

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

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services met on Wednesday, **November 27, 2000**, at 2:30 p.m. in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair John Schaufelberger presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Schaufelberger (Chair), Andersen, Gates and Souders;
 ex officio members Chistoserdova, Coulter, Cox, Fales, King, Martynowych, Sjavik, and
 Richard Jost.
 Guests Theresa Doherty, William Talley, Lee Copeland, and Brody Barry: Campus
 Master Plan; Roberta Hopkins, Director, Classroom Support Services.

ABSENT: **Professors** Aylward, Battaglia, Bramhall, Gill, Kasprisin and Zuberbuhler;
 ex officio members Ludwig, McCray and Pike.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of October 23, 2000 were approved as written .

Update on the Campus Master Plan – Theresa Doherty, William Talley, Lee Copeland and Brodie Bain

Doherty said the Draft of the Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) of the Seattle Campus Master Plan of the University of Washington was issued on October 16, 2000. The Draft EIS Public Hearing was held on November 9, 2000. Doherty said a handful of people testified at the Public Hearing, but that nothing in the testimony suggested controversy over the DEIS. The date by which comments on the DEIS were due was November 30, 2000, but that date was extended to January 10, 2001, the date by which CUCAC must issue their report on the DEIS.

It was pointed out that two conceptual master plans have been prepared for the Seattle campus, based on the 1983 City-University Agreement. The University's current master plan is the second of these two master plans and is known as the General Physical Development Plan (GPDP). The GPDP was completed in September 1990 and adopted by the University's Board of Regents and the Seattle City Council in May 1992. In approving the GPDP, the Regents and City Council endorsed a framework for development of 43 projects involving nearly 2.8 million sq. ft. of floor area, associated with new academic building space, and 1,750 parking spaces.

In 1998, a new City-University Agreement was adopted. Consistent with that Agreement, cognizance of the fact that the 10-year duration associated with the existing GPDP was nearing expiration, and recognition of the amount of growth that is projected for the campus in the next ten years, in mid-1998 the University initiated preparation of a new master plan. Comprehensive goals and policies to guide future campus growth were developed, including the University's mission statement, results of a visioning process, the University's previously adopted goals, and input from within the University community. Development of the proposed Seattle Campus Master Plan has involved active participation from faculty, staff, and students of the University; residents and businesses in surrounding neighborhoods; representatives of local government; and people that use the University's services and programs.

Several projects not mentioned in the 10-year plan are part of a long-term potential for some eight million sq. ft. of development at the Seattle campus, in part to accommodate the growing needs of an enhanced student, faculty, and staff population. (Some projects that are part of that long-term estimate, such as the new Law School in the northwest section of the campus, are included in the 10-year plan.) The City would prefer greater specificity, but that is not possible, nor – recent experience would suggest - is it politically sound. The City also would like to be more involved than they are in the management of historical landmarks that have been managed primarily by the University.

As for the west campus (in Seattle), every effort is being made by the University to be compatible with the larger community in the University District. (Copeland said this has been the University's "best master plan cooperative effort with the larger University-area community" in quite some time.) Some members of the community, however, including two members of CUCAS, are skeptical of the University's intentions with respect to the N.E. Campus Parkway. However, those involved in the master plan consider it a good idea to overhaul the Parkway. The largest amount of proposed new open space is planned in conjunction with vacation of the north portion of N.E. Campus Parkway.

Another contentious project is the construction of a lid over N.E. Pacific to link the S.W. campus with the main campus. There is a degree of tension in the City, and within the public generally, over any new "over-the-road" development. It was noted that Botany is particularly concerned about the greenhouse located near the pedestrian overpass at the southwest corner of the main campus. As Talley noted, that location has been designated a potential development site in the past two master plans.

The master plan proposes two new pedestrian bridges: one across N.E. Pacific connecting the Physics Plaza with the proposed Life Science complex northeast of Hitchcock Hall and the other across Montlake behind the Engineering Library connecting with the Intramural Activities Building. Doherty indicated that the City historically has not supported street vacations for pedestrian bridges. After discussion of the importance of these bridges, the council agreed that the Chair should send a letter expressing the council's strong support for these new pedestrian bridges.

Talley asked the council if the master plan "does what you believe it should do." The council for the most part said it does. Schaufelberger did point out, however, why there has not been more response by faculty than there has been. "Faculty are interested in open space and in who gets the new real estate. They are interested in the character of the campus, and how to get around on the campus." As for all the buildings proposed in the plan, unless it is their own building, or building-to-be, faculty are not likely to be interested enough to comment.

