

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services  
December 12, 2013, 10:00 am – 11:30 am  
Mary Gates Hall 224

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to Order
  2. Approval of the Minutes from October 17, 2013
  3. Chair's Report
  4. Creation of a Subcommittee on Childcare
  5. Fluke Hall Renovation
  6. Classrooms Update
  7. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Christie at 10:00 a.m.

**2) Approval of the Minutes from October 17, 2013**

The minutes from October 17, 2013 were approved as written.

**3) Chair's Report**

*Board of Regents*

Christie reported that FCUFS did not meet last month due to difficulty scheduling presentations because the Board of Regents meets on the same day, and FCUFS presenters tend to have business with the regents. Christie suggested that all future council meetings be scheduled for the third Thursday of the month to avoid conflict with the Board of Regents, which typically meets on the second Thursday.

*Approving Building Projects*

Christie met with University Architect Christina Barnes and others about how UW approves building projects. The process is not well defined. UW is now in a transition period from moving to state-funded buildings to self-funded buildings. The major steps in the current process involve:

1. Colleges and administrative offices proposing projects
2. The Office of Planning and Budgeting tracking these projects on a priority list
3. Approval by the Board of Regents

Concern was raised that how the order of projects on the priority list is set, and how projects are chosen to present to the Regents is unclear, and in particular, how, where and when the faculty is consulted on these decisions is unclear. FCUFS has not historically been consulted on these decisions, nor has any other faculty governing body (e.g. the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting).

Kennedy explained that projects are listed by tiers based on the likelihood that funding is available for the projects. As potential funding is identified the projects are moved up the priority list. State funding for building projects has been limited to design reviews in the recent years. In situations where the state provides funds for a design review, and UW is able to secure funding, the project is likely to go forward. If a project is receiving additional support from the community, such as funding from the UW internal lending program, ASUW or outside donors willing to support the project, then the project is even more likely to move up a tier. A question was raised asking who the person is that makes this decision. Kennedy explained that funding sources and community support drives capital projects, not one person. For example, renovations to the Husky Union Building were strongly lobbied by ASUW and the university received funding for a design review which generated momentum for the project. Kennedy reemphasized that there is not just one person making the decision to go forward on projects. Rather, it is the entire community which is generating the necessary funding and support. Typically, these types of projects will have a champion which pushes the project to be a high priority.

However the decision is made, the Provost's office controls the priority list and submission to the Regents.

### *Architectural Commission*

Christie represented FCUFS at the recent architectural commission meeting. Several items of interest were discussed including:

- UW landscape survey
- Overpass to Schmitz Hall
- On-campus building sites
- Seismic issues related to on-campus housing
- New student housing bordering historic Denny Field

In March Rob Lubin will discuss developments around NE campus. Christie mentioned that there is no agenda for January and will likely schedule a tour of the Mercer Court complex instead.

During the Commission meeting a presentation was made regarding the student activity center at UW – Bothell. The architects were told to redesign the building principally because blocked too much of the view of the wetlands. Christie opined that the proposed design looked like a Costco store and the color was too dark. The building is working against a low budget. The Commission offered some ideas to enhance the building which will likely be incorporated into the new design, such as an outdoor terrace.

At the Commission is was reported that UW sent out request for proposals (RFPs) for the Intellectual House project. The initial estimates were \$3 million but all the bids received were in the range of \$4 million. UW made some basic changes to the interior design, windows and utilities and sent out new RFPs hoping for bids in the \$3 million range. The goal is to begin construction in March.

Christie reported that the initial design of the Sound Transit Link Station generated discussion over interior colors. A representative from Washington State University wanted to include scarlet on the visible glass of the facility. However, past-President Mark Emmert did not like the suggestion so Sound Transit is now revisiting the color scheme.

### *UPASS*

Christie reported on a discussion he had with Joshua Kavanagh about UPASS, which may be a potential agenda item for a future council meeting. The issues surrounding UW students have been solved but there are still outstanding funding problems affecting faculty and staff. Balick is on the University Transportation Committee and at its recent meeting UPASS was not discussed. Chuck Treser, chair of the Faculty Council on Student Affairs, is a good contact to follow up with. Christie explained that the subsidy for the UPASS has ended and concern has been raised that it is now too expensive and not being used to its fullest potential.

#### *N6 Parking Lot*

The N6 parking lot partially falls within the construction site for the Intellectual House and has been closed. When this issue was discussed last year there was a lot of concern on the resulting impact to the Music department. The parking lot is used for patrons to music and other arts events and there have been no remedial steps to address this problem. Kavanagh suggested reopening the lot for event parking until construction actually starts, and finding parking on the driveways between buildings as a permanent remediation. Kavanagh will probably contact the Music department chair to identify alternatives.

Discussion ensued. At this point there is no definite remediation plan. A suggestion was made to use the N22 parking lot north of the HUB, but that lot is 24/7 disabled parking, which is required by code.

#### **4) Creation of a Subcommittee on Childcare**

Christie received an email from Professor Fine of Psychology suggesting there is a need for a special subcommittee on on-site childcare. Christie consulted the Faculty Code concerning the creation of faculty committees, which allows a Faculty Council to appoint subcommittees without Senate confirmation.

**ACTION:** Christie moved to approve an Ad-Hoc Subcommittee on Childcare. This subcommittee will deal with all aspects of UW child care, and in particular is charged with pursuing the expansion of childcare services at UW.

Discussion ensued. Balick stated that while this is a very important issue, when he was Chair of the Faculty Senate the response from the Provost was “no” due to insurance and liability issues. Given that the response has not changed Balick ask what the subcommittee will be charged to do. Christie stated the charge would be to champion the child care issue and build momentum to move the project forward, in effect to find a way around the administration’s response.

Last year Vice President of Human Resources Mindy Kornberg explained to FCUFS that UW subcontracts with individual contractors to provide childcare services. Therefore, if UW has the available space all the university needs to do is expand the contractors into the new areas. Discussion ensued to identify possible locations.

The subcommittee would provide a basis for a champion to promote this issue, fundraise and address the political concerns to move this issue forward. This will provide a platform to address the need for childcare services for faculty, staff and students. A comment was raised that this is not just a concern for existing employees but for recruiting new employees who are concerned about childcare availability.

Mescher presented on this issue last year and will be the designated liaison for this subcommittee. Christie suggested this could be a joint subcommittee with the Faculty Council on Women in Academia.

The motion to create an Ad-Hoc Subcommittee on Childcare received unanimous approval. Christie stated that Mescher will be a member and will report back on additional members for the subcommittee.

## **5) Fluke Hall Renovation**

Kurt Jensen (Capital Projects Office) was invited to discuss the renovation of Fluke Hall. UW is at the end of the design phase and has a few budget issues to address.

Jensen presented a video on the UW nanofabrication facility which lasted 10 minutes.

At the end of the design phase UW was over the originally-approved budget of \$6.5 million. In order to get back to budget the design team removed redundancies. Some of the items removed may have been important, but the final version still allows for the maintenance of the facility without complete shutdowns. After users reviewed the final proposal they were willing to make the sacrifices in order for the design to go forward.

The original building was built in 1988 by Sellen Construction with the original cost of \$16 million. The building includes:

- 2 floors of lab and clean rooms
- 3 floors of office and support with mechanical penthouse
- High end fabrication facilities
- Classrooms
- “Wetlab” modules for outside companies
- Biology area for tissue/culture work

The new design incorporates a revised layout of research labs to accommodate future research within the facility. The project budget was initially set at \$28.5 million but received additional funding which raised the budget to \$31.5 million. Currently, the project is near the end of the design/development phase and the group is working with the contractor to confirm the budget numbers. The project schedule is as followed:

- Design and Bidding: November 2012 - May 2014
- Phased Construction: June 2014 - April 2015
- Commissioning and Closeout: November 2014 - May 2015

The once the project team gets approval by the Regents they will begin to order equipment and mobilize for construction.

A question was raised asking about disruptions to campus. Most of the construction will be done indoors. There will be some outside work but it will be fenced off to allow for construction materials. The goal is to ensure current occupants can stay in the building during construction while allowing for the movement of equipment without impacting people’s work. Concern was raised that the

construction will be occurring near high-traffic areas. Jensen explained that the construction will not close any sections of the Burke-Gilman trail.

## 6) Classrooms Update

Roberta Hopkins and Phillip Reid (UW Classroom Technology and Events – “CTE”) were invited to discuss recent activities with classroom improvements across campus.

Since July 1, 2013 CTE has been a unit of UW-IT’s Academic Services, which positions UW-IT and UW to respond to rapid changes in classroom technology. Additionally, CTE’s move to UW-IT allows it to be an innovator of design and integration of technologies for state-of-the-art learning environments and able to coordinate best practices in teaching and learning technologies with classroom infrastructure. CTE supports instruction in more than 300 general use campus classrooms across the Seattle campus and gives students access to \$1.2 million worth of modern multimedia and computing equipment.

The average hours of use in general classrooms has remained fairly stable. The highest use classrooms are those with a seating capacity of more than 251 students, while the lowest are classrooms with the seating capacity of 10-25. Classroom utilization (weekly hours x % of seats used) at UW is 24 with 60% of seats filled. This is a number which historically has been used to compare peers institutions across the board. Classroom utilization amongst peers includes:

- University of Washington – 24
- University of Michigan – 18.2
- Ohio State University – 21.1
- University of Minnesota – 20.8
- University of California – 35
- “National” Standard – 18-20

Classrooms continue to be heavily used on upper campus. The number of seats filled and use factor is volatile from year to year so it is difficult to predict usage. The council discussed classroom usage and demand. It would be beneficial for departments to have access to large lecture spaces but it is expensive to create new rooms due to the square footage and shared costs. This begs the question if creating larger lecturer halls would be the right investment to make.

An influential factor is the scheduling of courses. Courses are scheduled by departments based on agreements with faculty to ensure they are taught at appropriate times. For example, large biology courses must be scheduled around open lab times. A question was raised asking if this would be different if UW was not a commuter campus and all the students lived nearby. Class scheduling is not just a student issue but a faculty issues as well. Most students will follow the course schedule if required, but not if they are taking electives. Hopkins explained that class scheduling is very closely tied with student expectations.

CTE has recently received an increase in permanent funding thanks to the Provost’s interest in student engagement and learning improvements. CTE put together an 8-year plan to provide \$900,000 per year to improve individual classrooms. 54 rooms have already been updated to technology standards with the rest to be dealt with later. The estimated technology upgrade costs will be approximately \$6 million over the 8-year time span. Smaller rooms (17 total) are low priorities for CTE and expect to cost approximately \$136,000 while 11 large lecture halls will cost around \$680,000.

Hopkins discussed the new active learning classrooms in Odegaard Undergraduate Library. The classrooms are wildly popular and CTE is still conducting assessments to measure usage. The feedback has been very positive and there have been suggestions to create more of these classrooms throughout campus. One benefit of these classrooms is the easy conversion from formal classrooms to open work spaces. Additionally, the classrooms are an excellent example of how to integrate technology into everyday teaching. CTE is now reviewing older rooms and evaluating how they can be converted to this type of format. One issue that constantly arises is the space for students to move around. Unfortunately, there are not a lot of existing classrooms that can be easily converted. While there are small classrooms that are underutilized, they are scattered around so it is difficult to knock down separating walls to simply create a larger classroom. One factor that is constantly evaluated is determining whether the room itself, or the room plus technology, makes it a good candidate for an active learning classroom. For example, rooms could be full-blown active learning classrooms or smaller ones with just a few technology upgrades.

In the 2013-14 academic year there have been 50 course sections scheduled for these two active learning classrooms. The majority of the course sections fall under sciences, but there are many social sciences, humanities, public health and public affairs courses that are using the active learning classrooms as well.

## **7) Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Christie at 11:25 a.m.

---

*Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst, gcourt@uw.edu*

**Present:**           **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Balick, Gates  
**Ex-Officio Reps:** Zuchowski, Byrne  
**President's Designee:** Kennedy  
**Guests:**

**Absent:**           **Faculty:** Mescher, Ozubko, Proksch  
**Ex-Officio Reps:** Goldblatt