

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Tuesday, **November 13, 2001**, at 10:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Bramhall, Gates, Pace, Rutherford and Souders;
 ex officio members Fales, Sjavik, Martynowych, Pike and Jost;
 Guests Robert Jansson, Assistant Registrar; Olivia Yang, Capital Projects Office (for Richard Chapman) .

ABSENT: **Professors** Andersen, Battaglia, Gill, Kasprisin and Zuberbuhler;
 ex officio members Christoserdova, Coulter, Cox, Chapman, Ludwig and McCray.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of October 16, 2001 were approved as written.

Suzzallo Library Renovation Project: an Update – Richard Jost, ALUW representative

Jost distributed the July 2001 issue of “Suzzallo Library Renovation News” to the council. He said that, according to Project Manager Paula Walker, the renovation project is “on target” to open in Autumn Quarter 2002. Jost also noted that a part of the School of Art will move into the space temporarily occupied by Libraries staff members at Sand Point. Asked if the Sand Point facilities will continue to be used for off-site shelving by the Libraries, Jost said that specific facilities will indeed be maintained for volumes that will be able to be retrieved, for the most part, on the same day as requested.

Update on Coordination Policy for Placement of Temporary Facilities – John Schaufelberger

After council discussion , the final wording of the Policy reads as follows:

Policy for Coordination of Placement of Temporary Facilities on the University of Washington Seattle Campus

Temporary facilities may be placed on the campus to meet short-term University needs for space. The siting of these facilities often does not conform to the University Master Plan for the development of permanent facilities and is not subject to the normal coordination procedures used for permanent construction. Therefore, before any temporary facility is placed on campus, the office or activity proposing placement of the facility will coordinate its siting with appropriate University offices, neighboring units, and with the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services. This is to ensure that faculty and staff are notified of the proposed temporary facility and the anticipated removal date, and are given an opportunity to provide input to the University Administration prior to a decision being made regarding the facility’s placement.

The coordination procedures to be followed are:

- The office or activity proposing placement of the temporary facility will first coordinate its placement with the Capital and Space Planning Office, the Capital Projects Office, and the Facilities Services Office.
- Once the above coordination has been completed, the office or activity proposing placement of the temporary facility will provide a description of the proposed facility and its anticipated impact on the surrounding environment, an anticipated date for its removal, and a diagram depicting its proposed location to neighboring units occupying space near the proposed facility site.

- Once these units have been given an opportunity to provide input, the office or activity proposing placement of the temporary facility will provide the same information and the comments of affected neighboring units to the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.
- The council will review the proposal and provide written comments to the proposing office or activity and to the University Administration. In emergency situations, the Council Chair may elect to review the proposal and provide comments rather than convene a special Council meeting.

Policy approved on November XX, 2001.

Weldon E. Ihrig
Executive Vice President

John E. Schaufelberger
Chair, Faculty Council on
University Facilities and Services

Asked if the policy could be considered as council policy, Schaufelberger said that it needs to be a university policy. The policy will be added to the “Facilities” section in Volume Four of the University Handbook. Once approved by Weldon Ihrig, Executive Vice President. As a follow-up to the meeting, the policy was signed by both Ihrig and Schaufelberger on November 16, 2001.

When a request was made to require an informal assessment of the anticipated environmental impact of each temporary facility, Schaufelberger indicated that the request would be added as a policy requirement.

Classroom Scheduling System – Robert Jansson, Assistant Registrar

Jansson distributed a printout of different kinds of data produced by the “Schedule 25” software program used in scheduling University of Washington classrooms. (The University has used this program for upwards of 25 years. It is by far the most widely-used scheduling program among major universities throughout the country. There are three other scheduling programs in use, none of which is considered to be comparable to Schedule 25. The company that provides this software is also used to process both our entrance and graduation applications.)

Jansson said scheduling needs “to be done early” at the University because “it is driven by the print version of the Time Schedule.”

He said scheduling worksheets for a particular class are generated by the same class’s schedule one year prior in the same quarter. (Thus, the worksheet of a class being scheduled for Autumn Quarter 2001 would be generated by the class’s same schedule in Autumn Quarter 2000.) Some classes remain the same as they were the previous academic year; others of course change, and need to be revised.

Jansson said, “Scheduling is still a paper process; it takes five or six weeks for departments to process us the information we need.”

Jansson said Schedule 25 uses four different files. All general-use classrooms are listed. There are lists of physical data in particular classrooms. There are lists of the times that particular classrooms open and close. (For instance, a classroom may not be available after a certain time of day, even though it is unoccupied.)

Jansson said the scheduling program has defined each academic curriculum, and not the department in which the curriculum is housed. Each curriculum has four different levels of priorities. “We tell each department what their partitions are, as we know them,” he said.

Asked about the relationship of Schedule 25 to the student data base, Jansson said, “We enter all the data from Schedule 25 into the student data base, then extract a batch from this data. We can tell the program

what we want it to do.” Pre-assigning of classrooms is done as little as possible. “The program does it much better than we could do it manually,” he stressed.

Jansson said that specific features in a classroom can be requested: “When that happens, we will not schedule a course unless we have a room available that has the specific features requested.” The more partitions a department has, the more likely it is that that department will get a classroom. “We can, though, overrule this program and give a partition to a department for a specific course in a specific quarter.”

