

The Institute Advisory Committees

June 8, 2017

Meeting Notes

1. Introductions

a. Committee members in the meeting or on the call.

i. Additional Guests:

1. Mary Kay Carodine
2. Architects
3. Robert
4. Will Atkins
5. PJ Jones

ii. The Institute of Black Culture

1. Elda Auxiliaire - present
2. Kianna Brown - present
3. Tiffany Chatmon
4. Dwayne Fletcher - present
5. Brooke Henderson
6. Jaron Jones
7. Wallace Mazon
8. Kelli Murray - present
9. Jordan Rhodes - Present
10. Talia Rogers - Present
11. Lydia Washington

iii. The Institute of Hispanic-Latino Cultures

1. Steven Baldizon
2. Meriza Candia - Present
3. Liana Guerra - Present
4. Anayansy Hernandez
5. Robert Lemus
6. Gian Mattei Soto - Present
7. Carla Rodriguez - Present
8. Christopher Wilde - Present
9. Sebastian Wright - Present
10. Edward Zambrano - Present
11. Jose Miranda

2. Review of Meetings from Past Meeting

a. Committee members made a few edits

i. Minutes were approved

b. Committee asked for future meetings to be recorded just for the committee to double check the minute accuracy.

c. Will mentioned that the minutes are for the committee members only until they are approved.

3. Future Meetings

- a. Will Atkins led the group in discussion finding a time that works for future meetings
 - b. Wednesdays at noon will be the meeting date and time moving forward
- 4. New insights from constituents groups
 - a. Committee member said program options were something students are very interested in
 - b. Committee member mentioned wanting to explore elevator options to be compliant and save resources.
 - c. Committee member mentioned wanting to discuss fundraising
 - d. Architect mentioned today we will be looking at program options and space sizes. We are not looking at design schematics.
 - i. Last meeting was about updating information and providing background. Today's meeting is more discussion based.
- 5. Typical Interior Design Process
 - a. Define identities and goals is for the facility
 - b. Implementation and design – coordination between users, disciplines
 - c. Final finishes
 - d. Case Study – Valencia College – Poinciana Campus
 - i. Defined goals, location, demographics, challenges/problems they want to solve
 - ii. Implementation & Design – Talked through needs and wants for the facilities. Brought in history and cultural
 - iii. Development and Refinement – Final renderings, city approval
 - e. For the Institute projects, the architects said we are on the first step (defining identities) at this point
- 6. Architects started with the information they knew about the identities and goals of each facility and asked for feedback on their current information.
 - a. La Casita Identity
 - i. Goals:
 - 1. Communicate the identity through the design
 - 2. Has presence and is a resource to the community
 - 3. Social space for the communities
 - ii. Looking at the current floor plan, want to bring back the vibrancy of colors, the central focal point (like the fire place), the flags and displaying them (to show who we are and what we are here for).
 - iii. Wanted to add a timeline to show significance.
 - iv. Committee members said they liked the colors they intent to bring in
 - b. IBC Identity
 - i. Goals:
 - 1. Communicate Identity
 - 2. Preserve and convey the history
 - a. Save and display historical artifacts
 - b. Want to design a feature wall to better display items
 - 3. Has presence
 - 4. Social Space

- ii. Want to bring in a historical timeline, have a family wall to showcase history, utilize the original artwork, build shelving for artifacts.
 - iii. During design and development, it is not the architects' job to decide what artifacts and what items on the timeline is important to display. That is the job of the students, alum and staff.
 - c. The architects asked for any comments
 - i. A committee member mentioned being uneasy because the openness might feel not like a house
 - 1. The architect asked feeling specifically like a home where there is different rooms and important.
 - 2. A committee member wanted it to feel more home like
 - 3. Another committee member asked for it to be a little more open and less isolating/boxy)
 - 4. The architect talked through the layout concept for the flow and about balancing a home away from home while supporting a number of students.
 - 5. A committee member asked about a rectangular box on the front of the house.
 - a. Architects said it was a planter and discussed how they want the house to feel even more home like
 - ii. A committee member said the inspiration looks good, but right now, they'd rather talk about the program comparison and get back to the inspiration later.
7. Review (4) Program Comparisons
- a. Began with review of state requirements for facilities (efficiency standard)
 - i. Goals: 40% of support spaces to 60% of program space
 - 1. Hallways are considered non usable space
 - 2. 34% for general circulation, walls, covered walkways
 - 3. 6% for electrical, communications, mechanical and HVAC space
 - 4. Florida building code says you have to have 2 ways out of the building
 - 5. UF also has size standards for types of rooms
 - a. These parameters have to come into play when designing
 - b. Architects went through Four program scenarios:
 - i. Existing Houses
 - ii. Current Design
 - iii. Separate Design within the same budget
 - iv. Separate Design with the same sq feet if there was no budget
 - c. On the presentation, items in orange are usable, program space. Items in blue are non usable space.
 - d. There was a great deal of committee discussion.
 - i. Committee Member asked the difference between NSF and GSF
 - 1. GSF – Includes the exterior
 - 2. NSF – Includes only the interior
 - ii. For a cost comparison, a cost for sq. foot. Architects didn't count balconies in the square foot comparison.

- iii. During the design documentation process, during the three different phases, there is a level of refinement that happens with the design. At the end of advance schematic design, the architects were about 900 sq feet over and have to figure out how to address this
- iv. Committee member asked for the capacity of the occupancy of the programming/assembly space.
 - 1. 125 each.
- v. Committee member asked what is it that makes them code as one building?
 - 1. The architect said it is where a bridge wouldn't be sufficient for the amount of egress that is required.
- vi. Committee member said we may have lost sight of the first slide (what we settled on as far as the goals of identity and goals of each facility). In fact, space was not listed as a goal of the facility as the issue is not the amount of space, but what we want to do there. It is more important that we maintain the goals of each facility in mind and not be concerned about the actual square footage numbers involved. It is important to note that in any of the designs, the square footage (in any of the new designs) exceeds the square footage in the existing buildings, even with new required state requirements (that were not in existence at the time of the construction of the older facilities).
- vii. Committee member asked if there is code for the amount of people who can be in the space given the location.
 - 1. The architect said yes, but it isn't based on location but rather the size of the buildings.
- viii. Committee asked where the usage lays with for the last few years?
 - 1. Will said there hasn't been a BSU meeting in the IBC in the last three years. Not a lot of programming in the IBC because of the capacity.
 - 2. A committee member said you couldn't have a meeting in the IBC.
- ix. A committee member asked how many members come to BSU.
 - 1. 110
- x. A committee member asked how many members come to HAS.
 - 1. 200
- xi. Architect mentions that if you do two separate buildings, you have to have two stairs plus an elevator for each.
- xii. Committee member thinks it is deceptive to add the assembly space into the total for the current design.
- xiii. Current design:
 - 1. 2795 – ibc
 - 2. 2714 – la casita
 - 3. Plus 1,000 each for assembly
- xiv. There was much discussion about adding the 1,000 each assembly space into the total for each Institute.
- xv. Committee decided to say (for the current shared space design) you have access to 1,000 each with an asterisk and an explanation.
- xvi. A committee member was concerned with what we are going to do with the shared space between the institutes
 - 1. A committee member said they thought is a culture. If you have it, people will utilize it.
 - 2. A committee member says the culture shifts every four years.

3. A committee member said they had the hardest time of finding event space on campus for alumni reunion and that this shared area would be a perfect homecoming space for alumni that would feel “home” in their institute.
 - xvii. A committee member said we should be thankful for current funding and think about the realities of fundraising as an option at this time. Committee member believes that there aren’t viable finding options within the timeline.
8. Budget comparisons
- a. The all-in program with separate buildings will cost \$9.2 mil total (\$4 million more than the current budget)
 - b. That’s if you kept the same square feet.
 - c. PJ commented it would take 10 years to raise that kind of money.
 - d. Committee member asked about historical fundraising for the institutes – or in general at UF for these types of projects.
 - i. MK responded that, in her recollection, the most money we’ve ever raised \$10,000 for programming and furniture at GGG. That has decreased over the years.
 - ii. IBC has raised far less.
 - iii. Division came up with \$280,000.
 - iv. Committee member urged conclusion that this would be difficult and limiting.
 - e. Will asked about timing. Right now the facilities can’t be used and encouraged thought and deliberation about the length of time we’re willing to keep the facilities unoccupied to pursue a fundraising goal.
 - i. Shared with a committee a discussion he had with an alumnus who fought for the IBC and wondered how they would really feel if we continued to wait rather than make a decision at this time.
 1. We need to think about history and what it will look like in 5 years when the spaces are vibrant and thriving.
 - ii. Want to think about real outcomes and consequences.
 - iii. Thanked the advisory committee for their time and investment.
 - f. Committee asked -- are the 900 people who signed the positions going to give money?
 - i. We have to move along.
 - g. A committee member said we need to be grateful for the money and get the buildings up and running in a functional way.
 - h. A committee member asked if classic fare would be required in those spaces and who would decide if we rent it?
 - i. Pj says it is up to MCDA and our communities have first dibs
 - ii. MK said that they are not a classic fare space.
 1. There is a UF approved vendor list, however.
 - i. A committee member moved to remove the fourth option (option that required appx. \$4 million in fundraising)
 - i. There was a second.
9. Discuss Project Outcomes
- a. What’s the goal of the next meeting?
 - i. Update the PowerPoint and distribute to the committee
 - ii. Show everything, but know we won’t entertain the third level.

- b. A committee member education piece webinar was suggested by the alums.
 - i. After the education piece, how to we pull out the feedback?
 - 1. There was a lot of discussion about this and the role of the advisory committee relative to their communities.
 - 2. PJ said understanding programming goals that aren't being met is important.
 - a. The Architect – educational webinar will mean more by sharing the MCDA program goals from the area.
- c. Committee decided to meet next Wednesday, June 14 at noon to discuss the content of the webinar.
- d. On June 28 – Committee will do a final review and make recommendations.