Faculty Senate, Tuesday, January 14, 2020, 5:00 PM
Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

Motions with voting results are in red.

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:02.

2. Minutes of the Dec. 3, 2019, meeting were approved.

3. Announcements and Information: Speaker Lewis announced that the Board of Trustees will be meeting on campus Thursday and Friday, Jan. 23-24. He also reminded attendees of a reception following the meeting, sponsored by Academic Affairs, in the Tate Center 202 gallery.

4. Reports

   a. Speaker of the Faculty Simon Lewis reflected on the transitional moment the College finds itself in, turning 250 with a new president and searches ongoing for a new provost and multiple deans. He noted a sense of energy and optimism among faculty but stressed that this is a pivotal semester, as the strategic plan is being crafted and so much upper-level hiring is taking place.

   Speaker Lewis discussed the recent ModernThink survey, which indicated two major drags on morale: (under)compensation and a lack of trust in senior leadership on the part of faculty and staff. But he also expressed appreciation for the new administration’s sharing that survey data at a well attended open forum that was run by a ModernThink representative rather than by a College administrator. He encouraged faculty, at this crucial juncture, to put aside cynicism and “risk trust” in President Hsu and senior leadership, while reminding administrators that ongoing trust must be earned. He further stressed that the College’s 250th anniversary is a rare opportunity to gain national and international attention.

   b. Interim Provost Fran Welch, who had circulated her report in advance of the meeting [PDF], supported Speaker Lewis’s assessment and took questions from the floor.

   Senator Todd Grantham (HSS) asked how she plans to respond to the lack of trust in the administration, reflected in the ModernThink survey, this semester.

   Interim Provost Welch responded that along with Michelle Smith (Director of Institutional Research) and Alicia Caudill (EVP of Student Affairs), she plans to meet with other senior leaders and deans to determine, quickly, how to respond.

   Senator Linda Jones (SSM) said that she hopes faculty and staff will be included in those meetings. Interim Provost Welch responded that the response needs to be coordinated
across campus, that she would like first for meetings to take place with heads of divisions and deans, but that faculty will be involved at a later time.

Senator Irina Gigova (HSS) asked what the College is doing to make its case for budgeting priorities with the South Carolina legislature.

Interim Provost Welch responded that we have hired a new consulting firm for that purpose, and that President Hsu has been meeting with the General Assembly and the Commission on Higher Education.

Senator Michaela Rupert Smith (Adjunct Senator, German and Russian Studies) added that increased compensation for adjunct faculty should be included in our budget priorities.

c. Vice President of Facilities Management John P. Morris provided an overview of the work and current state of Facilities Management. PDF

Senator Tom Carroll (EHHP) commented on how difficult it is to work, and for students to study, in the Silcox Center, citing lack of soundproofing and temperature control. VP Morris acknowledged the poor condition of Silcox and stated that full renovation is being planned.

Senator Elaine Worzala (Finance) pointed to perennial complaints from first-year students about sickness due to mold. Professor Dan Greenberg (Guest) asked about ongoing safety issues in the recently renovated RITA (Rita Liddy Hollings Science Center). VP Morris acknowledged these problems and said that Facilities Management was working on them.

5. New Business

a. Curriculum Committee (Andrew Przeworski, Chair)

Please note: All College of Charleston faculty may view curricular proposals in Curriculog. PDF copies of individual proposals are available to non-faculty guests upon request (peepless@cofc.edu).

Prof. Przeworski explained the rationale for each proposal prior to discussion and voting.

1) BIOL - New courses: BIOL 213, 213D, 454, 454L; Course description change: BIOL 211; Program changes; BIOL Core, MBIO
https://cofc.curriculog.com/agenda:110/form

Senator Kristin Krantzman asked if these changes to the program would create new prerequisites. Prof. Przeworski replied that there were no changes to the prerequisites for existing courses.
The proposal passed by voice vote.

2) CSCI - Course prerequisite change: CSCI 230
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:1942/form

The proposal passed by voice vote.

