

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Tuesday, **April 25, 2002**, at 12:30 p.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

**PRESENT:**       **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Balick, Gates, Pace and Rutherford;  
                  **ex officio members** Cox, Fales, Chapman, Martynowych, Pike and Waddell.  
                  **Guests** George Bridges, Dean, Undergraduate Education; Steve Folk, Manager, Central  
                  Construction Office, University Facilities Building Annex 1; Bradley Holt, Chair, Faculty  
                  Senate.

**ABSENT:**       **Professors** Andersen, Battaglia, Bramhall, Gill, Kasprisin, Souders and Zuberbuhler;  
                  **ex officio members** Christoserdova, Coulter, Jost, Ludwig, McCray, Schulz and Sjavik.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of February 14, 2002 were approved as written.

**Temporary Trailer for new Power Plant Construction Project – Steve Folk, Manager, Central Construction Office**

Folk distributed a drawing depicting the contractor staging area, signage requirements, and expected road closure sequence for the construction of the new power plant, Project #2643: Emergency System Power Supply.

Folk said the temporary trailer for the project is located near Physical Plant Annex #4. He said “the whole area is cluttered with Physical Plant vehicles.” Jefferson Road, temporarily, is being turned into a one-way road.

Folk said two “big issues” are: 1) access for the UW grounds crew to get in and out through the project area; and 2) “keeping a pedestrian access to Physical Plant Annex #4 and Annex #6.

“There will be some noisy activity for awhile, but they’re OK with it,” said Folk, who has spoken with people who will be subject to the noise.

Folk said the project officially commences on June 1, 2002, and should take approximately 11 months.

Schaufelberger said the College of Engineering and Jeraldine McCray, Associate Vice President of Facilities Services, have consented to the project. “So FCUFS has no reservations. We’ll send a memo concurring with those who have approved the project,” said Schaufelberger. [The memo was sent on April 26, 2002.]

**Draft Policies for Assigning Courses to Classrooms – George Bridges, Dean, Undergraduate Education**

Bridges distributed to the council a copy of “Draft Policies For Assigning Courses to Classrooms.” There are five criteria in the draft, “ranked in order of priority,” that read as follows:

- 1) Courses shall be assigned to classrooms in relation to course enrollments, with large classrooms reserved for the largest classes and small rooms for small courses.
- 2) Courses shall be assigned classrooms in a manner that accords highest priority to those courses that meet important curricular policies or requirements of the University and/or individual colleges.

3) Courses shall be assigned classrooms in a manner that accords highest priority to those courses that meet important curricular policies or requirements of individual departments.

4) Courses shall be assigned classrooms in relation to the course's teaching and learning needs with respect to technology, room layout, and type of furniture.

5) Classrooms should be assigned in relation to University geographic "partitions" or zones, where the assigned zone is as close in proximity as possible to the instructor's office.

Bridges said that in December 2000, two weeks prior to the beginning of Winter Quarter, some 700 courses were listed for January 2000 for which no classroom had been assigned. "This occurred," he said, "because of remodeling. A few critical rooms were closed down for remodeling, which in turn broke down the system of assigning rooms." He said great frustration was vented about the system.

"It is a difficult job for people doing this work," said Bridges. He said the Provost asked Tim Washburn, Executive Director of Admissions and Records, to study the room assignment process. This study culminated in the "Report on Classrooms and Room Assignments."

Bridges said, "Faculty cannot get classrooms now when they want them. This is *not* a simple problem, and is, in part, a problem created by faculty. Faculty do not want to teach in the afternoon because they feel that students will not attend classes during those hours. Thus, almost 75% of our undergraduate courses occur between 8:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. The afternoons are simply not being used for instruction. We are not using our classrooms well."

Bridges pointed out one particularly egregious example of classroom assignment. "One professor was scheduled for Kane 130. His class was German Conversation, an important class in Germanics, but a class with 30 students. The seating capacity of Kane 130 is 700." In another instance, a large room in Mary Gates Hall was assigned for a quiz section. "This happens because, by default, *anyone* is put in an empty room."

Bridges noted that, under "Recommendations" for the University, on page 7 of the "Report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Classroom Scheduling" (distributed to the council), all units are asked to move 20% of their classes to afternoon hours by the Fall of 2002, 25% by Fall of 2003, and 30% by Fall of 2004 (if necessary). The definition of "afternoon" is "after 1:30 p.m."

