

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Wednesday, **May 23, 2001**, at 10:30 p.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

**PRESENT:**       **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Andersen, Aylward, Bramhall and Gates;  
                  **ex officio members** Cox, Holen, McCray and Pike;  
                  **Guest** Duane Storti, FSEC Group VI representative (Mechanical Engineering).

**ABSENT:**       **Professors** Battaglia, Gill, Kasprisin, Souders and Zuberbuhler;  
                  **ex officio members** Bolton, Christoserdova, Coulter, Fales, Jost, Ludwig, Martynowych  
                  and Sjavik.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of April 20, 2001 were approved as written.

**Update on Campus Signage concerns – Sarah Gates**

By way of background, Gates, in her May 23, 2001 memorandum to FCUFS, noted that the arts units raised concerns over parking and signage issues on campus with divisional dean Michael Halleran in Winter Quarter 2001. Dean Halleran asked Gates to follow up. She contacted Jerri McCray who arranged a meeting for her with Jon Hooper, Manager of Physical Plant Maintenance and Alterations, Campus Landscape Architect Bill Talley, and Parking Services Manager Carl Root.

That meeting proved helpful and constructive. The result was that “we have an excellent start in addressing the very serious problems associated with the Meany Studio Theatre.” Bill Talley took up Gates’s offer to attend a School of Drama production in that facility one evening. He parked in the garage and had a very hard time finding his way to the theatre. Once he reached the courtyard outside the main entrance he still was not certain he was in the right place. The experience confirmed all the issues Gates had raised.

Since that time, Talley, Denis Martynowich, Head of Facilities for Arts and Sciences, Campus Art Curator Kurt Kiefer, School of Drama General Manager for Production Anne Stewart and Gates have met twice at the Studio Theatre. Because of funding from Arts and Sciences, planning is under way to move the sculpture that currently blocks the entrance to the Studio Theatre, and to install lighted signs, both informational and directional. Talley has worked with the Physical Plant and some lighting fixtures are due to be installed above the entrance to the theatre this month. Kiefer is talking with Root and others about directional signage in the garage, and Martynowich is trying to think about who might fund the plan which is being created.

All parties are exhibiting goodwill and being as helpful as possible. However, the lack of directional and informative signage that is visible day and night remains an acute problem. “At the Studio Theatre,” Gates said, “we have begun to address one serious problem. I have been told that years ago a policy was made to have very discreet signage in keeping with the park-like ambience of the campus. Since that time, the University has made a commitment to community outreach and evening activity. Therefore, I ask FCUFS to consider a motion to urge the University to re-examine this policy and rapidly move to design and install signage that will make the campus a more welcoming environment for all.”

McCray said the Landscape Advisory Committee has expressed a desire for “tasteful signage” to Executive Vice President Weldon Ihrig. Schaufelberger said, “We need to figure out what needs to be done, and compare it to any written restrictions currently in place.” McCray said a problem is that no money has been appropriated for signage. “We will, though, redo existing signs so that the print is larger and easier to read.” She added that, on some buildings, it is clear that more than one sign needs to be in place (on the new Fisheries building, on the Oceanography building, and on others).

Schaufelberger again suggested the need for conveniently situated dispensers containing official campus maps showing the locations of individual theatres and other arts venues. If the theatres and venues are not discrete buildings themselves, but are housed in buildings already shown on the campus map, their locations should be highlighted where the buildings in which they reside are represented. Gates, at McCray's request, will annotate a campus map that will serve as a guide for these changes.

McCray said Facilities Services – of which she is Assistant Vice President – will do all that it can to bring about the changes and improvements suggested by Gates and the council as a whole. She also suggested that Gates contact Carl Root to help with this process.

McCray asked Gates to let her know exactly which signs on campus need adjustments in wording and presentation (improving the size of wording on signs to allow greater readability from a distance). Gates said she would be happy to do so.

### **Discussion of Professor Duane Storti's Recommendation for Building Removal – Duane Storti**

Professor Duane Storti's letter to FCUFS, sent on May 9, 2001, includes the following:

The subject of this message is an urgent faculty governance matter that involves university facilities, so I hope you will take the time to read this message.

A facilities building was recently installed on campus with complete disregard for any shared governance processes, and I am requesting that your council recommend immediate removal of this building.

1) Based on my inquiries at the most recent meetings of the Faculty Senate and the Senate Executive Committee, no faculty were consulted before this building was installed. The administration (including the President) conceded this fact at the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) meeting of May 7.

2) The administration seems to be claiming that if they simply declare something as "temporary" they can just proceed without consultation. While I do not begin to buy that argument, this building IS NOT temporary. The building IS modular (i.e., consists of prefabricated units that are dropped into place), but it has been installed on top of a poured concrete foundation and there is no schedule for removal (as the administration again conceded at the FSEC meeting).

3) All considerations regarding the placement of this building seem to have occurred within administrative units including Facilities Services, Capital and Space Planning, and the Office of the Provost. At least one ex officio member of FCUFS was involved throughout the entire process that led to installation of this building but did not inform the council about what was happening.

4) While I do believe that the primary issue here is complete circumvention of shared campus governance, there are a number of secondary issues that highlight why consultation on such projects is essential: I) The building is an inappropriate intrusion into the academic environment; II) The sidewalk was altered to accommodate parking of university vehicles at the expense of a handicapped access route; III) Activities associated with the building have negative impacts on traffic, parking and safety in the area, but these impacts were not considered; IV) A better site is available for the facilities building that would free up the current site for other (better) uses either for parking (as originally intended) or as an alternate location for the truly temporary construction trailers that are now parked immediately in front of the main entrance to More Hall.

Storti said that Vice Provost Steve Olswang, at the FSEC meeting, "suggested the administration's idea of a suitable remedy: If the problem was a failure to consult, the remedy should be to consult in the future." The end result of such an approach, said Storti, "is that there is no real consequence to the administration when it fails to consult. Such an approach allows the administration to just do whatever it wants and skip faculty consultation whenever they find it convenient."

Storti urged the council “to take a much stronger stance. To have any real role in governance, we must establish that actions taken without faculty input cannot stand. I urge you to recommend that the building be immediately removed.”

Schaufelberger said that, according to Executive Vice President Weldon Ihrig, this is “a temporary structure.” Storti said that “other sites [for the structure] were considered, but faculty were not consulted.” There was a proposal to house the maintenance staff in the Mechanical Engineering building, and to develop other space for Engineering, but the Provost said no to this proposal. Cox said the proposal to house maintenance staff was part of a major Mechanical Engineering building remodeling proposal; that the project was deemed “too expensive at this time.” The move of the temporary structure was a relocation of an existing structure, not a request for new space. The relocation was necessary to proceed with major construction projects.

The issue involved the Provost’s Office and the College of Engineering. Storti said, again, that faculty should have been involved in the discussions. Gates said she has found some temporary placements of structures inconvenient, but wonders if faculty should be involved in all such movements. As she noted, no-one was consulted regarding the temporary structures for the Suzzallo Library Renovation Project. Schaufelberger said, “There has been no procedure in the past on this kind of issue. This summer we’ll work on coming up with a policy or procedure that involves the council, because there isn’t one in place at present. FCUFS looks at Master Plan projects, and the Master Plan is not involved with temporary structures.”

McCray said, “This particular site will never be a permanent construction site.” Storti said, “Just saying this will be remedied next time is not good enough.” Gates said there have been faculty speaking out while this administration has been in place, and sometimes this has brought about effective change. She once went to Executive Vice President Ihrig with a specific complaint and he promptly “did something about it.”

Storti again said, “Faculty consultation needs to take place; it didn’t here.” Andersen said, “This seems like a somewhat unusual project. It is not like the larger projects, where everything shows up on architectural plans. This is a different, smaller kind of project, from all appearances.” Storti asked, “Can we get some kind of firm date? Some kind of commitment on a date?” Schaufelberger said, “We can get an agreement on the event. When EE/CSE III is done, this temporary building will be removed, but a specific date cannot be determined at this time. This is because all the funds needed to construct the building have not yet been raised.”

Holen said, “If you guessed a specific date, and it didn’t happen by that date, the complaint would be back again. This summer we’ll have a much better notion of when this removal could take place.” McCray added, “We had to pay to move and put together again this modular structure: The entire project cost about \$300,000.” Such projects, she said, are not inexpensive. Cox said, “Space is extremely tight now; there is nowhere to move this structure to.” Pike noted that there have been many requests for temporary trailers that the administration has turned down. “The administration is conscious of this problem,” she emphasized. Holen said, “Weldon Ihrig wants to get rid of the ‘green monster,’ but it will take a little time.”

Schaufelberger said he will speak with Holen and Ihrig to come up with a policy on temporary buildings. Storti asked, “Would you include a removal date in that policy?” Schaufelberger said, “That’s a good idea. We should do that.”

The council agreed to Schaufelberger’s plan that includes a removal date for temporary buildings.

[The Faculty Senate, at its meeting on May 24, 2001, approved a Class “C” Resolution presented by Professor Storti recommending that a policy be established on removal of temporary buildings. The Resolution was modified in accordance with the conclusions reached in the May 23, 2001 discussion between Professor Storti and FCUFS.]

### **Discussion of Potential Policies for Space Allocation – John Schaufelberger**

Schaufelberger said academic space is allocated to colleges and schools; then to departments and units within the colleges and schools. The departments and units then allocate assigned space for specific academic uses. The question was asked: Should there be guidelines regarding space allocation at the departmental level? And should there be specific policies about research faculty and teaching assistants? Where do we go from here?

Cox clarified the information in Mary Coney's memo to FCUFS, stating that there is no subcommittee composed of members of the Board of Deans charged to address space allocation. Dean Denton and Dean Nowell have raised the issue with the Board of Deans to determine whether there was Board of Deans interest in pursuing a more in-depth discussion. Decisions on the larger issues of space allocation, she noted, are made within schools and colleges, as Schaufelberger suggested; and decisions on allocations of space to specific faculty are made at the departmental level. Schaufelberger said the problem is that new faculty and TA's are being hired each year, but there is not enough space to accommodate the new faculty; in some instances there is not enough space to accommodate faculty previously hired. (As Aylward has pointed out, certain research faculty whose departments are housed in the Health Sciences have been forced to change the nature, or at least the emphasis, of their very work because the necessary laboratory space was not available.)

Schaufelberger said, "We are cramped all over campus." Some departments, he discovered, had space for 40% retirees but not for new hires. These are "very emotional issues," he stressed. The two most pressing issues in this area for faculty are office space on campus and parking. Gates said, "We chairs are responsible for the designation of office space in our departments and for teaching assignments, in addition to our responsibility for our departmental budgets." Alyward said there should be something in departmental policies that assures incoming faculty that they will have the necessary office and laboratory space in which to do the work they were hired to do. And departmental chairs should be mindful of this when faculty are hired. Gates agreed with Aylward and said this is something that she, as a chair, pays close attention to.

Schaufelberger said the Facilities Planning guide for four-year colleges and universities in Washington state stipulates that 140 square feet of office space are to be made available to faculty members. That number does not always obtain, *de facto*, with some faculty having much more than that, and some much less. Gates said it is appalling to her that any faculty member should have two offices, but in fact some faculty do have two offices. Schaufelberger said the council could conduct a survey to see what kind of space faculty actually have, and do not have.

Cox said, "The reality is that we're really cramped all over campus and yet new initiatives are always being pursued." She added, "There's a culture change, and some colleges, schools and departments are more aware of this reality." Cox said she is not certain that a discussion of this issue will occur at the Board of Deans level, but she said it would be very helpful at the level of faculty and departmental chairs. Gates said, "Guidelines could be helpful for chairs, but you would need a disclaimer, so that chairs would not be deprived of the flexibility they need to make the best possible decisions for their departments." "It seems that some chairs don't regard this problem too closely," Aylward said. Andersen said one thing that could be done is to "better allocate the space that we have." Some departments, he said, "will not get new space," or not for some time. Thus it will be imperative to look at the present allocation of space.

Schaufelberger said, "Hopefully, these problems can be well addressed internally within units." Cox said, "There are some guidelines for space allocation. The problem is that people in the new buildings are closer to current standards than are those in the much older buildings." Aylward said, "We could recommend that a committee be formed of deans and faculty chairs that looks at the way space currently is allocated, and the way space should be allocated." Cox said, "The reason this is done at the dean's level, and at the college level, is that academic programs can be best managed at these levels: particularly, the goals and priorities of academic programs." Gates said the "culture shift" to which she referred earlier "could be good for the University." Aylward said, "If the guidelines are in place, but deans and chairs are not doing what they should be doing, the guidelines aren't of much use." Cox said, "We work with colleges and units

to help make adjustments in space allocation, and sometimes we give funding for specific renovations. And we prefer that such requests for funding come from the dean.”

Aylward said she would be in favor of forming a committee “to come up with more specific guidelines, and to look at the process of space allocation. And department chairs should be required to look at and respond to problems of space allocation. The committee could recommend that deans be charged with the responsibility of seeing that their department chairs do this.”

Schaufelberger said he would put a committee together composed largely of FCUFS members to develop a set of draft guidelines that would be sent to the faculty for review and comment.

**Next meeting**

This is the final meeting of the 2000-2001 academic year. The next FCUFS meeting will be held in October 2001.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder