

CR 2.11.2 The institution has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. (Physical Resources)

Off-Site Review Team Comments

A comprehensive overview and inventory of all facilities was provided including a section on future planning and deferred maintenance. There was no photographic evidence of facilities condition, nor was there any information recognizable as a Facilities Master Plan; substitute documents may exist but were not evident or identified. Plans for future improvements shown on page 104 of the Compliance Certification states “These planned projects pending award of state funds will enhance the instructional process and provide greater academic support”. However, no mention is made of the planning process preceding that determination. There is no reference to an institution planning document regarding adequacy of facilities that would indicate that facilities scheduled for construction are consistent with the established academic plan. The rationale provided for the top three institutional priorities for construction appear to be consistent with the institution’s mission, but absent reference to a planning document, validation that planning preceded the development of these priorities is not possible. (re: Core Requirement 2.5). [see below]

University Response

The construction of physical facilities on the campus as well as the location and design of the facilities reflects a planning process that is long-standing and inclusive of all campus constituencies. In 1970, the State Board of Trustees commissioned a *Campus Development Plan*¹ which was completed by Gills and Wilkins, Architects and Planners, Florence, South Carolina. Eighteen pages of the plan dealt with projections concerning: academic programs, the faculty, campus life, buildings proposed to be built between 1970-75, and growth goals (1970-80). Additional sections dealt with developing mechanical and electrical systems, which were maximally efficient in operation and cost, and did not detract from the aesthetics of the campus landscape. The plan further divided the original 300 contiguous acres of the campus into six segments or regions: Academic, Administration, Athletic, Student Life, Residential and Support.

For over 35 years, that Campus Development Plan has guided the University in land use and capital development. With the recent construction of the Lee Nursing Building, The Grille, and Phase II of the Forest Villas Apartment complex and with the completion of the Gail and Terry Richardson Center for the Child in the summer of 2008, all useable development space within the 300 acres will be achieved. This is premised on the University Administration’s desire to maintain the integrity of the six regions while preserving the remaining “green space” on the campus. The one remaining campus development project to be constructed on the 300 acres, once funding is determined, will be the School of Business/School of Education Building. The site of that building has already been determined to be located across the campus pond from the Lee Nursing Building.

¹ Campus Development Plan, Gill and Wilkins, Architects and Planners, Florence, SC 1971

The University, through the efforts of its Education Foundation and Real Estate Foundation, recently acquired an additional 109 acre tract of land adjacent to and across Highway 327 west of the campus. The University engaged the services of the LandArt Company of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, to develop a land use master plan for that property that would develop it as an athletic and recreational complex. That plan was recently presented to and accepted by the University Administration.² The relocation of the outdoor athletic facilities to that complex will also make available 10+ acres from the original 300 acres for future academic facility development.

During 2001, a Facilities Management Plan was developed for the University. The essential element of that plan was an Audit and Condition Assessment of all existing buildings, Athletic and Recreational Facilities and Utilities and Support Infrastructure.³ Additionally, the Management Plan surveyed proposed sites for future buildings and support infrastructure and prospective land acquisitions. The plan was briefed to the University's Board of Trustees in October 2001⁴ and thereafter has been periodically revised and updated.

The overview of current physical facilities provided in the initial *Compliance Report* has been revised to include photographs and a current condition assessment matrix for each facility.⁵ As will be seen during the on-site visit, the University's facilities are in excellent condition. They are continually well-maintained and renovated and repaired as necessary. For example, during summer 2007, Founders Hall and Cauthen Educational Media Center were entirely re-carpeted, including lobbies, hallways, offices and classrooms. All restrooms in those buildings were also renovated. Additionally, McNair Science Building auditorium was completely renovated and equipped with state-of-the-art audio visual technology. Further, currently nearing completion is the renovation of the indoor pool in the Smith University Center to include the installation of a new HVAC and de-humidification systems.

Funding for those renovations came from state appropriated funds earmarked for deferred maintenance or the University's Maintenance Reserve Account where a portion of student fees are specifically set aside for renovation, repair, and maintenance of the University's facilities.

In the context of facilities planning, each state higher education institution responsible for providing and maintaining physical facilities is required to submit a Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plan (CPIP)⁶ annually. Each institution's complete CPIP covers five fiscal years and is submitted to the Commission on Higher Education for consideration each year. The entire CPIP of each college and university is submitted to the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) for review and recommendations forwarded to the Joint Bond Review Committee (JBRC) and the Budget and Control Board (B&CB). As part of the Commission's review process, each project is evaluated based on relation to institutional mission, impact on current academic programs, need, and the potential impact of the improvement not being made.

² West Campus Athletic Complex, Conceptual Design Report, LandArt Company, December 2007

³ Facilities Audit and Condition Assessment, October 2001

⁴ Facilities Management Plan Briefing to Board of Trustees, October 2001

⁵ Updated Extract From Campus Facilities Overview Core Requirement 2.11.2

⁶ FMU Comprehensive Permanent Improvement Plans, 2007 and 2008

The first year of the CPIP (Year 1) includes all permanent improvement projects expected to be implemented with funds already available or expected to be available during the coming fiscal year. The purpose of Year One of the CPIP is to approve at one time each institution's permanent improvement plans for the coming year, except for emergencies and other unanticipated needs. Once these projects are approved by CHE, the institutions may initiate the projects at any time during the coming year as funds become available and if no substantive changes are involved.

The second year of the CPIP (Year 2) includes, but is not limited to, new requests for Capital Improvement Bond (CIB) funds for the next fiscal year. These projects are scored according to approved CHE criteria and prioritized to reflect statewide capital needs. The recommendations are submitted in the fall as part of the Commission's annual budget request.

The third, fourth, and fifth years of the CPIP represent the institutions' long term plans and are presented for information only.

The development of all new University facilities occurs with the involvement of the University's faculty leadership. Each year, campus development plans, facilities budgets, and the operating budget of the University are reviewed with the faculty budget committee and then presented to the entire faculty. The facilities management process is closely aligned with strategic planning for the University as will be discussed in Section 3.11.3 of this report. The plans are further reviewed by the University's Board of Trustees and then submitted as part of the comprehensive permanent improvement plan to the South Carolina Commission for Higher Education as previously described.