Bridges described what he called "boutique courses." These are courses that faculty "want to teach at odd hours of the day for a long period. These courses consume classrooms for, in essence, two consecutive periods. They clog the system." He said there are "300 different configurations of ways that classrooms can be scheduled." Most emphatically, he said, "We're reducing that."

Bridges stressed, "This is a management issue. We *have* enough classrooms." He said the Provost asked him to "consider new ways" to manage classroom assignments, and that led to the draft that he has brought to the council today.

As for the priorities given in the draft, he said the size of classroom is obviously of paramount importance (finding the appropriate size classroom, and not, per the examples given above, the inappropriate size). As for proximity of the assigned classroom to the office of the instructor of the course, he said this is indeed a significant priority, but not one that supersedes the first four criteria in the list presented in the draft.

Bridges said there are different "zones" on the campus that "partially govern classroom assignments." He said there are "informal agreements involving departments within specific zones," particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences. He also said that "some faculty are *aggressive* in pursuing their own interests," and sometimes those interests do not result in effective use of classroom space.

The draft of a new set of policies for assigning classrooms was done in conjunction with members of the Teaching Academy, said Bridges. The draft has had "mixed reviews," which he said is to be expected.

With respect to specific points in the draft, Bridges said that policy criterion #2 applies to “courses that meet general education needs.” Policy criterion #3 means that “departments should be able to weigh in on their own priorities.” About policy criterion #4, he said, “There is nothing worse than going into a room and not finding the technology you need to be able to teach your class. Under the new policies, whatever technology is needed will be brought into the classroom, if it is not already there. We’re also trying to go to more movable furniture in classrooms.”

Regarding policy criterion #5, Bridges reiterated that “proximity of the classroom to the instructor’s office is important, but not as important as criteria #2 and #3.” He said there could be “separate policies for different quadrants” on campus. There are three main quadrants: the area of the Quadrangle itself; the Engineering complex; and South Campus. “We won’t, for instance, be assigning art classes to the Fisheries quadrant.”

Bridges said, “These policies will be operational: built into the software for carrying out classroom assignments.” Schaufelberger noted, “And the assignments must be timely.” Bridges said, “There is a challenge here. It’s the outmoded way classroom requests are made. They’re entered by hand. It takes from four to seven weeks.” He said Tim Washburn “is performing an overhaul of this process and streamlining the Web-based way that it will operate in the future.” Faculty will be asked to state several priorities for classroom assignments in the new process. Also incorporated into the new policy will be the issuing of a strong voice to individual departments. Gates said, “I applaud this effort: these policy suggestions. It makes sense.”

Balick said, “I understand the basis for this policy. But the problem is bigger due to the interlocking nature of different classes. It is difficult to move certain parts of the curriculum around [to accommodate certain scheduling alternatives].” Bridges said, “Many departments have your problem. But there’s no facile way to fix this. It has to be a combination of solutions.”

Faculty Senate Chair Bradley Holt said, “I agree it’s broken, but it could be made worse. In Engineering, we can’t move a class. Our ability to move a class is severely hampered by the fact that labs are held in the afternoon.” Holt suggested that “these policies do not capture the complexity of the problem. If we bounce students all over the campus, building a sense of community in the undergraduate experience will be much more difficult.”

Bridges said the major problems in classroom assignment, for the most part, are in Social Sciences and the Humanities. Holt said, “A possibility would be to implement changes gradually.” Gates said, “Instead of *mandating*, it might be better to strongly *urge* departments to move some of their classes to afternoon hours. Why not *reward* departments that figure out themselves what changes need to be made?”

Bridges said the plan is to “work incrementally toward our goals, and to offer help (e.g., additional TA’s). The policies are just a draft. But the final goal is to produce a mechanism by which these problems can be handled at the departmental level.”

Schaufelberger pointed out that policy criterion #3 “does allow for that.” And he said that, if faculty realize that excellent classrooms are available in the afternoon, but not in the morning, that will induce them to make changes in their classroom assignment requests. He stressed, however, that “the time factor is still crucial.”

Bridges said, “There should be rational order here.” Holt suggested that the policies for assigning courses be used “in selected cases.” He added that there definitely should be a faculty representative on the committee creating these policies.

Bridges said, “But it’s not a faculty problem; it’s a problem of management. But it’s fine to have a faculty representative on the committee.” He concluded: “I think this problem is fixable. The Provost wants to acknowledge a ‘big problem,’ and ask for a goal of 20% for 2002 [all units offering at least 20% of their

undergraduate courses to start after 1:30 p.m. by the Fall of 2002] and greater increments in 2003 and 2004, if necessary, and resources to address that goal. No one wants the current system; that much is clear.”

Pace said, “You’re saying location takes a back seat to history, but this proposal won’t solve this.” Balick said, “Students should be the first priority of the University. If faculty have to trudge [some distance from their offices to get to their classrooms for particular courses], let faculty trudge.” Gates said, “There needs to be a penalty that faculty incur if they’re late in requesting a classroom.” Pace referred to a domino effect: “When one department changes the time at which a class will take place, it affects another department that has a dual relationship with that department.”

Bridges said, “There is a fundamental dilemma. The University’s faculty had no formal say in the formulation of the original policy. There *will* be a group of faculty reviewing this policy on a quarterly basis. But the administrative leadership has to have a say in this.”

As for the stance taken by the state legislature on this issue, Cox noted that “the legislature does press us to use our classrooms more effectively.”

Waddell said, “This draft proposal sounds good in many respects.”

Bridges said, “From today’s discussion I glean that this is an important issue to faculty and the administration both.”

#### **Draft Procedure for Assessing Space Allocation – Clark Pace**

Pace, who is Undergraduate Program Coordinator in the Department of Construction Management, distributed a “Draft: Procedure for Space Allocation,” which he prepared with the assistance of Jeff Hagen, a graduate student in Construction Management.

The draft contains charts showing:

- Total CAUP [College of Architecture and Urban Planning] Space Allocation by Department (%), in which the Department of Architecture (AR) has 55% of available space, the Dean of the College (DN) has 26%, the Department of Urban Planning (UP) has 8%, the Department of Landscape Architecture (LS) has 8%, and the Department of Construction Management, Pace’s own department, has 3%.
- CAUP Space Allocation by Function (%), in which Instruction has 68%, Research has 9%, College Support has 11%, Departmental Support has 7%, Student Services has 2%, and Other Institutional Activities (OIA) has 3%.
- Total CAUP INST Space Allocation (%), in which AR has 65%, DN 15%, UP 7%, LS 12%, and CM 1%.
- Total CAUP RSCH Space Allocation (%), in which AR has 52%, DN 23%, UP 23%, LS 1%, and CM 1%.
- Total CAUP DS Space Allocation (%), in which AR has 41%, DN 19%, UP 16%, LS 5%, and CM 19%.
- Total CAUP CS Space Allocation (%), in which AR has 28%, DN 71%, UP 1%, LS 0%, and CM 0%.
- Total CAUP SS Space Allocation (%), in which AR has 13%, DN 60%, LS 8%, UP 3%, and CM 16%.
- Total CAUP OIA Space Allocation (%), in which DN has 100%, AR 0%, LS 0%, UP 0%, and CM 0%.

The draft says that “the previous charts were meant to illustrate the current allocation of space in the CAUP. In and of themselves, they may or may not be helpful in determining the most appropriate or desired allocation of space. However, as this report is designed to develop a methodology for analyzing space performance, it is a necessary place to begin. The information becomes useful in analyzing the space performance of the CAUP when it is compared or contrasted with other pertinent facts of the CAUP. Several important factors may include the number of administrators per department and the space that has been allocated to perform functional requirements of their position. Also, the number of staff or employees, along with the space they have been allocated to perform functional requirements. The example used in this report includes CAUP approximate enrollment. The purpose is to compare the amount of students to be supported by each department within the CAUP against the number of professors in each department as well as the space that has been allocated for the functional duties of supporting this enrollment.”

Two charts illustrated:

- CAUP Enrollment by Department, in which AR has 41%, UP 16%, LS 11%, and CM 32%.

and:

- CAUP Full-Time Faculty by Department, in which AR has 59%, UP 24%, LS 10%, and CM 7%.

The draft suggests that it is useful to compare the information in the “Enrollment” chart with the information in the “Full-Time Faculty” chart, and to “evaluate this data against the amount of space that has been allocated to a specific department.”

The second of the two charts “illustrates the amount of full-time faculty in the CAUP as a percentage by department. In summary, the way the information in this example is designed to be read is as follows. The Department of Construction Management, with 7 percent of the total staff in the CAUP and 32 percent of the student enrollment in the CAUP, has been allocated 3 percent of the total space in the CAUP with which to carry out its functional use requirements. Additionally, for example, of the 68 percent of total CAUP space allotted for the functional use defined as INST, the Department of Construction Management has been allocated 3 percent.”