3) GEOL - New course: GEOL 495; Course prerequisite change: GEOL 402

The proposal passed by voice vote.

4) MATH - New course: MATH 101S
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2038/form

Senator David Desplaces (Management and Marketing) asked if the new placement system for Mathematics would place students into either MATH 101 or 101S, based on their proficiency, and Prof. Przeworski replied that it would.

Senator Chris Starr asked how little math a student would have to know in order to be placed in MATH 101S. Prof. Przeworski said that placement would be based more on high school records and SAT/GRE scores, and that this question would be clarified in a placement proposal that will be coming before the Senate next month.

The proposal passed by voice vote.

5) MEIW - Change minor: MEIW

The proposal passed by voice vote.

6) RELS - New courses: RELS 106, 117, 118

The proposal passed by voice vote.

b. Committee on General Education (Susan Kattwinkel, Chair):
Approval of three RELS 106 for Humanities credit; RELS 117 and 118 for History credit in General Education:

RELS106: https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2072/form

RELS117: https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:2062/form

Prof. Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, represented the General Education Committee in Prof. Kattwinkel’s absence.

Senator Carroll (EHHP) asked about the anticipated demand and staffing needs for these courses, since they will fulfill a general education requirement. Prof. Elijah Sigler (Chair of RELS, Guest) said that they are planning to start with two sections in the Fall. Speaker Lewis cited the letter of support from Prof. Phyllis Jestice (Chair of HIST), stating that having these courses count for gen-ed History would take a little pressure off of her department in terms of staffing.

Senator Steve Litvin (Hospitality and Tourism Management) asked why RELS 117 and 118 couldn’t also count for gen-ed Humanities, since many History courses fulfill the Humanities requirement. AVP Ford replied that any course may satisfy only a single gen-ed requirement, and RELS designed and proposed these courses for the History requirement.

The proposal passed by voice vote.

c. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Deborah Boyle, Chair): Motion to eliminate the “WA“ as a grade option [PDF](#)

Prof. Boyle reviewed the motion, pointing out that while eliminating the “WA“ altogether is the committee’s recommendation, other alternatives have been outlined.

Prof. Todd McNerney (Theatre and Dance, Guest), speaking for himself and on behalf of Senator Gretchen McLaine (Theatre and Dance), who could not attend, argued against the motion. For Dance faculty, the WA grade differentiates between failure for absences and failure due to poor quality of work. The WA grade informs students that they have failed the course at the time they have exceeded the allowable number of absences, rather than having them continue needlessly in the course until final grades are posted. Prof. McNerney cited his own experience prior to making use of the WA grade: without it, he found it difficult to fail a student who had a combination of excused and unexcused absences that totaled over one third of the class meetings. Prof. Boyle suggested that he (or anyone) could still include an absence policy on the syllabus that included a grade of F for excessive absences. Prof. McNerney maintained that it is useful to have grades that differentiate between failure for poor quality of work and failure for not showing up. He cited other institutions that have variations of our current WA policy.
Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) noted that WA is the only grade that is submitted outside the midterm/final grading periods, which creates some problems. She pointed out that other options include retaining the WA grade but only at the midterm or final grading periods.

Prof. McNerney described a student who kept attending class after receiving the WA, which led to a complaint and appeal from a parent who thought the student’s work justified a change of grade. Since then, Prof. McNerney has made it clear to students that once they have the WA, they are “invisible” if they choose to continue to attend. He stated that the College’s withdrawal policy is very generous, another reason the WA grade is fair and appropriate.

Prof. Boyle said that the Academic Standards committee sensed that students would be more likely to initiate a late withdrawal if they saw an F on their transcript than if they saw a WA, partly because many students don’t seem to know what a WA means.

In response to questions from Senator Paul Young (Mathematics) and Senator Andy Shedlock (Biology), Registrar Bergstrom and AVP Ford clarified that all midterm grades, including WA, are advisory, not final. They also clarified the timing: the withdrawal deadline follows posting of midterm grades, and the WA grade cannot be assigned until after the withdrawal deadline.

In response to a question from Senator Jen Cole Wright (HSS), Prof. Boyle reviewed alternatives to the recommendation of the committee. One is to continue to allow WA grades but only during the midterm and final grading periods. The other is to keep the current policy but try to educate faculty about how it works, and possibly forbid students from attending class after the WA has been assigned.

Senator Wright, along with AVP Ford, clarified that faculty who use the WA must spell it out in the syllabus; faculty have options regarding their absence policies, but they must make that policy clear to students.

In response to other questions, AVP Ford pointed out that many students do not withdraw from classes after they receive a WA at midterm, and she explained that class roll verification, which faculty perform early each semester, is not part of the grading system.

Senator Irina Erman (German and Russian Studies) said that she favored the second option, the one recommended by the committee, because she finds the current policy confusing. She acknowledged that the WA grade potentially saves some labor for the professor, who does not have to grade a student’s work after the WA has been posted, but that benefit is outweighed by the simplicity and clarity of the F.
Senator Irinia Gigova (HSS) asked if any office within the college tracks or makes use of the WA-versus-F distinction. Registrar Bergstrom replied that no one uses that information.

Senator Krantzman (SSM) said that there is a useful distinction between the meaning of a WA and the meaning of an F, and asked if the WA could still be posted but then turn into an F on student transcripts.

Senator Carroll (EHHP) pointed out that even without the WA, instructors can still stipulate on their syllabi that a certain number of absences results in an F.

Senator Sarah Hatteburg (Sociology and Anthropology) cited her earlier work on an ad hoc committee charged with reviewing FAM policies on how faculty treat excused and unexcused absences. The FAM includes language describing the WA, making clear that faculty members set their own attendance policies. She wanted to know if that language would be retained, or if some language in the FAM would make clear that faculty control their own attendance policies.

Sen. Litvin (Hosp. and Tourism Mgmt.) spoke in favor of the proposal, citing the clarity of the F as opposed to the WA. Sen. Kathleen Foody (LCWA) questioned how students interpret the WA. She would like to know if they tend to see a midterm F as salvageable, and if they understand that a WA at midterm means they have in effect already failed the class. Senator Desplaces (Management and Marketing) added that he doesn’t think students understand the WA; he assigns F’s for excessive absences. He suggested the possibility of a midterm grade of FA to indicate excessive absences but a final grade of F.

Prof. Dan Greenberg (Psychology, Guest) said that if we get rid of the WA as an option, there should be language in the catalog to show that failing a class because of absences is a possibility.

Prof. McNerney argued that students probably see a WA as better than an F because it doesn't signify that the student did poor work but rather just didn't attend class enough.

Senator Todd Grantham (HSS) cited the constant battle to educate students and faculty about the WA and asserted that the F is cleaner and simpler.

Senator Carroll called the question. The motion to call the question passed by a voice vote.

The motion to eliminate the WA grade passed by a show of hands (20 in favor, 9 opposed).
6. Constituents’ General Concerns

In response to questions, Registrar Bergstrom and Associate Provost Mark Del Mastro assured the Senate that revised language in the FAM and the College Catalog would reflect the change just voted on, making clear that students can fail a course because of excessive absences as determined by the instructor.

7. The meeting adjourned at 6:52 PM.
**Motion to eliminate the "WA" as a grade option**
Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (FCAS)
January 2020

**Introduction**

The “WA” grade is assigned to students who have exceeded the course attendance policy, or stopped attending class, but who did not officially drop or withdraw. The “WA” does not withdraw a student from a course.

Prior to the days of financial aid for higher education, the “WA” resulted in a student being withdrawn from the course. This is not the case today, as only students may initiate a withdrawal from a course. Many faculty and staff continue to believe (incorrectly) that a student may not return to class after a “WA” is granted. However, there is no policy that prevents a student’s attendance after a “WA” has been earned. The Registrar’s Office often receives faculty inquiries about a student’s continuing attendance in a course and despite receiving a “WA” grade: “I submitted the form, but the student keeps showing up.” As a result, the RO ends up addressing issues with students that should be addressed by the professor.

