision and Values document.

c. Recommendations for Forms/Process

- It was requested that the proposal form include a space where people can indicate if the proposal is time sensitive.
- A separate suggestion was made to include questions on the proposal form to ensure that the space will be used well; there are times when people want a space just because other departments received space, not because they truly need it. This request was not supported because the form is meant to be general. It is the responsibility of SAUS members to ask questions and challenge these proposals when there are doubts.
- Committee members expressed a need to identify spaces and know what spaces are vacant and available in order to be able to make a decision on how to allocate them when a proposal comes up.
- Although there is a space on the form for it, the first three proposals did not indicate costs associated with their moves. This needs to be enforced.
- There were many concerns that the process was repetitive throughout the various committees and, therefore, inefficient. There will be further dialogue regarding the process as we move forward. It will need to be made clear what roles belong to SAUS or to FSSC in order to ensure efficiency.
- Another concern in the process was that the forms already required the provost's signature, however, the proposals were sent back to the provost for consideration. Mr. Denney clarified that in this instance, the provost was asked to make a second recommendation because both competing proposals fell under his division and neither SAUS or FSSC made a decision on which to prioritize.