The draft goes on to say: “The information above illustrates the current allocation of space within the CAUP. The methodology to analyze the performance of the space that follows has been designed to account for three measures. The three measures include the physical space requirement to perform functions, the input as to the relative value which certain spaces have been given, and finally, the potential for benefits of allocating space for a specific function. These three measures complete a more developed picture of the actual performance of a space. Additionally, using these three measures of performance gives the opportunity to examine the difference between current space allocation and the optimal allocation.”

Using other words to describe the “three measures,” Pace told the council that “three procedures were used in conjunction”:

- 1) function as criteria (comparing function to how much space is needed);
- 2) importance placed on a type of space (defined by dean or chair);
- 3) benefit (more critical aspect: establish criteria to be accomplished by that space).

Pace said that his department, Construction Management, looked at “what space we had; we looked at the room survey.” The University has 11 “Spatial Distribution Definitions”: 1) Instructional; 2) Sponsored Research; 3) College Support; 4) Departmental Support; 5) Student Services; 6) General Administration; 7) Other Institutional Activities; 8) Operations and Maintenance; 9) Library; 10) Sponsored Projects Administration; and 11) Patient Care. Some of the results of that scrutiny are given above.

One thing that stood out particularly was the great disparity between the space allocated to the Department of Construction Management and the department's large percentage of students and faculty within the composition of the College of Architecture and Urban Planning.

Pace said the method employed in the report for the analysis of functional requirements is based on the data provided by the CAUP room inventory survey of 2000-2001. This data contains spatial attributes of department, location, square foot and user. The report has chosen to evaluate the functional use of academic office space in evaluating the method described. For office space, the baseline square footage has been determined to be 154 square feet. "This represents the minimum amount of space to perform the basic requirements necessary for the given type of space. The baseline has been established using the task profile of administrative/managerial from the reference *Time Saver Standard for Interior Design and Space Planning*.

Pace and Hagen looked at three different kinds of users of space within the CAUP: an individual faculty member; a program coordinator; and a department chair. In the case of the individual faculty member, in addition to the baseline 154 square feet needed, he had space allocation functions necessitating 10 sq. ft. to supervise projects, 5 sq. ft. to introduce courses, and 10 sq. ft. to develop facilities (conferencing, equipment), bringing his total to 179 sq. ft. needed for his space allocation functions. The size of his academic office is 68 sq. ft. Thus, he needs 111 sq. ft. more than he actually has.

In the case of the program coordinator, in addition to the baseline 154 sq. ft., space allocation functions necessitated 10 sq. ft. for providing leadership (conferencing), 10 sq. ft. for entrepreneurial enterprises (conferencing, correspondence), 5 sq. ft. for communication skills (equipment, correspondence), 5 sq. ft. for building partnerships (conferencing, correspondence), and 10 sq. ft. for acquiring resources (conferencing, correspondence), bringing his total to 194 sq. ft. needed for his space allocation functions. The program coordinator's academic office is 91 sq. ft. Thus, he needs 103 sq. ft. more than he actually has.

In the case of the department chair, in addition to the baseline 154 sq. ft., space allocation functions necessitated 10 sq. ft. for providing leadership (conferencing), 10 sq. ft. for encouraging growth (conferencing, correspondence), 15 sq. ft. for cultivating relationships (conferencing, equipment), 5 sq. ft. for developing ABET (storage, analysis), and 10 sq. ft. for implementing ABET (storage, correspondence), bringing his total to 204 sq. ft. needed for his space allocation functions. The department chair's academic office is 204 sq. ft. Thus, he has exactly the square footage that he needs.

Pace said, using a hypothetical situational example, that research and instruction were viewed as equally important in this study. One thing that stood out dramatically as regards the "intended benefits" of proper space allocation was that departments that have proper space allocation for the functions they need to perform have improved their productivity and the quality of their work. One significant example is that two departments within the CAUP have improved their publications as a result of increased space allocation.

Pace said the "approach" employed in the report captured every department's view of "how their space *should* be allocated and how it plays out in 'the real world'."

Pike, Principal Educational Facilities Planner in Capital and Space Planning, said, "We *don't* have enough space. We have to re-allocate space. Our office performs space assessments that help departments figure out what they need to do with their space to best utilize it. Some colleges have space-sharing policies. But people often don't share space because they fear not getting back their space when it is needed, if they once give it up, or give it up for any length of time."

Schaufelberger said, "Something *like* this ["Procedure for Space Allocation"] could be used within a department." Pike said, "Faculty need to be involved in the process."

### **Next meeting**

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Thursday, May 23, 2002, at 12:30-2:00 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder