

Office of Facilities Planning
Research Laboratory No. 2, Room 301
453 UCB
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0453
(303) 492-1275
FAX: (303) 492-7186

Meeting Minutes

DATE: Monday, October 12, 2009 10:00 a.m.

SUBJECT: Academic Needs and Space Utilization Master Plan Task Force

LOCATION: Atlas 229

ATTENDEES: Keith Maskus
Bob Cloutier
Deb Coffin
Dennis Russell
John Culshaw
Hans Morgenthaler
Bill Lewis
Armando Pares
Bill Kaempfer
JoAnn Zelasko
Phil Simpson
Robin Suitts
Megan Rose

1. Introductions and thanks from Keith Maskus
2. Introduction of Master Planning process
 - a. Deadline to get the master plan approved is March 2011
 - b. Task Force reports will outline land use principles and need to be complete in January of 2010
3. Review of Charge Letter
 - a. How can the campus best plan for the use of existing and new facilities to accommodate the projected increase in students that will occur 5, 10 or 20 years into the future while simultaneously giving credence to campus goals for carbon neutrality?
 - b. What are the important space planning and utilization considerations to ensure the continued provision of top quality educational services?
 - c. How can space be built to foster better utilization and maximize precious resources?
 - d.
4. What types of partnerships can be forged to better serve students, faculty and staff as well as the community of Boulder and citizens of Colorado?
5. Resources for this committee

- a. Master Plan Web site www.colorado.edu/masterplan
 - b. Old Master Plan (on the web site)
 - c. Flagship 2030 Strategic Plan site www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/
 - d. Facilities Task Force Report at <http://www.colorado.edu/flagship2030/downloads/implementation/TaskForceFacilities.pdf>
6. Keep in mind opportunities at East Campus
 - a. Class, libraries, labs, venues, office space
 7. Review of 2030 Strategic Plan Initiatives and Facilities Task Force recommendations (Robin handout)
 8. Procedure for approval of buildings/renovations
 - a. More transparency
 - b. Efficiency in the area of space utilization
 - c. Move from offices that never get used to offices always in use (timeshare offices)
 - d. Keep in mind some research grants require office space
 9. Increase in interdisciplinary teaching and research programs
 - a. Departments have offices in multiple buildings
 - b. There is more of a necessity to meet with different groups and more often
 - c. Anschutz model of utilization
 - i. Not allowed to hold onto underutilized space
 1. Allocating a space to a department is more efficient than having someone request use of a space
 10. Office space in older buildings are generally larger – we need to find a way to overcome this structural aspect—I don't think this is what was said. I think we agreed this is just something we have to live with.
 - a. Generally only 1 faculty member in a large space; difficult to double up
 11. Right now the campus has no official space utilization policy on campus
 - a. Perhaps we create one similar to EBIO – assign a small core space to individuals and have the large spaces by request only
 12. Note : We do have existing guidelines
 - a. Will bring for review at next meeting
 13. What about interface with other committees/task forces?
 - a. Phil, Megan and Robin will be at all three meetings so we will bring any information requested
 - b. We are planning a large 'big picture' meeting in the first couple weeks of November, all of the Task Force members will be invited to attend
 14. Include libraries and library space
 - a. Change in technology is limiting the demand for large book collections
 - b. Could there be other use for some library space?
 15. Should there be a central campus faculty office building?
 16. Can data be provided about how much space departments will need with the projected enrollment growth?
 - a. We have Joe Bilotta's model; Noel will plug in new figures
 - b. For classrooms not research, working on hiring a consultant for research needs
 17. We are trying to increase graduate student enrollment, but we don't have adequate space, and the space we do have is sub-par
 18. Identify the building footprints left on campus
 - a. H-wing of physics
 - b. Science library, between Benson and Math
 - c. East side of Engineering

- d. Lot 308
 - e. Telecomm and Euclid Autopark were designed to add a level between
 - f. Sewall field
 - g. Sites that need major redevelopment
 - i. Powerhouse, ENVD, Music
 - ii. Fleming needs to be considered
19. of The College of Engineering and Applied Science has a long-term strategic goal to move to new buildings on East Campus
20. Places on the margins of buildings where they can be enlarged – Education
21. What is the chance of demolishing some buildings rather than renovating them?
- a. Hard to answer because you have to balance historical needs with new needs
 - b. Also difficult because you need to find a place for those programs to ‘live’ until the new space is built
 - c. Ideally, move a department out to East Campus and then re-purpose the existing buildings
22. Are there any new major projects approved for main campus?
- a. Aerospace addition to the Discovery Learning Center – 75,000 GSF
 - b. JILA Addition
 - c. IBS
 - d. No approved program plans for new academic programming
 - e. Under consideration: Fleming, Music/Arts Venue
 - f. Renovations of Ketchum, Ekeley, Hellems and Guggenheim
 - g. Send a link to the quarterly report:
<http://fm.colorado.edu/planning/quarterlyreport/documents/QuartReport-10-09-RS-FINAL.pdf>
23. What is the plan for Grandview area?
- a. Initially was planned to be a dense research area, now that is moved out to East Campus
 - b. Conference Center?
 - i. Would likely go in the North of Boulder Creek area
 - ii. Entitlement issues on Grandview make it difficult to mass renovate
24. Will East Campus be strictly planned for anything in particular?
- a. Perhaps some members should serve on both committees
 - b. Consider East Campus as more accessible to the community
 - i. For example, moving Henderson out to EC would hit two birds with one stone, more community involvement, free up space on campus
 - c. EC classes should be scheduled 30-minute lag of main campus schedule
 - d. Performing arts center on EC because of accessibility?
 - i. Anxiety about splitting up music dept
25. There will be a reluctance to splitting departments
26. Is the Colorado Research Diamond still a workable concept?
- a. As partnerships yes but, resources do not exist to build separate property and facilities
27. What do the students need?
- a. Student service offices, how these services are delivered, outreach and engagement
 - b. Group study/work space
 - c. Norlin Commons always crowded
 - d. Overnight needs
 - e. Norlin Renaissance is focusing more on including group space
 - f. Math library almost always empty

28. Our campus may start to look more like UC-Denver, more like a commuter campus, if so we will need more group space and space where students can stay on campus all day
29. North Campus @ Gunbarrel? Spread out for better accessibility to the community rather than increase to undesirable density
30. Year-long learning was not well received, however there are opportunities to start increasing enrollment in the summer more
31. Online delivery of information can free up classroom space
 - a. For example meet 1 day/week rather than 3 days/week, other 2 days will be online
32. Discussion between computer labs vs laptop areas
33. Request for new CIO of IT come talk to the group
34. Core campus seems crowded to the point of dangerous
 - a. Multiple accidents from intermodal conflicts; No tracking of near misses or accidents between bikes and peds, skateboards and peds, etc
 - b. This could be a result of construction
 - c. Once projects are completed, traffic flow will be eased
 - d. Thinking about a perimeter service vehicle road
35. Is there a cap on how dense main campus can get?
 - a. No cap
 - b. Should there be?
 - c. Campus is at a tipping point where capacity has been reached
36. Connectivity between campuses
37. In the last 2 years we have increased by 1000 students but it feels like a lot more
 - a. If we are planning on increasing 6000+ we are not ready
38. Snapshot of enrollment numbers
 - a. Growth of 5,000 students, 2500 undergrad, 2500 grad students
 - b. Also consider the desire for more grad and international students as expressed by Chancellor DiStefano in the State of the Campus address last week
39. Can we physically fit more students in existing facilities?
 - a. Move some core classrooms to disperse walking and density
 - b. When a room has 49+ students you must have 2 doors, because of this there is an inadequate number of 50-100 people classrooms
 - c. Operating time from 8-5, look at extending weekdays and into weekends?
 - d. Desire for a state-of-the-art theatre style facility for teaching a class of 800-1000
 - i. w/ back of seat screens
 - e. Are there any studies from other schools about how effective this learning climate is?
 - i. AAU Peers
40. Is there one single entity scheduling classes?
 - a. Yes, central scheduling
41. Who mediates conflicts for classroom requests?
 - a. Bill Kaempfer

Five areas were identified for more in depth analysis and member interest:

- Efficiency in space utilization: space planning principles, classrooms, labs, venues, libraries, staff needs, etc. (Keith, Noel)
- Moving beyond existing to new space and renovation by location; What we have vs. what we want to have: EC, GV, Conference Center (JoAnn, John, Kambiz)

- **Delivery of education:** Class schedules, class sizes, summer delivery, facilitate commuter students, on-line delivery (Armando, Bill Kaempfer)
- **Student Services:** Group study, space needs, interaction w/ living-learning group (Deb Coffin, Dennis Russell)
- **Academic/Research futures:** research, teaching, better models, student learning

ACTION ITEM: Phil and Keith will order the topics into meeting dates and identify Subject Matter Experts for each

NEXT MEETING: Monday, October 26, 10-12 UMC 415-417