Schaufelberger said that what is happening is that “what’s out there is different than what the original partitions indicate.” Jansson noted that, not infrequently, departments want a particular day of the week and a particular hour of the day more than they want particular physical and electronic features in a classroom, and end up taking a room different from the originally-indicated partition because of this. Again, it comes down to priorities, as it simply is not always possible to get exactly the partition a department desires.

Jansson said, “Individual buildings, floors, and rooms have their own partitions, or their own sectors. Ideally, each instructor would like to have his or her classroom as close as possible to the department’s building, and to his or her own office.

Asked if the scheduling program can “cut down the size of the classroom requested,” Jansson said the program will not assign a smaller classroom than what is requested. “If the size of the room requested is not available, the request will be “rejected.” In that case, the department will be contacted to see if a successful compromise can be reached. In addition to the “rejected” requests, there are what are called “losers.” These are courses that “ask for days and times that cannot be accommodated.” Again, the departments are contacted to see if adaptations can be made.

Jansson said undergraduate courses are by far the most difficult to schedule; the scheduling of graduate courses presents few of the complications that are unavoidable with undergraduate courses. Asked how the complications are “adjudicated,” Jansson said, “We adjust, if possible, and then, and only then, go to the departmental dean to see if a resolution can be reached.”

Jansson said, in reference to the category “Not placed” on the last page of the handout (“Placement Analysis”), “You’ll see that only 217 classroom requests (or 5.16% of the total) were “not placed.” The bulk of the requests in this category ask for rooms at 9:30, 10:30, or 11:30 a.m., which are the times when the overwhelming majority of classrooms meet. We have to tell 5% of those making requests that “we’ve run out of space.” Jansson said the departments are asked if they can change the time or the day of their request. They are also asked if they can accept putting 25 students in a 100-seat room.

Jansson said Schedule 25 “is a sophisticated program, and does an excellent job.” When it does not work, it is often because departments “do not let us know exactly what physical characteristics they need.” He said all courses have an equal chance of finding a classroom. “They’re all thrown into the same soup pot.” Generally, he emphasized, there is no “open space,” so there is a pressing need to get requests in on time. “Getting them in early, however,” he pointed out, “matters nothing to the computer program. You don’t want to be late; that is the important thing. But being early is unavailing.”

“The forms are driven by what is in our student data base. Special notations of what is in the classrooms are not in the student data base.” Balick, and several other council members, said it would be exceedingly helpful if physical and other features of particular classrooms *were* in the student data base. The entire council agreed that this is most desirable.

Jansson said the name of the building, the room number, and the seating capacity of the classroom are the only data that are purged on each form that is submitted. All other information is the same as on the previous form submitted by the department.

“Again, I must stress, the scheduling program (Schedule 25) is wholly separate from the student data base,” said Jansson. “The new information is put into the scheduling program, and not into the student data base.” (Asked who is in charge of the student data base, he said the most influential person in this regard is Tim Washburn, Director of Admissions and Records.) Jansson said, “The output from all of this gets thrown into a secondary program, a room management program, called 25E (which is where everything is kept), and that is what keeps us from scheduling conflicts.”

Resource 25 (the “events program”) is the next generation program of 25E, Jansson said. “It will be able to communicate with our student data base.” (Resource 25 has a “Web Viewer” product that “would show everything that is scheduled on the Web, and would display whatever is current on Resource 25.”) Jansson said there are only “about 25 conflicts each time around” during scheduling: a remarkably low number, considering the intricacy of course scheduling at the UW. Resource 25 will give “a snapshot of an entire course, including all meetings and sections associated with a particular course. And we’ll all be on the same data base: all three campuses.” Jansson said departments will be able to make some changes on their own, on the Web, perhaps as soon as Winter Quarter 2002.

Schaufelberger said the council wants to make a resolution to Tim Washburn recommending the inclusion of specific room characteristics in the student data base. He suggested that departmental partitions be placed on the Web and that departments be asked to update their classroom partitions annually.

Balick said, “Overall, course scheduling has gone very well.” Other council members corroborated Balick.

Maintenance of Whiteboards in classrooms – John Schaufelberger

Schaufelberger said that custodians are responsible for maintaining the whiteboards and all writing implements in classrooms. He said custodians could be asked to keep classrooms supplied with chalk and the different kinds of pens used on the whiteboards. Balick said a problem with that solution is that custodians might have pens in the classroom that do not work. Schaufelberger said it is precisely because of that possibility that many faculty carry the pens they know they will need with them to their classrooms. Gates also said this seemed the best remedy. Schaufelberger said he will ask Jeraldine McCray and Roberta Hopkins to discuss this issue with the council in a Winter Quarter meeting.

Issues for the 2001-2002 academic year – John Schaufelberger

Schaufelberger said the following issues, among others, will be addressed in the 2001-2002 academic year:

- Sandra Lier, Assistant Vice President for Business Services, will speak with the council about “Emergency Preparedness.”
- The council will discuss the issue of allocation of office space, and decide if it wants to propose guidelines for this process.
- The issue of signage will be discussed, with respect to various venues: What signage is still needed on the campus?
- The council has been asked to look into computer policies “from an academic perspective.” Where is all the money going with respect to computers at the UW?

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting will take place in January 2002. The scheduling process is under way.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