Most faculty submit their “WA” grades at the end of the term; data from the last nine years indicate approximately 79% of “WA” grades were submitted during the final grading period. While the RO makes every effort to provide faculty with instruction, each term faculty continue to submit “WA” grades prior to the withdrawal deadline for the semester. Faculty have also erroneously submitted “WA” grades during attendance verification. These mistakes result in a conversation with the faculty member, cancellation of the workflow request, and resubmission. Some faculty have argued that the RO does not have the right to prohibit the awarding of a “WA” at any point during the semester, particularly prior to the withdrawal deadline.

The Registrar’s Office also fields questions from recipients of official transcripts who inquire as to whether the “WA” means absences due to medical reasons, ceased attendance, or a violation of the instructor’s policy. The RO’s response defaults to a violation of the instructor’s attendance policy because the RO does not track or store such information. No current policies have been identified that reflect a requirement to indicate what “type of F” the student earns.

**Three Options**

The following three options were presented in September 2019 to FCAS by Registrar Mary Bergstrom and Associate Provost Mark del Mastro:

**Option 1: “WA” Grades are Only Submitted During the Official Midterm and Final Grading Periods**

By adopting Option 1, the “WA” grade submission period would be during the official semester midterm and final grading periods. The faculty member would be responsible for communicating with students the course attendance policy and the consequences for violations. Faculty could use the midterm grade to signal to the student that the final grade will be a “WA” unless they withdraw from the course. The RO would then be eliminated from the notification process.
Option 2: Eliminate “WA” as a Grade Option and Award an “F”

By adopting Option 2, the “WA” grade would be eliminated as a grade option, and faculty would award a final grade of “F” for students whose excessive absences merit the failing grade.

Option 3: Keep the Current “WA” Process, Re-train Faculty on The Process and Their Responsibilities, and Amend the Current Attendance Policy

The current attendance policy does not indicate that the student who receives a “WA” may not continue attending the class. By adopting Option 3, the College would amend the attendance policy to indicate a student may not continue attending a course after a “WA” has been awarded. The email notification from the RO would include the policy but would continue to refer student contact to the professor. Academic Affairs would provide faculty with additional training and resources regarding the “WA” process, policy, and communication with students.

Members of FCAS discussed these options at the October 3 and 17 meetings, and unanimously preferred Option 2. The committee Chair sent requests for feedback to the email lists for Chairs/Program Directors and Deans. Of 11 replies, 8 favored Option 2 (eliminating the WA).

Motion:

Eliminate the WA as a grade option.

Rationale

There is widespread confusion among both faculty and students about what the WA grade means. Some students believe (incorrectly) that receiving a WA as a midterm grade means that they have thereby been removed from the course, and so they do not withdraw from the course by the withdrawal deadline. A grade of "F" would be clearer; students would realize that they should withdraw, or at least that they should consult with their instructor about what to do. Sometimes students do not realize that a WA counts as an F in calculating the GPA; again, a grade of "F" would be clearer. There is also some misunderstanding among the faculty regarding when the WA can be assigned, as well as confusion among recipients of students' official transcripts (such as graduate programs to which students are applying) about what the WA designates. Eliminating the WA option would eliminate all such confusion.
Great Colleges Survey Results

President Hsu and I are quite pleased that we had “standing room only” faculty and staff participation in the Town Hall presentation by Rich Boyer from Modern Think last Friday afternoon. With the President’s approval, I have included the PPT presentation Rich shared. The Senior Leadership Team also met with Rich separately on Friday afternoon. This report relates particularly well to the work of one of the Strategic Plan working groups on employee success. We have work to do and look forward to discussing plans moving forward in the near future.

250th Celebration

We’re excited to celebrate the College’s 250th Anniversary on January 30, 2020, and I hope faculty, staff, students, alumni, friends and supporters of the College will join in the festivities. CofC Day includes an unveiling of a South Carolina historical marker, a 24-hour fundraising drive, global alumni club events, and a block party with food, festivities and entertainment for all ages. For more information celebrating this historic milestone, check out the following websites and be on the lookout for additional details from President Hsu soon.

https://cofcday.cofc.edu/
https://250.cofc.edu/

The Lowcountry CofC Alumni Club invites alumni, parents, and friends to celebrate CofC Day on the College’s 250th anniversary, Thursday, January 30, from 6-8 pm, in Towell Library (in Cistern Yard). Your ticket includes delicious hors d’oeuvres, a limited edition #CofC250 t-shirt, wine, beer, sodas, and fabulous door prizes.

Register: https://alumni.cofc.edu/lowcountry-cofc-day. Note that you must register in advance in order to attend.

Student Success and Retention (SSR) Steering Committee Update

This Committee is co-chaired by Lynne Ford and Alicia Caudill and works closely with Michelle Smith in Institutional Research. Other members of the Steering Committee are: Jim Allison, Melantha Ardrey, Mary Bergstrom, Jeri Cabot, Lisa Chestney, Jimmie Foster, Michelle Futrell, Zach Hartje, Karen Hauschild, Rochelle Johnson, Tim Johnson, Tripp Keeffe, Page Keller, Chris Korey, John Morris, and Sebastian van Delden. This Steering Committee has been hard at work last semester and will continue this semester and into the future. Recently, the co-chairs sent me a thorough progress report. In late August, I charged the committee as follows:

Learn best practices regarding student success and retention; collect and review current data at the College of Charleston; analyze current practices and resources allocated to
student success and retention; recommend a goal and timeline to improve retention and graduation rates.

Last semester, this Steering Committee reviewed best practices related to student success and retention relative to what we currently have in place and what might be developed or enhanced in the future. They also reviewed retention trends at the College relative to peers and aspirant institutions, considered the current context for improving retention at the College, and recommend a new retention goal of 87% by 2026. Please be thinking of ways you can help us achieve this goal.

The Steering Committee will continue in the spring to review the data associated with 4, 5, and 6-year graduation rates to establish a 2026 goal. They have also created five working groups to focus attention on preparing for the selection and implementation of an SSR Customer Relationship Management (CRM) software program and to make progress on some areas in need of immediate attention.

Dean Searches

The Dean Search Chairs are: Valerie Morris, SSM; John White, HSS, and Gibbs Knotts. Honors College Dean Search applicants are encouraged to submit materials by February 15, 2020, at https://jobs.cofc.edu/postings/9593. HSS and SSM applicants are encouraged to submit their materials to R. William Funk and Associates by February 28, 2020, to receive full consideration. Details about these searches, the committee members, materials to be submitted, application addresses etc. can be found at http://academicaffairs.cofc.edu/recruiting/index.php.

Strategic Plan Update

The Strategic Plan Steering Committee has broken into three groups to work on areas of the plan with working titles: employee success; public national university with liberal arts curricular foundation in the context of next century expectations; and student success. These are working titles only and likely to change as discussions about goals, metrics, and initiatives continue developing. Drafts of the revised mission and vision statements and other aspects of the plan will be shared to campus shortly via an email from President Hsu. Information including data survey results, materials from the strategic planning workshops, and a video of President Hsu’s “Tradition and Transformation” presentation will be accessible to faculty and staff using their CofC credentials, both through links provided in the email and posted on the Strategic Planning website. The next on-campus meeting of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee is February 12.

Center for Sustainable Development

With support from President Hsu and the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs, the Office of Sustainability and Sustainability Literacy Institute have embraced a new, singular identity as the Center for Sustainable Development.
The Center’s scope and purpose reflect the Sustainable Development Goals outlined by the United Nations with a focus on regional partnerships designed to build inclusive sustainable development. These goals intend to solve challenges felt both globally and locally in communities like Charleston, particularly poverty, hunger, overconsumption, gender and racial equality, environmental degradation, and climate change. The Center for Sustainable Development will also advance the five core components of The College’s Sustainability Action Plan: Carbon Neutrality, Zero Waste, Sustainability Culture, Sustainability Literacy, and Institutional Resilience.

Under the leadership of Dr. Brian Fisher, the Center stewards sustainability literacy and serves as a hub for study, practical application and the professional development of diverse, innovative students. As thought leaders and sustainability experts, its team builds and fosters strong, service-oriented partnerships in the Charleston community and on campus, and advocates for policies and practices that enable our university to advance its climate and zero waste goals.

This renewed identity helps signal the Center’s mission to provide students, faculty and staff with the knowledge and tools to transform the present and positively influence the future. To learn more about the Center or to get involved, please reach out to Brian or visit the Center at 14 Green Way.

**College Reads Book 2020**

The College Reads Committee is chaired by Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience. Committee membership is broad based and includes faculty (current and retired), staff, students and representatives from the broader community.

The committee reviewed 120 books and recommended *The Line Becomes a River* by Francisco Cantu as next year’s book selection. This book is a memoir of Cantu’s experience growing up around the border in the desert southwest, studying the border as an international relations major at American University, and his decision to join the Border Patrol (2008-2012) in an attempt to better understand the dynamics of the US southern border.

A clip of Cantu presenting at the 2018 FYE Conference is available at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p5iR9_trnUpM

Cantu will visit campus next October to speak, visit classes, and meet with students.
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AGENDA

• Facilities Management
• Project Timeframes
Total Cost of Ownership

Customer Focus
- University mission and vision

High value project investments

Student Success

Total cost of ownership

Managed risks and regulations

Sustainable and energy efficient operation

Research Excellence

Optimal space utilization and configuration

Optimal building and grounds operations

Asset life extension
Total Cost of Ownership

50-year building
- Initial Construction: 15%
- Operation, Utilities and Renewal: 80%
- Decommissioning and demolition: 5%

Buildings and Infrastructure
- Campus Total GSF: 3.67 M
- Estimated Current Replacement Value: $1.3 B
- Annual Renewal Target (3% of CRV): $38 M
- Operating Budget: $16.2 M
- Utility Budget: $ 8.7 M
Learning and the facility-built environment are interconnected

- Thermal comfort
- Indoor air quality (IAQ)
- Noise/acoustics
- Lighting
- Size and configuration
- Maintenance quality
- Facility age/quality
- Aesthetics
- Technology
FM works with the campus community to create and enhance learning and living environments.

- Modern classrooms and laboratories
- Current technology and adequate access
- Residential living environments
- Recreational opportunities
- Outdoor environments that create a sense of place
- Flexible open spaces where students can congregate and interact
- Hiring students provides opportunities for real world experience
- Demonstrate sustainable practices
- Implement TCO fundamentals
The mission of Facilities Management, in partnership with the campus community, is to create and enhance learning and living environments that promote student success and research excellence.
Facilities Management Vision

To be a progressive, customer-focused organization that is recognized as a leader in providing exceptional service and responsible stewardship of resources.
We value our employees, our campus community our institutional heritage, and our natural environment.

We achieve organizational excellence through the following core values:

•  Integrity
•  Respect
•  Community
•  A safety culture
•  An engaging workplace
•  A culture of sustainability
•  Value-added customer service
•  A diverse and inclusive community
•  Teamwork, partnership and cooperation
•  Innovation and continuous improvement
Facilities Management Strategic Plan

1. Improve Campus Appearance and Functionality
2. Promote a Customer Service Driven Culture
3. Promote a Positive and Encouraging Organizational Culture
4. Embrace Continuous Process Improvement
5. Ensure Responsible Fiscal Management
6. Advance Campus Sustainability
Facilities Management Strategic Plan

Improve Campus Appearance and Functionality

• Expand campus inspections
• Develop and implement a focused preventive maintenance program
• Implement energy conservation measures
• Increase use of student hourlies
• Ensure campus space is effectively utilized
  • Space Committee
  • Classroom Renovation Committee
Facilities Management Strategic Plan

Promote a Customer Service Driven Culture

- Develop a customer focus team
- Continue building partnerships with other service departments
- Develop a Building Liaison Program
- Investigate ‘customer service professional’ training
- Ensure website content is current
Promote a Positive and Encouraging Organizational Culture

- Promote a safety culture
- Develop training plans and opportunities
- Enhance employee recognition and appreciation opportunities
- Develop an employee satisfaction survey to assess the organizational culture
Facilities Management Strategic Plan

Embrace Continuous Process Improvement

- Implement process improvement teams
- Identify key performance indicators
- Utilize industry benchmark standards
- Continue to improve our use of AiM
Facilities Management Strategic Plan

Ensure Responsible Fiscal Management

- Continue to train and empower individual work unit leaders to monitor and manage their budgets
- Review inventory management processes
- Develop fully loaded charge out rates and fees
- Continue to improve utility cost, consumption and conservation reporting
- Pursue historic preservation and other grant opportunities
Facilities Management Strategic Plan

Advance Campus Sustainability

- Continue to collaborate with the Office of Sustainability and the Sustainability Literacy Institute
- Assist with implementation of a campus Sustainability Action Plan
- Assist with data collection to complete the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System (STARS) report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINOR PROJECTS (Construction Cost Less than $10K)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Define project scope / Obtain GC proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>PO execution and delivery to General Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 days</td>
<td>Average duration prior to construction start</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNAL PROJECTS (Construction Cost $10K - $100K / NO A/E)

15 days  Define project scope / Develop Request for Bids
21 days  GC bid duration
45 days  CofC OLA Review
30 days  PO execution and delivery to General Contractor
111 days Average duration prior to construction start
INTERNAL PROJECTS (Construction Cost $10K - $100K / IDQ A/E*)

*Non-IDQ A/E requires additional 45-day CofC OLA review

15 days Define project scope / Obtain fee proposal from A/E
30 days PO execution and delivery to A/E
45 days Design
21 days GC bid duration
45 days CofC OLA Review
30 days PO execution and delivery to General Contractor
186 days Average duration prior to construction start
INTERNAL CAPITAL PROJECTS (Construction Cost $100K - $350K / with IDQ A/E*)

*Non-IDQ A/E requires additional 45-day CofC OLA review

21 days Define project scope / Obtain fee proposal from A/E
10 days AiM Capital Request / Establish AiM project record
30 days PO execution and delivery to A/E
60 days Design
14 days OSE review
21 days GC (TOC) bid duration
30 days PO execution and delivery to General Contractor
186 days Average duration prior to construction start
INTERNAL CAPITAL PROJECTS (Construction Cost $350K - $1M Project Cost / with IDQ A/E*)
*Non-IDQ A/E requires additional 45-day CofC OLA review

21 days Define project scope / Obtain fee proposal from A/E
10 days AiM Capital Request / Establish AiM project record
30 days PO execution and delivery to A/E
90 days Design
21 days OSE review
30 days SCBO Bid posting / GC bid duration
11 days Bid protest period
10 days GC contract prep
45 days CofC OLA Review
30 days PO execution and delivery to General Contractor
298 days Average duration prior to construction start
Project Time Frames

STATE CAPITAL PROJECTS (Over $1M Project Cost / low bid procurement)

30 days  Define project scope / Obtain fee proposal from A/E for feasibility study
30 days  PO execution and delivery to A/E
75 days  Feasibility study & cost estimate
75 days  CHE Phase 1 approval
10 days  AiM Capital Request / Establish AiM project record
60 days  A/E selection
30 days  A/E fee proposal, negotiation & contract prep
45 days  CofC OLA contract review
30 days  PO execution and delivery to A/E
90 days  Schematic Design & Cost Estimate
21 days  OSE review
75 days  CHE Phase 2 approval
270 days  Design & cost estimate (assumes 3 BAR reviews)
30 days  OSE review
35 days  SCBO posting & bid duration
11 days  Bid protest period
10 days  GC contract prep
45 days  CofC OLA Review
30 days  PO execution and delivery to General Contractor
1001 days  Average duration prior to construction start
Thank you!