Update on Classroom Renovation Project – Roberta Hopkins

Hopkins, who addressed the council on January 26, 2000, reiterated that the Provost appointed a Policy Committee (including, among others, FCUFS Chair John Schaufelberger, Dean of Undergraduate Education Fred Campbell, Associate Dean George Bridges, and Capital and Space Planning Director Marilyn Cox, and chaired by Fred Campbell) to determine the allocation of the \$9 million received from the Provost for the Classroom Renovation Project. Initial allocations were made both to the health sciences and to upper campus.

It was determined that the funding should be used for "aesthetic improvements" and that an architect would be brought on board for guidance and consultation. Bids for specific renovation projects were due by November 28, 2000.

The first major project involves three separate buildings: Denny Hall, Kane Hall, and the Mechanical Engineering building. The general classroom upgrades for Denny Hall and the Mechanical Engineering building will involve: 1) new VCT tile flooring; 2) new window shades; 3) new acoustical tile ceiling; 4) new light fixtures; 5) new acoustical wall treatment; 6) new chair rail treatment; and 7) new paint. Work on 22 rooms in Denny Hall will commence in Winter Quarter 2001. Work in the Mechanical Engineering building will also commence in Winter Quarter 2001 after work on Denny Hall is completed. Work on rooms in Smith Hall, Thompson Hall, and the Art Building will begin in Spring Quarter 2001. Work on room 130 in Kane Hall will commence in Summer Quarter 2001.

The provost has established September 1, 2001 as the deadline for this work to be completed.

Gates noted that these improvements are not simply "aesthetic improvements." They are substantive improvements, and will actually affect the way classes can be taught. Other council members concurred. As Schaufelberger said, "You're changing the teaching environment." Hopkins said this is certainly the case: the term "aesthetic improvement" is a purely technical term employed in architectural parlance.

Cox noted that significant acoustical improvements are being made to classrooms that are not included in the \$9 million funding for the Classroom Renovation Project. Given the many acoustical problems in classrooms pointed out by Dean Heerwagen in his report to the council last year, these acoustical improvements are especially important both for faculty and students.

Hopkins said a major strategy in the Classroom Renovation Project is to make improvements on fewer rooms, but to make those improvements complete.

Schaufelberger said council discussion on this issue in Winter Quarter will focus on the need to use greater funding on technology in classrooms. Ideally, it may be that a split of the funding would be preferable: half of it for "aesthetic improvements" and the other half for technological improvements.

Hopkins distributed a "Summary of Classroom Technology Plans." Among the 240 small classrooms on the Seattle campus as of June 2000 ("small" meaning 10-45 seats), 215 are "chalk and talk" classrooms; 25 are "multi-media" classrooms. Among the 54 medium classrooms (50-95 seats), 39 are "chalk and talk"; 15 are "multi-media." Among the 31 large classrooms (100+ seats), 10 are "chalk and talk"; 21 are "multi-media." The targeted numbers for the small classrooms are: 180 small "chalk and talk" rooms; 48 "multi-media" rooms; and 12 "broadcast" rooms. The targeted numbers for the medium classrooms are: 13 "chalk and talk" rooms; 38 "multi-media" rooms; and 3 "broadcast" rooms. The target numbers for the large classrooms are: 0 "chalk and talk" rooms; 29 "multi-media" rooms; and 2 "broadcast" rooms. Hopkins said the need is to spread the multi-media rooms as much as possible around the entire campus.

Hopkins pointed out that the growth of courses on the main Seattle campus is fast reaching the point of saturation. There are 325 classrooms (according to the June 2000 inventory) and yet many courses still do not have a classroom for Winter Quarter 2001. This issue will not go away. There will be widespread classroom congestion for the foreseeable future. The provost is against classroom conversion, but this conceivably could happen: rooms being converted to office and/or lab space to address space needs within individual departments.

Related to this problem is the problem of scheduling. The goal, Hopkins said, is to put 30-student classes in rooms of appropriate size, and 70-student classes into rooms appropriate for "medium"-sized classes. Hopkins noted that home departments drive the need for particular buildings; and departments without their own building (English and Psychology, to name two) are "scattered to the winds." A major factor in classroom congestion is the campus-wide preference for teaching classes in the morning hours. In point of fact, many classrooms are indeed available, but not at the hours requested. Many faculty may have to decide to teach their courses in the afternoon hours, to take advantage of available classrooms. As Hopkins stressed, large classrooms are available, but everyone wants them at the same time. This is the crux; and this is also what allows the legislature in Olympia the perception that the University does not use its available instructional space as well as it could. The legislators ask: Why cannot the faculty use these classrooms throughout the day?

Cox, on the other hand, said, "We do not get the proper credit for the use we do make of our classrooms." Hopkins said the "magic formula" used by legislators does not recognize much of our use of classrooms. Cox said the ad hoc committee emphasized making all classroom upgrades compatible with teaching enhancements. Hopkins added, "We're changing many features in rooms that anticipate technological innovations."

Next meeting

The next FCUFS meeting is set for Friday, January 26, 2001, at 10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder

