

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
September 4, 2007
Indiana Memorial Union Oak Room
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Moya Andrews, Jack Bielasiak, James Biles, Lisa Bingham, Julianne Bobay, Stephen Burns, James Capshaw, John Carini, Andrea Ciccarelli, Angela Courtney, Diane Dallis, Joseph DeJean, Paul Eisenberg, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Pat Foster, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Robert Hatten, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Brian Horne, Kevin Hunt, Owen Johnson, Lloyd Kolbe, David Mackay, Eric McPhail, Valerie Markley, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, John Paolillo, James Perry, Lisa Pratt, Diane Reilly, Jennifer Riley, Paul Rohwer, John Scott, Jeanne Sept, Robert Shakespeare, Richard Shockley, Sarita Soni, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, David Waterman, Susan Whiston, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Matt Jarson for W. T. Wright

MEMBERS ABSENT: Eric Arnold, Aurelian Craiutu, James Drummond, Jeremy Engle, Robert Eno, Csilla Kajtar, DeWitt Kilgore, Christina Kuzmych, Brian O'Donnell, Mike Robinson, Alex Tanford, Robert Terrill

GUESTS: John Applegate (President's Office), Bennett Bertenthal (Dean of COAS), Roland Cote (Registrar), Patrick Murray (Bureau of Facilities), Greg Peters (Mathematics), Sue Talbot (Trustee), Mike Carson (Registrar), Erika Knudsen (Registrar), JoEllen Baldwin (Space Management), Tom Swafford (Space Management), Laurie Antolović (OVPIT), Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Steve Hinnefeld (Herald Times) Roger Thompson (Enrollment Management), Becky Alvarez-Valentine (Registrar), Nancy Gambrell (Registrar), Beverly Teach (OVPIT), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council) Robin Murphey (Faculty Council), Lebo Molefi (Faculty Council), Charles Frederick (Student Academic Center)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

March 20, 2007: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/minutes/03.20.07.htm>

April 3, 2007: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/minutes/04.03.07.htm>

2. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)

(Professor Lisa Pratt)

Circular B1-2008 <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B1-2008.xls>

Circular B2-2008 <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B2-2008.xls>

Circular B3-2008 <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B3-2008.pdf>

3. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)
(Provost Hanson)

4. Question / Comment Period* (5 minutes)
(Provost Hanson and Professor Lisa Pratt)

5. Condition and Capacity of Bloomington Classrooms. Presentation and discussion (45 minutes).
(Roland Coté, Registrar; Greg Peters, Senior Lecturer Mathematics, Beverly Teach, Co-Chair of Classroom Committee and Manager Classroom Technology Services)

6. Brief recess (5 minutes).

7. Condition and Capacity of Bloomington Classrooms. Presentation and discussion (50 minutes).
(Charles Frederick, Director Student Academic Center, Bennett Bertenthal, Dean of the College; Patrick Murray, Director Bureau of Facilities, Programming, and Utilization)

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HANSON: The first order of business is the approval of minutes. There are two sets of minutes; one from March 20th, 2007 and one from April 3rd, 2007. Did you look at them? They are online. Is there a motion to approve?

JOHNSON: I move that they be approved.

HANSON: Second?

CICCARELLI:

HANSON: Thank you Andrea. All in favor? ... ["aye"]. All opposed?

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

HANSON: Agenda Committee Business, Lisa.

PRATT: Well, let me just start with a brief welcome to the new and returning members of the Bloomington Faculty Council and let me introduce some new and wonderful favorite old faces that are up here at the front table; Provost Karen Hanson. I almost think a round of applause because it's such an exciting time, if you'll join me in welcoming her. Let me introduce also so that you can put faces with names and those that are not seated at the front table I am going to ask them to stand and face you so you know who they are. The Agenda Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council for the upcoming year; Julie Bobay, Laura Ginger, Herb Terry; Herb if you can just make yourself conspicuous, Kevin Hunt whose standing and Alex Tanford who—Alex are you in here? Well, Alex is somewhere. Perhaps the face that is least familiar to

you but someone you will come to know well is sitting on my left and that is Craig Dethloff. Craig can you wave or stand up? As some of you will know, Kelly Kish was spirited away to the President's Office this summer and we thought we would not be able to quickly find a replacement and we consider it an extraordinary gift that Craig was in the area, was interested in the position and he has done as you will know from the mailings you've been receiving, he has done a remarkable job stepping up and understanding the system with the help of Lebo who I don't know if she's in the room and Robin who is here. Both Robin and Lebo, you will know from last year, they have gotten Craig connected, up and running and with a lot of phone calls to Kelly. I think we are in good shape for the coming year.

We the elected members of the BFC in my mind really are the conscience of the university in helping the President and the Board of Trustees to make wise decisions on a broad range of complex issues that impact the academic mission of Indiana University. In the coming year we will assess the condition and capacity of our classrooms, we will evaluate the impact of changing admission standards, we will monitor the development of the general education requirements and we will work with President McRobbie and Provost Hanson to clarify their emerging roles as the leaders of the Bloomington campus. I ask you the members of the BFC, both faculty, students, staff and administrative, to stay focused on the centrality of education and scholarship in our institution as we see state support decline in proportion to other avenues of funding. We are members of the BFC during a time of administrative transformation in Bloomington and our energies and talents are needed more than ever to guide long term planning for this great university. I will close my brief remarks from the Agenda Committee with the now immortal words of a former President to me this morning who said "the turnover everywhere seems so complete and positive that little as I normally regret having good reason to be absent from a BFC meeting, this time I'm sorry that I won't be there to join you"; Bob Eno. So if Bob is looking forward to BFC meetings this year, I think we can hope for a high attendance.

You will notice that we have changed locations in an effort to find a room that is easier for everyone in the room to see the speakers and hear the speakers. I regret that we end up with a rank in file ordering rather than a round table but it simply was impossible to really feel that people were staying connected with the program in the other room. Also this room allows us to far more easily have beverages in the room and allows for a secret escape route through the back door. If you, like I always did, arrive late and don't want to have to make your way through the entire assembled masses. So I think you'll enjoy this room. We are here for all but one or two of our meetings?

DETHLOFF: Our next session is going to be in State Room East.

PRATT: And that was simply because we were not able to notify the union soon enough of our intentions but please let us know if you would prefer to go back to Ballantine and not have coffee, tea, popcorn and beverages and a five minute break. But in the meanwhile we will try this and see how it works and see if it makes it easier to have everybody's energy stay up for the two hours. That's it.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HANSON: Thanks Lisa. I want to say that I am grateful for your welcome to me. It has been a long time since I've been on the Faculty Council. I sort of gauge it by my children's age. It has been over a decade now while they have been growing up and I have been declining I guess. But it is great to be back. I know many of you. I don't know absolutely all of you. It's probably the younger ones that I don't know. I am really looking forward to this. The Faculty Council is crucial to getting the faculty view about so many of the changes that are happening on campus and I intend to make the best use of this wonderful resource that I can.

I don't have a lot of business to discuss today. In fact, one of the things that I wanted to mention is that the State of Campus Affairs speech, which is traditional for the Provost or Chancellor at some point early on in the Faculty Council meeting, has been postponed by mutual agreement. Lisa proposed this and I leaped at it because I have only been in office a month. And it would make a lot more sense for me to do this at the beginning of next term, when I really could say something that might be more useful.

I do have a couple of announcements to make today though. They have to do with interim appointments and search and screen committees. Jean C. Robinson, professor of Political Science, has been appointed Interim Dean of the Hutton Honors College, the position that I had previously. Many of you know Jean. She has a terrific career in political science as an award winning teacher and an active researcher. And she has served as Director of Women's Studies and Dean of Women's Affairs in the past. And she is presently remaining on for half-time as director of graduate studies in political science. But she is just coming off a stint as Director of Undergraduate Studies. She is very interested in undergraduate affairs and the Honors College. She's worked on a number of initiatives in the Honors College in the last few years, when I have been there, and I know that her involvement pre-dated my arrival there. So I was delighted that she agreed to take up that post.

I also am delighted that Catherine Pilachowski has taken on the Office of Women's Affairs Deanship on an interim basis. She has been very active in that office in the last few years in the Women in Science Program. She intends to continue that. She is of course a distinguished researcher as well, and presently and I think still continuing to serve as chair of Astronomy. She has spent more than 20 years on the scientific staff of the National Optical Astronomy Observatory before she came here. She has done wonderful things on this campus since she arrived. Again, I feel very fortunate that she agreed to do this.

Both Jean and Katy, as I say, are taking this on an interim basis for this year. We are forming search and screen committees, internal search and screen committees, within the next couple of months to search for permanent people for these deanships. And they are of course people who might be candidates for these positions. The nominating committee here has been helpful in supplying names and we will get other names and announce when those committees when they are ready to roll out. I think that is all the business that I wanted to announce today, though.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

PRATT: We do have in the agenda time for questions or comments. I don't think that the office received anything by email from the rest of the faculty. Did you see anything? I did not see anything.

HANSON: I did not get anything.

PRATT: I will pause for a moment if there is anybody in the room who has a burning question to ask. Otherwise, I think will move along because we have a packed program today. Good.

AGENDA ITEM #5: CONDITION AND CAPACITY OF BLOOMINGTON CLASSROOMS (PART I)

PRATT: We have with us a number of guests who have kindly agreed to help facilitate the discussion. The first topic is the Condition and Capacity of Bloomington Classrooms. Roland Cote is here, Greg Peters. Roland is of course the registrar, Greg Peters senior lecturer in mathematics, Beverly Teach, co-chair of Classroom Committee and the manager of classroom technology services. Did you folks want to speak in that order?

COTE: We decided to reorder the.....

PRATT: I might have known there would be a rebellion within the ranks, if we set an order.

MURRAY: I think its Bev, myself, and You want us to...

PRATT: Patrick, I think if youprimarily we do not have amplification but we are recording in order to transcribe notes. So if you will speak from the podium that will help us save your words.

MURRAY: Well I don't have the loudest voice so this can remind me that I need to speak up.

PRATT: And perhaps we should introduce you.

MURRAY: An introduction my name is Patrick Murray, I am the Director of the Bureau of Facilities Programming and Utilization, what that means is I am involved with helping, in terms of the programming, helping define functions or use of new space that we develop on campus. In terms of the utilization, my office keeps track of the official inventories of all of the space, building inventory and lease space that the university owns, and all of the floor plans. We hold the official floor plans for the university. My job is actually, I don't know that much about it. My staff are the experts in this, but we do keep up to minute, nearly, up to the week inventories of floor plans. If you have ever gotten, as a department chair, an inventory to fill out, it came from my office and so that might be your annual contact with my office.

One of the things that you have before you today is a chart that looks like this. This is my take-away for you today. This chart illustrates classroom use after the first drop and add sessions in the fall. What we do is to take, after drop and add, we take information from the registrar's office. We match it up to our building inventory for classroom space and we generate this chart.

This chart shows classroom use over the course of a typical week. And as you can see, there are from about 9:30 on, the line is pretty near to the top of the chart, especially for Monday through Thursday. Friday is a different story and that might be something that becomes a topic of conversation later. I could get into a lot of detail about how we arrive at these numbers but it probably, present benefit the conversation at this time. This chart talks about our auditorium or lecture hall classrooms, regular classrooms, and seminar space. It does not address class labs or other kinds of laboratory classrooms. These are registrar controlled classrooms. We have another chart that shows all classrooms. There are probably a 100 or more departmentally controlled classrooms that we do not have the same kind of data for just because we don't have the same--the same type of information is not reported to the registrar so it doesn't get passed on to us. In terms of understanding how well the classrooms are used, you only need to take a look at each bar graph. You can see that by 9:30 on most days, nearly every one of the classrooms is in use. It will stay in use until mid- to late-afternoon. There is a drop off at 5:30, so between that 9 to 5 period of time, our classrooms are well-used. In fact they are so well used that they exceed our own level of optimization. We need to schedule some classroom openings for maintenance, for repair of technology, to clean the rooms and do those sorts of things. We are approaching a level where we do not have time to take care of the classrooms on a daily basis.

I don't know if there are any questions that you might have concerning this chart. Yes.

THEOBALD: For example at 10 o'clock, does this say, take Wednesday the gray bar in the middle, that there are less than 120 classes in session between 10 and 10:30 on campus?

MURRAY: That particular period of time and Roland is sort of chuckling about it, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday is a different schedule than Tuesday and Thursday and there is a period of time where the class--the pass time between classes is extended so that the class start dates, or start times line up better. So that gap in the data is anomaly due to an extended class period time, class passing time.

THEOBALD: But it seems that we are using too many 50 classes between 9:30 and 10:00 and then the rest of the half...

MURRAY: It's an anomaly in the data and Roland can speak to it.

COTE: I can do it now or I can...

MURRAY: Or you can do it later. But...

COTE: Basically, if you look at our standard meeting times they are at 8:00, 9:05, and 10:10 on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. We have a growing group of classes being taught 75-minutes Monday, Wednesday, which means their standard time would be 8:00 – 9:15, 9:30 – 10:45. So if you take the snapshot at 10:00, this is a point in time at 10:00am, these are the number of rooms being used because the Wednesday 50 minute period at 10 o'clock, this is the passing period. It's the point in time. I will address this a little more when I speak.

MURRAY: In order for us to put everyday on the same chart, there are a few anomalies that show up. If we had one chart for the 50 minute class schedule and another one for the 75, you would see that the classrooms are optimally used across that time period. It is when we put the two charts together, try to marry the two charts that we had these anomalies crop up in the presentation. There is a question here and then one over there.

GROTH: Is the data made available to look at on a sort of a real time basis? So as our faculty our filling up a classroom, they are always saying geez is there another room available and then we have to go to somebody, who calls somebody, and then the answer comes back as no. But I would think that if this data was accessible then you would be able to portray to the faculty why some sense that their request really can't possibly be satisfied.

MURRAY: This particular chart is a once a year snapshot. Roland can probably speak better to the scheduling issue—scheduling question than I can. What I do, or what my office does is we pull the data together partly as a function of our reporting requirements to the state. We report on a bi-annual basis the usage of all of the space that the university has. Part of that usage is classrooms. We do not report it at this level of detail. We give them a broad general summary number along with all the classifications of use that we have, so that information goes to the state. Yes, question here.

MACKAY: Do you have an idea as to whether non-registered controlled rooms are used more likely and what determines the control of a room?

MURRAY: Good question. We do not know. We get our information from the Registrar's Office. We do not physically check the room. So I don't know in terms of if Chemistry has a room that's under their departmental control, I do not know what the intensity of use of that room is. And I don't know that if anybody except for Chemistry does. Not to pick on Chemistry. Yes.

TERRY: Answer the second question: what determines whether the room is controlled by the Registrar or some other entity?

MURRAY: That's a good question and I don't know what the answer to that is. And I think-- there is Tom Swafford.

SWAFFORD: I'll take that question. There are very few classrooms, seminar rooms controlled by departments. Most of them that are controlled have been there for a long period of time. We do not assign new classrooms, seminar rooms to the department. Also, I look at the data every fall, when we get the utilization report. If we find a room, that has poor utilization; either myself or JoEllen goes out and looks at the room to find out why. If it is a department controlled room, then we have a conversation with the department. And typically what they do, is suppose to open them up to the registrars office, once they schedule the classes for the department. And I hate to disagree with you but I don't think that we have a 100 of them out there. But there is actually very few, a lot of them have some specialized equipment in them too. That also is the reason departments control them. But typically, if we find a room that is not well utilized, it is usually a condition of the room, could be the location of the room, or a very specialized room.

PRATT: Tom if you don't think it's a hundred, do you have a stab of what it is?

SWAFFORD: No but I can find out. I can send it to you.

PRATT: Thank you.

TEACH: Patrick does the hundred, the teaching labs, and the 110s and 220s.

MURRAY: It would be the 210s and 220s. It will be....

TEACH: There might be a hundred of those.

MURRAY: There most likely not 110s.

SWAFFORD: No I was referring to the 110s.

MALE VOICE: What's a 110?

TEACH: That's jargon.

MURRAY: A 110 is a—to fill you in little bit on our jargon; 110a is a lecture hall or auditorium. It's a large classroom most likely it is tiered. A 110b is a general purpose classroom. It is the bulk of the classroom space that we have on campus. A 110c is a seminar room. Those are the three categories of classroom that are on this chart. It doesn't cover any other kind of labs or space other than that.

ROHWER: Sorry to interrupt, I have a different question for you. And we are going to talk very specifically about the language classes in Ballantine on the second floor. I want to know how many chairs are in the room and how well they are matched up with the cap on the course size that are in that room. Because John just walked in and he described a problem to me with the German department does. They have to take the chairs out of the room in order to form a circle and each night the maintenance staff come back and prorate the file system. And so you are in the room, Tom's in the room so lets solve the problem.

COTE: We will address that a little later.

MURRAY: That was an issue that Bev was going to speak to specifically.

ROHWER: Do you keep track of the number of chairs in the classroom?

MURRAY: Pardon.

ROHWER: Do you keep track of the number of chairs?

MURRAY: I have in our inventory what the number of seats should be in that classroom.

ROHWER: How often do you count them?

MURRAY: We do not.

TEACH: Building services counts them and puts them back in some linear array, either every night or every weekend. I don't know the timeline on it, but they do keep track of how many chairs are supposed to be in the classroom.

ROHWER: So building services has the number.

MURRAY: That's generally known information. In fact, some classrooms might have that number on the wall on a placard.

TEACH: There should be a plaque in the room.

SCOTT: Rooms are marked with maximum capacity.

MURRAY: Yeah

SCOTT: It is more a matter of it's maximum capacity from an equal pedagogical methods, where everyone is sitting in exact 90 degree arrays.

MURRAY: Kind of like this.

SCOTT: As opposed to anything that is actually functional for communications with your students.

MURRAY: Well Ballantine was built in the middle ages, I believe so. [Laughter] Appropriate architecture for that period of time. Ballantine was built in 1959.

HANSON: Thanks Patrick. You folks were making your own order here was it Beverly-- Beverly Teach, co-chair of the Classroom Committee and Manager of Classroom Technology Services. Thanks Patrick.

TEACH: I co-chair the Bloomington Classroom Committee with Hank Hewetson, who now has a very official title, Assistant Vice-President for Facility Operations. And he is head of the Physical Plant as well. So the two of us partner this, and we took over from Sonya Johnson, who was the Director of the Bureau of Facilities, which is now Patrick's position, and Gary Kent, who was Director of the Physical Plant. And we have been doing this together for probably 8 or 9 years now. The Bloomington Classroom Committee focuses on classroom management issues, so we review requests for physical, functional, and technology changes in classrooms, and we are supposed to take a leadership role in creating a list of renovation priorities. We have representatives on our committee from the Bloomington Faculty Council. Tom Gieryn has represented you all very well the last few years. We have people from the Office of Registrar, the Bureau Facilities, Physical Plant, Space Management, the Architects Office, and University

Information Technology Services. If something comes, if you want to do anything in a classroom, we don't tell you how to teach, but if something needs to be done in a classroom, it generally finds its way to our committee. So we are responsible for figuring out how these classrooms can be refurbished. Overtime, we hope that they get painted; we hope that the projection screens work; we hope the chalkboards are able to be written upon; we like chair rails so that the chairs don't mess up the walls. If you can't project something because there are no blinds or shades on the windows, we hope to make that right. We hope to improve the lighting in these rooms. Over the course of these last few years, aside from buildings that have actually been renovated, in some period of time like the Student Building, and Swain East, and Rawles, and I know that has not been really, in the last few years, but in terms of renovation, they are rescinding renovated from our point of view. But Ballantine has been painted and there are new shades on them. Sycamore Hall has been painted and has new blinds. And I am not all trying to say that these are model classrooms that we would to have today. But they are the classrooms that we have and so we try to keep them up as well as we can because they are what we have. We get involved in renovation and in new classroom construction or design when we in fact--and we haven't had one of these for awhile, have a new building that actually has one of these general purpose classrooms in it. We have over the last few years been able to actually renovate about 15 of the auditoriums on this campus. In the 1999 to 2002 or 3, there actually were some repair and rehabilitation dollars that we were able to allocate to classrooms and so we renovated rooms like Woodburn 120 and Woodburn 100 and 101. If you have been here a long time and seen those classrooms in the past, they may not look that great now but they looked really worse before we started. If there are new construction projects, the people from the committee serve on various design development committees so that we can put forth, what we think classrooms should be, and we get that information actually from feedback from you folks.

There are things that are beyond our scope, so if you have a room that is really, really hot. If the heating doesn't work in the winter, if the air conditioning doesn't work in the summer, if the roof leaks, those are all major maintenance kinds of issues that are beyond the scope of the Classroom Committee. We try to deal with furniture. Furniture in classrooms is a very hard issue to deal with. If we need new moveable furniture, I know, I know tablet arm chairs are not the seat of choice but they are what fit in these fully packed rooms, and the ones that we have had forever are too small for the student body today. So we work with space management and we have been over the last few years been able to slowly replace some of the older smaller ones for ones that have articulating backs and a little bigger tablet and a little bit more space between the back chair, which I certainly could use too. We all know that you want tables and chairs and we will talk about that in just a bit.

Fixed seating we can sometimes do through our committee or through other repair and rehabilitation dollars. So this past summer, we were able to replace the seats in Ballantine 109 which were old wooden seats. We replaced the seats and did other work in Ballantine 310, which was about one of the worse rooms on campus. We will be replacing the seats in Ballantine 013 sometime this year as time allows.

Another thing, maybe one of the more important things although keeping the rooms sort of in working order is important, is that we try to do planning. In 1999, we came up with a 10 year plan for classrooms for renovation and for technology installation. And it worked hand and hand

with the IT strategic plan to some degree and so we had hoped that by 10 years, so 2009, we would have some level of technology in some of the rooms and that no room would be below what we thought would be the absolute minimum. We have actually made a lot of progress on that. We also wrote a model classroom description so that when something new came up or we were able to fully renovate a room, we would have standards by which either the architects office here and physical plant, or external architects would follow that we think represent your needs.

When we thought that we were going to have a lecture hall, we developed--we created a small pre-design team, where about 5 or 6 of us went out and looked at many, many of the classrooms and the good points and the bad points, and we had focus group meetings with different faculty groups. We came up with a very revised model classroom description that tries to address the kind of things that you want. You want more space in classrooms. You want to be able to have tables and chairs. You want them to move. You want to be able to divide into groups. You want to be able to show two images at the same, two different images at the same time. You want more front space, you want more side space, if there is away to have some kind of chalk mark boards on the sidewalls. You would like your groups to do all sorts of things. So we took this to heart and so our new model description is about as long and addresses this many things. We haven't actually been able to use it in Bloomington yet. We are hoping someday that we will be able to do that.

In terms of the technology in classrooms, we started out in 1999, 49 of our 260 some classrooms that had some level of fixed technology in them, meaning a data, a video projector, and a computer and a way for you to control that. We had hoped to have 30 percent of the classrooms done, but time in terms of the cost of these components going and your demand really going up for the use of this and our inability to have enough people to roll everything around and get it around to you when you wanted it, and not being able to just have you call us up 5-minutes before and have it there. All of that went into our really intense efforts to get more fixed technology in more classrooms. So over the last 15 months, we have installed fixed technology in 93 classrooms, which is from my point of view an incredible amount of work, and I can't say enough for physical plant who had to do all the infrastructure and UITS telecommunications who ran new data and voice wires, and the electronics group in physical plant, and my own staff, who got quite a system going. So there are now may be 35 classrooms that have no technology permanently installed. They all have overhead transparency projectors that some of you really still like to use and that's okay. They have TV's and VCR/DVD combo units, but they...we hoped to by January to have another 10 or 12 done and that will basically it. The rooms that remain are very poor physically; like they have a column in the middle of the room, or they are L shaped and the L is at the back, or they are used for purposes that don't use any technology. So for now we are not doing those, but we now have 235 of our 270 classrooms that have either...that have at least one data/video projector, at least one computer, the ability to hookup a laptop, the ability to bring some other AV device in and hook that up, the ability to show a DVD or a VCR and it has a sound system and it has a control system. Some of them also have document cameras, some of them not many of them here have more than one projector, the rooms simple aren't large enough for us to do that. So the issues that we have are in fact access to these rooms to be able to maintain both the physical-ness of the room and all of this technology, we have just put in. And that can be as simple as changing the lamp that has blown

and we need to try to get in there in the 15 minutes between classes or fixing something else complicated than that.

And the other issue that we have is what was brought up about the classes on the second floor of Ballantine that have 30 to 35 seats in them. We won't get into all the technicalities of this but in all of the work and research that we have done, we have come up with the figure 20%. And that means that if in fact, you just had enough seats to do your--to put your seats in a circle or we were able to replace the tablet armchairs with small tables, individual student tables and chairs that could be rearranged however, which gets into a whole different set of problems when the class before you has arranged it in some way you don't want it to be, but we won't go there. We lose 20% of the capacity of the room, so our 268 or 70 classrooms have probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 15600 seats or something like that. So if we cut 20% of those out, we need at least 3000 more seats and when we do these complicated analyses that have formulas, we had to explain to ourselves a lot. In 2004, when we looked at this and said okay we don't want, we want the amount of room to increase and we are expecting that there will be this much use in the room and on and on, we were 4000...well we were actually 23 or 6 thousand, 2600 seats short, and that didn't...that assumed that we would get the lecture hall and that we would get a couple other renovations done. And I don't know what assumptions we can make today, but to be able to do the kind of things you want, we simply don't have enough spaces to reduce the size of classrooms to be able to do the kind of teaching that you all are hoping to do these days.

HANSON: Question or two? Herb

TERRY: It looks like something happened; in February of 2009, it looks like NTSC analog television technology will sunset and you are nodding like you know what this is. Basically, how are we going to handle that?

TEACH: Good question. It is a really good question. I don't know what it will really mean for us, quite frankly. And all of us are wondering this very question, my colleagues at other institutions are wondering how we go to high definition or how we go to 16*9 versus 4*3. On new things, we are putting wider screens. You know the 4*3 is your little TV and the 16*9 is the widescreen image and so we are putting in wider screens, when we are starting out new. Even if we are not going to have something that is a native 16*9 right now, you are just going to get white on the sides for now. Its going to be a long time to convert everything or I saw Laurie Antolović here or Laurie, I need lots more money.

TERRY: What do you mean by a long time?

TEACH: Well I mean it took us this long to get all of these rooms in. There are very few native 16*9 projectors. You can't buy them yet, and everything we now have in the classroom actually has a life cycle so projectors are on a 3 or 4 year life-cycle, depending on when we bought them and if we bought an extra years warranty. Computers are on the same 3 to 4 year life-cycle. VCRs will go away someday, but there are a lot of VHS tapes in the library that faculty use and so eventually something will have to be addressed in that regard. DVD players are consumables these days. Are we going to go to Blu-ray or whatever? Some faculty want more document

cameras, so need to think of how we might deploy those. These are issues and so we would be happy to talk with you about them.

HANSON: We are treading on a tight schedule, like to thank Beverly. We have a couple other folks who wanted to make presentations and then we can have broader discussions, Roland Cote the Registrar.

COTE: Thank you. I am here to validate your perceptions of the current classroom situation on campus with some information, some data, that I would like to put out for all of you. And explain how we have derived the data. We're talking about 262 general classrooms. These are the rooms that are scheduled by the Office of the Registrar. We break those down into 4 categories, very similar to what Patrick alluded to earlier, but we make a finer distinction when we talk about large classrooms. Or 4 categories are: auditoria, these are largely stepped or sloped rooms with fixed sitting. We have 35 of those with capacities of 90 to 424 in Woodburn; Large classrooms ranging in size from 58 to 89. We have 40 of those; Other general classrooms ranging in size from 14 to 57, we have 161. This is our largest base of classrooms. And the size range is from 14 to 57; And then we have category of seminar rooms. We have 26 of those. And they range in size from 10 to 34. That is the inventory, that's the classroom inventory that we work with when we schedule classes. We have in all of those classrooms 15,720 seats. Simply speaking at any given time, we could put 15,720 students in a seat in class that sounds impressive. Pretty good. Our total enrollment last fall, 2006, was 38,247. That means that we have an average of .41 seats per student. There are research reports and national standards that would set that standard at .75 per student. We are at .41. I think we got a picture. It is getting tight.

We have some data to pass around or a graphic, which I am going to speak to next. We have. In order to overcome, actually, Neil you couldn't have asked a better question. In order to overcome, the problem that Neil presented with a point in time of how many classrooms are being used. We looked at each individual class segment. A segment--if a class meets for 50 minutes, Monday, Wednesday, Friday then that class we counted as 65 minutes Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, because each class must have a 15 minute passing time for students to be able to move among the rooms, instructors to be able to move among the rooms and among the buildings. Alright so we basically have--what you have in front of you is a graph that shows the actual minutes available and used each day. I have selected five buildings for this illustration. We have probably about 20 buildings in the inventory, but these five buildings represent about 63, well they represent 63% of all the classrooms. The classrooms in these 5 buildings represent 63%. It is a fairly representative group and at 63% of all classrooms that are scheduled by the registrar. The seats in these 5 buildings, there are 9900 which represents, again 63% of all seats available on campus. The other thing that we have done with this, we are concentrating on 9 to 5. I have data for the other time periods as well, but really, we have talked about prime time as being 9:30 to 2:30, well that is a myth. 9 to 5 is when we are scheduling classes. People still want 9:30 to 2:30 but we are scheduling throughout the day, throughout the daytime hours of 9 to 5.

Take a look at the graph. The black line going across all bars is the weekly utilization of all classrooms. We are using classrooms 77% of the time during the 9 to 5 period. Take a look at the red line. This line is debatable but based on research and accepted standards, an acceptable

standard for daytime usage would be 67%. Feeling it? Believe me, we feel it everyday. There are some, if you look at the graph again, some of the highs Ballantine Hall on Monday and Wednesday, particularly on Wednesday, 90% used. What's the problem? Hey, that's great. Looks great doesn't it, really, really effective use of classrooms. Well, where is the flexibility? How do you go in and change a light bulb? How do you rearrange furniture? How do you put it back to where it was? How do you take a room out of service to paint it, to put in new equipment? There is really no room for any play. This is pure. The reason that it is not going to 100%, one of the reasons that it doesn't go to 100% is because we have two standard time slots. Monday, Wednesday, Friday 50-minutes or Tuesday, Thursday 75-minutes, but we now have a third Monday, Wednesday 75-minutes, and we have got a whole slew of non-standard times because the instructor only wants to teach once a week or for several reasons there are non-standard times. Well those non-standard times, break or cause us to be unable to fill in the slots that are left open. It's the example that Neil came up with on Wednesday; why does it look like we are even using rooms at 10 o'clock on Wednesday's? That would have been my question. It should have been empty, but it's not because we have Monday, Wednesday 8:00 to 9:15 and 9:30 to 10:45 classes. Those are being counted at that point in time, but the standard meeting time of 9:05 ends at 9:55 and the next one starts at 10:10, so those classes that are meeting on the standard Monday, Wednesday, Friday timeline are not there. And to take that a little further. If a class meets from 8:00 to 9:15 and we follow-up and we are able to follow-up with a 9:30 to 10:45 that's very good, but sometimes we are not always able to follow-up with a 10:30, with a 9:30 to 10:45 and we end up with 8:00 to 9:15 and 10:10 to 11:00. There is a big break and it's totally a non-standard time, you can't put another class in there. So that's where we lose efficiency. That is why we are not at 100% in some of these rooms. If you look at room chart, if it were, I could show you a particular room. A weekly schedule for a particular room and it is full and what you see are little white spots here and there that can't be used.

People talk about using Friday. Well our average classroom utilization, Monday, or average... well actually let's look at 8 o'clock first that seems to be a more tolerable fall back. Our 8 o'clock usage Monday through Friday across all rooms is 38%, that's 8:00. We are using 38% of our rooms at 8:00 am. Actually in the School of Business at 8:00 am, that's the campus average 38%, if you look at certain buildings and you look at the School of Business at 8:00 am, they are using rooms 61% of the time.

Courses, this is just more data that we can refer to later if we need to. During a typical, well during the fall of 2006, we offered 4200 unique courses. We published 4200 courses in the time table. Some courses are single-section courses, some courses are multi-section courses. There are two types of multi-section courses. There are--the easy example would be English W131: English Composition. It is a single course, but there are about 90 different sections of it. Okay so that is a multi-section course. There is another type of multi-section course an example of that would be History H105, where we have a lecture that meets twice a week one section, and then we have 10 discussions to accompany that lecture. That's 11 sections. We are counting all those sections. We have to schedule a room for each of those 10 as well as for the lecture. So in Fall 2006, we offered about 4200 courses resulting in almost 9000 sections and of those 9000, we had to schedule rooms into about 4100. 4100 sections into the 262 rooms. Remember we are not counting the labs, the teaching labs the science labs, or any other departmental rooms that might be available. How do we do this? Well we do this with great difficulty. And those of you who

have been here at least 4 or 5 years, will remember in 2005, we failed. And we started classes without having to be able to assign all classes to a room that hasn't happened since then. It didn't happen in 2006 and it did not happen in 2007, and will hopefully never happen again.

We do this with the assistance of about 90 scheduling officers. Each school has a scheduling officer: Business, Informatics, Education. The scheduling officer is our point person. We had a question earlier about why I can't I go see online or I have to go see this person, who then goes to see this person, who then calls the registrar. The scheduling officer is our point person who basically puts requests together for that particular unit. It may be the School of Education or in the College, it may be one of the 55 different departments. We have a scheduling officer in each department and that scheduling officer has the responsibility to help us in consolidating departmental requests for rooms and scheduling. What are some of the challenges? I have already mentioned one. We have a mix of standard and non-standard times, which results in non-schedulable time slots. Those of you who have studied, actually this is one of those general information things. You have heard of the three colored puzzle, which is basically what we are playing with in scheduling classes. Trying to take...we have a classroom available classroom pool, we have the requests, and we are trying to put these pieces together so that there are no blank...so that the surface is full and no colors, no two colors are adjacent to each other. It's a real puzzle. It's a real puzzle.

So we have the creeping of Monday, Wednesday 75-minute classes, the mixing of Monday, Wednesday 75-minute with Monday, Wednesday, 50-minute classes, the increase as well in non-standard meeting times, and I could have planted the one comment earlier about the language class. Language class insists a particular language class will insist and there may be 10 or 15 sections, they will insist on a room for 35 and they are only going to enroll 20. Why do they want a room for 35, so that they can rearrange the chairs. So now we are not talking just about scheduling, we are also talking about actually, effectively, or efficiently using the space. We have a room that could have held 35 that is only going to have 20 in it. It has a maximum enrollment of 20 even though the room capacity is 35, but the chairs have to be rearranged so we can have students facing each other or all in a circle, another one of our challenges. We have very little and I think this chart illustrates that. We have virtually no flexibility for any kind of innovation. It is also very difficult. Innovation in delivering instruction. It is also very difficult to put on an experimental course, a new course. I just designed this course. We want to get 200 students in it. Please give me this room or a room like this, its brand new. And so we go ahead, fine, we will go ahead and schedule in a room for 250 and lo and behold 50 people show up. There is another missed opportunity for another large section that also wanted or was competing for that facility at the same time.

And Bev mentioned earlier the issue of physical maintenance, which has become very problematic over the last few years. That's the general picture without getting into anecdotes and other anecdotal type information. That is the general picture of where we are. I think you'll all agree, it really does validate how we feel about the lack of classrooms.

HANSON: Thanks Roland. I am sure you may have questions for Roland but we are going to try to stay on schedule so take a 5-minute break now. Just 5 minutes and come back and Bennett Bertenthal will be speaking. Everybody will stay here right?

COTE: Be glad to.

AGENDA ITEM #6: BRIEF RECESS

AGENDA ITEM #7: CONDITION AND CAPACITY OF BLOOMINGTON CLASSROOMS (PART II)

HANSON: We're trying to keep on a tight schedule. There are some sound problems here, so if you're speaking from the podium please speak up and if you're in the ranks here please stand when you want to make a comment because otherwise people are having difficulty recognizing where the murmurs are coming from. Thanks. Bennett Bertenthal, Dean of Arts and Sciences.

BERTENTHAL: Thank you. You've probably heard enough about seating capacity although I'm sure some of you would prefer to keep talking about it much longer. But I would like to talk about the complementary issue which is the quality of the space in which we are teaching students today. Most of my information comes from reports from faculty, observations of my own, tours that I've recently taken and I would say generally ethnographic recordings that I've been able to just put together in a very short period of time. This is going to be very brief, I have four points to make and I think that will be sufficient.

The first is that you've already heard the Bloomington Classroom Committee has a very limited fund and that really is going to limit how much they can do in any one year to fix classrooms, renovate them, bring them up to speed. But there is an even more serious problem because in addition to the fact that very few classrooms have been renovated in the last ten years, some of the most undesirable classrooms; classrooms where I don't think anybody would want teach if they had their choice or want to have a student have to sit in, are in buildings that are slated for renovation and what that means is that we can't even renovate the classrooms until the buildings are renovated. As a case in point we have the old theatre, we have classrooms in that theater which should require hardhats for students and teachers. It's just not a pretty site. It's also not a very comfortable place to be teaching or be a student. So in general there is a limited amount of money for renovating classrooms and some of the most serious problems cannot even be addressed because they are in buildings that need to be renovated.

The second point is that there are many lecture halls that are in need of renovation. The acoustic support, you've heard that the seats are uncomfortable and unlike classrooms, lecture halls require much more money to renovate and the number of lecture halls that have been renovated are few and far between. Very few have been renovated in the last ten years. Those that have been renovated are quite attractive and I think it's an advantage to those departments that can teach with renovated lecture halls.

The third point is that the principal mission of the college is to train the next generation of students to enter the work force. Some part of learning goes beyond just sitting in a classroom; it's learning by doing. This involves being able to participate in teaching labs; get your hands dirty. Most of these teaching labs are in science and technology but they are certainly not limited to science and technology. We have studio arts labs, we have language labs and almost all of

these labs are in serious need of renovation. As a case in point I took a tour of Jordan Hall recently. There I discovered that most of the labs would probably be places that Louis Pasteur would find pretty comfortable. They are really outdated and it's unclear whether the type of work that can be done there is going to provide students with the type of education they need to enter the work force. But it is not limited to science and technology labs; in the ____ building where we have six studio arts classrooms, the building looks more like a barn than a classroom or teaching lab. While I have heard that some faculty actually enjoy teaching in this environment, it's a very difficult place to try to entice students to come to. On a more personal note, I know from one of my own experiences, moving from a relatively old office to a brand new office, with state of the art facilities, that it makes a world of difference in your own ability to be an effective teacher and your ability to work with students and often to just get their respect and attention. So there is a lot at stake in trying to improve classrooms and teaching labs. There are many buildings that I haven't been in but I suspect the teaching labs in geology and chemistry certainly needs to be updated quite a bit as well.

I don't want to leave you with just bad news. So my fourth point is on a much more optimistic note and it is to talk about the new general classroom building that was just completed. This is the new building on Third Street and on the first floor we have a number of new teaching labs, one of which is for biotechnology. This is really state of the art. It is a beautiful lab, it has modern equipment and I think it's going to provide students with an opportunity to learn about biotechnology in a way that is going to make them much better prepared for going out and finding jobs because they have been in labs that are going to be much closer to the types of situations that they will enter either in going to graduate school or going into the world of work. These are buildings that are not very expensive, they are not very special but they are certainly very effective in providing the space and the facilities that are needed to ensure that we're meeting our mission of educating students and providing them with the skills they need to become the next generation work force. Thank you.

HANSON: Thanks Bennett. I think the next person is Chip Frederick, Director of Student Academic Center.

FREDERICK: I'm Chip Frederick, I direct the Student Academic Center. I'd like to thank Lisa for the opportunity to address the BFC concerning classroom and overall building conditions in one small corner of the Bloomington campus. I have a brief statement which I will read.

When I arrived at the SAC in 1999, it's safe to say that the Daniel Patrick Moynihan coined term "benign neglect" could characterize the state of the building at 316 North Jordan. Notwithstanding its prominent location at the corner of 7th and Jordan, directly next door to Admissions across the street from the Neal Marshall Center, little if anything had been done to repair, let alone enhance a building in which two classrooms are in almost constant use Monday through Friday from 8:30am to 5:00pm. During the 06-07 academic year, approximately 17,000 students, most of them first or second year undergraduates, took our courses for credit. Still more students avail themselves of our services, all of which are geared toward helping them become confident, self directed and internally motivated learners.

Since the year 2000, our services have increased, as have our student enrollments and the number of our student employees needing office space. At the same time, the amount of usable space in our building has declined due to a series of failures in both maintenance and repair. During that same period, several minor plumbing failures eventually led to a flood of raw sewage in our basement, depriving us of our chief storage area. We also lost the use of our third floor office space, big enough for 4 to 6 AIs, for lack of a fire escape.

Last academic year, a roof leak led to a partial ceiling collapse in the smaller of our classrooms and while the repair was made, the room is in still fairly rough condition. We have a significant amount of mud plaster in our building due to water damage from the failing room. So the partial ceiling collapse in the second floor office last week while an AI was seated at her desk was not a surprise. It was just the latest challenge for the students and the staff who use that building. When students visit our building, they are invariably greeted by a friendly helpful staff but they are also entering a building that is in substandard condition and increasingly inadequate to our needs. I continue to work with Jeanne Sept and Ray Smith in search of other appropriate space on campus and in addressing our building's pressing needs. I should add that Tom Swafford in Space Management, the physical plant, the operations staff and the custodial staff in our section of campus have been extremely helpful in addressing our concerns. Thank you.

HANSON: Thank you. Lastly Greg Peters from Math.

PETERS: I think Roland inadvertently hit on a problem that could become clear from a light hearted point of view. About fifteen years ago, the four color map problem was solved at the University of Illinois. The three color problem is impossible. [Laughter]

I would like to take a moment just to make sure we get some people involved in this. I think in all of the shortcomings we've heard about, and they are real, the staffing that works with scheduling people is superb. I think that's got to be taken back to every department on campus. The staff over at Franklin Hall; Nancy and Karen and Mira and Becky and Angie, do a marvelous job of working with departments to help assure that people get what they need and that needs to be put on the record.

About two years, I had to work with Bev. In about a 48 hour period of time, one of our new faculty had a severe carpal tunnel problem and writing with chalk actually became painful to David within about 24 hours, and Bev helped me get some marker space in a room that we could use temporarily, and then that December we got some permanent boards put in. So from a personal perspective, the people that we work with on this campus just do a marvelous job. I think there are two key factors that aren't going to go away, that are going to continue to add to this problem.

Our campus is going to stay about thirty nine thousand, thirty eight, four, five, six hundred. As part of our research mission, we develop new classes. We faculty are our own worst enemy in a scheduling way because we build and create new things to teach. We need to do this. Our department has created five new courses in the last four semesters and this fall our total enrollment is up about 400. So the old classes don't go away. There are those students that still

need our one and two hundred level classes and we have five new courses on top of that. Those new sections create an additional demand and that's just math, and we're doing it everywhere.

We have to come to grips with an increasing number of sections, a large student body, and no more new rooms. I think many of us like to use nonstandard teaching times. I think that's a personal issue and if it works best, we need to do that. But I think there are two areas that chairs and deans can take back to departments to try to encourage; we need to give some of our faculty, maybe the younger, the junior faculty, to teach eight o'clock classes. In the winter semester we need to teach some nine o'clock classes as well and we need to get people to recognize that the decision for scheduling, for example in September, doesn't take place in July. It's awkward in a large campus but people have to make serious decisions about what we would like to do in September, the previous November. And it's awkward sometimes, I have a very very fortunate time teasing my colleagues sometimes when they talk about changes in May and June about "sure we can do that in May or June the next year", and they understand. But I think sometimes in some departments trying to make eleventh hour decisions and changes creates havoc. If more people can be aware that decisions for September take place the preceding November or December, I think that would help a lot of scheduling officers and if we can get people to be a little more flexible in teaching throughout the day, I think it would open up an enormous number of classrooms and give us a little bit of greater flexibility. That flexibility that was alluded to that we really don't have, and it's true. Thanks very much.

HANSON: Again, all of these folks are staying and I think Tom and JoEllen are still back there.

PRATT: Tom Swafford had to leave. JoEllen is there.

HANSON: JoEllen is there. We wanted to have general discussion. We all know almost everybody could bring a series of complaints about various rooms you've had but the business of the faculty council is to be deliberative from looking for solutions here. The crucial thing is that a lot of this bears on our educational mission and we're hoping that people can propose solutions and perhaps some action that might be in the faculty purview.

PRATT: And I think you should know that we the Agenda Committee, this is very high on our list of priorities for the coming year; to first gather the information that is available, seek input from across the academic committee and then decide rather or not there are policy actions that we should consider. We'll undoubtedly form one or more ad hoc committees and seek your participation in those working groups. This is just the beginning of a process that we hope will play out over the coming year and that we'll have something new; some new strategies if not new buildings in place pretty quickly.

HANSON: Could people stand up when they speak?

MACKAY: There was an article in the Boston Globe last week about universities starting to teach classes on Fridays again. There were two reasons for it. One was classroom space but the other was the curbing student drinking. I was wondering if you can make comments on that.

HANSON: This has been suggestion that has been made on this campus for decades and I think it's something that the faculty might take seriously as a policy recommendation, that there is a serious trend of partying on not just partying on Thursday night but Wednesday night because many people finish then. I think it's within the realm of faculty concern to think that they might be served by...

PRATT: I think there is also concern that with the higher quality of students that we are now attracting to Bloomington, we really need to think about enhancing the academic environment; strengthening it and certainly I think a full venue of classes on Friday would speak to that. There are individuals that have also asked whether or not to the north, rather or not we would consider Saturday morning classes. I find that difficult to imagine but I think that at this point in the process we should put everything on the table for consideration and really think it through over the coming months.

FOSTER: I was going to comment on Saturday, I went to classes on Saturday when I went school, I went to classes on Saturday when I went to school, specifically chemistry on Saturday morning at eight o'clock. But I also wanted to ask if there is a way to think outside of the box? For example, instead of scheduling classrooms across the university, what if we had departments schedule their own classes in classrooms that were assigned to them and have the scheduling officer for each department.

COTE: That is certainly a possibility. However, allocating those classrooms to the departments is problematic. We may have a department for example that has the need to teach two large lectures. Well we can't give them a lecture hall. So how do you allocate? We shouldn't be talking about allocating rooms to departments, but rather spaces to departments. This department teaches, for example, so many credit hours, so many students, so many heads, perhaps we allocate space based on that and include in that the spread across the entire day. That has been brought up as a possibility, you can suggest and bring it up as a possibility but I think it has been pretty difficult to accomplish and accomplish successfully. There have been articles written about that as well and one of the things that breaks down in that kind of an environment is the spirit of cooperation; to do that with the understanding that the departments are all going to cooperate with each other so that somebody in your department will call somebody in their department and say "hey, I've got this new person, really outstanding, and we really need to put him at two o'clock. Do you have a room available?" "No, we don't have a room available". So it is an interesting concept and we probably will examine it more closely but it's one of our problems.

HANSON: Well the classroom spaces are a common good on campus.

COTE: Right, and unfortunately they are not homogeneous. We have class, as Dean Bertenthal mentioned, there are some really nice classrooms, good classrooms, acceptable classrooms. Well, actually, really good, acceptable and really poor. So that's another issue in trying to allocate classroom space; do you give all the poor ones to one department? [Laughter] How do you do that? They are not equivalent because of the different sizes and the different configurations and the different equipment that may be in them.

HANSON: Yes.

MCCORMICK: I would add that one of the other things that we have to consider in classroom usage and space has to do with things that are beyond our control. I will give a good example; we have historically taught our introductory classes at eight o'clock. It's not unusual for us to have female athletes whose practice schedules run until nine o'clock. I have had two different semesters where I actually had a young woman who had to make a choice between a career and a scholarship. So I can't move that class out of the eight o'clock to try to accommodate the occasional athletes whose practice schedules encroach on that scheduling time. I think there are a lot of other factors that we have to consider as well.

COTE: To expand on that, this is a good example. Another good example would be in the School of Education where basically they are also trying to plan the pre-student teaching, I think they call it theory skills, and they are outside at schools in the area, or mostly within the county or may be up in Marion County and they are trying to schedule a class around that as well. So there are a number of these kinds of issues and it's outside of their control.

KOLBE: Let me take a, perhaps broad swipe at this to say this appears a serious division that is not likely to get any better, it's likely to get worse. I think how we couch the consequences of the problem would be important. If it appears that it is resolved that grumbling professors don't like our classrooms, I think it would be perceived one way. I think if we could couch it as major institutional problem having at least the following consequences, to be sure we risk recruitment and retention, good faculty and of graduate and undergraduate students in the future, to be sure we may have potential PR problems if this becomes very visible a problem outside of the campus. To be sure we'll have a potential legal liability if any of these crashing ceilings come down or if there are problems that we know about that have safety risks, would we be legally liable. All these things are interrelated and that could increase public media attention.

And lastly I wonder what it would do to the potential donors to the institution, especially our alumni donors. It's like we need to cast it as an institutional problem and not one that faculty are complaining about their own needs. Having said that, again, to be fair and broad, I think it would require a systems approach, that we would need a dedicated committee that would comprise both faculty and appropriate administrators to come together and manage them; a systems analysis to say "okay we can address this through policy and here are some of the policy issues we could work on. The allocation of existing resources, do we need to consider a capital campaign fund to raise resources". I think there is lots of broad based solutions, perhaps we need to look at the issue broadly from the beginning before getting bogged down in the issue.

PRATT: I think you should know that the conversation about how to formulate that sort of a broadly representative committee has already started in conversations that involve Karen and myself and Roland, to not duplicate it with multiple committees coming out of different areas and cross-talking, but to try to get key people in the room to try to address this collectively for the good of the institution because I think it is quite clear that it is an institutional problem of very large magnitude.

SCOTT: Three things; I'll try to keep it very organized and very brief. John Scott, Germanic Studies. So the first is looking at these charts I'm seeing pretty much, it's desirable but it also is at this point an advantage that could be used, that the Education Building is using much lower percentages for each of its rooms. Now I know that teaching for a lot of—especially college people could be not so fun in education, but we're already going to SPEA because of the studies classes and I wondered if we could utilize those classrooms more and just tell people to get over it.

Two, also just looking at the weekly usage, I wonder—and also to address the concern about the drinking and partying, if we could encourage Tuesday and Friday sessions for classes that would meet twice a week so that we can utilize Fridays more heavily and Tuesday being, I think, a weak instead of the other four days. So may be alleviate some of that.

And then the third one as a language instructor, it really struck me that the classroom sizes have a very broad spectrum of sizes within the one categorization between 13 and 54 and I was wondering if we couldn't do a lot by classifying those into small groups, may be increments of 10 or something like that. So the language classes can scale up to one and not end up with a class that would fit 54, when they only plan to schedule 23 students, but they could schedule them up to 30 when they have 23 students as their cap limit. And we could fine tune that level of it and may be addressed and thrown out for some reason.

COTE: Basically every room is an individual entity for us and they are all lined up and we will work with the department to try to get as large a room as they need and we won't encroach on a room for 40 if a room for 30 is enough for their 20 students.

The first question you raised, for the School of Education, people don't refuse—well, they do. We do not not schedule a class because it's in the Education Building, because we have to put it in the Education Building. There are difficulties with putting a lot of classes, non-education classes, in the Education Building because of the extensive use of non-standard times in the School of Education. I talked about this, the puzzle doesn't fit. It doesn't work because they have to deal with students on Monday and Tuesday, they may be teaching on Monday and Tuesday and therefore you can't have a Monday and Wednesday class, you can't have Tuesday and Thursday. So if inefficiencies that are built into these external requirements that the School of Education is trying to make. It's not that there is space available, there is space available, I think as you mentioned on the bar chart, Education is at a low. But the available space may not be available in a configuration that people want; either the size of the room or the times available.

HANSON: Yes.

BURNS: Not as a proposal but to put this in another light, I think that one question that should be asked in terms of the number of seats per student is what is the right student body size given this classroom portfolio to maintain the university and it is probably 10% lower from what I'm hearing than what we are actually at.

COTE: There was a study that, it's almost 10 years now, there was a Bloomington Capacity report and at that time, we had about the same number of classrooms that we have now and the

entering class enrollment was about 6500 to 6700 and that was deemed to be maximum, so we have just moved beyond that. That's eroded over the years.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: I don't know how this can't impact other offices, and I am sort of thinking of it as you can lead the horse to water but you make him drink. Someone I know wanted to take an 8:00 am language course this spring and it was cancelled because it only had three people lined up for the 8:00 am class, even though there was a waiting list for all the classes later in the day. I guess my question for someone who either advises students or works for the registrar's office or knows something is that we can offer these classes but what happens; do students just not take them--how do we force them into 8:00 am classes or Saturday morning classes or Friday classes.

COTE: We have just started mining this data basically. I mean its...all the information is in a new format, given the last three years and we are just now starting to put the data together to put the information together. Three years ago, we would not be able to put a bar graph like that together. We are going to do some much deeper analysis into the issues that you are talking about and it's going to require--I think this is part of the committee that Lisa was talking about. It's going to require broad participation among faculty and students and we are going to need. We are going to have to do surveys. We are going to have to mine the data to see all kinds...to come up with different theories for why students or why an instructor will not choose. It's a chicken and egg thing very often as well. The instructor will choose, I am not going to teach at 8:00, nobody will come. So they don't teach it at 8:00. Perhaps it's the wrong course to teach at eight o'clock. May be there should be another course that's teachable at eight o'clock. How do you know that? Well, you do some analysis of the data, you mine the data, you see what performance is like at different times during the day in the same course for example. We are just now getting into that.

HANSON: And actually another thing that we are thinking about as we talk about the culture changes you might have on this campus if the courses were arrayed differently. That can be one of the cultural changes too. We have a sense that the students should be able to choose whatever they want. We could do advising differently and so we need to think that everything is on the table here.

PRATT: And I will point out if you have sons or daughters at Purdue or if you know students at Purdue, they don't have much choice in scheduling. They are told what their schedule is and they optimize the use of rooms for the students so. There are other schools that have come up with other solutions.

COTE: I would like to recall a point that Professor Kolbe made here earlier about new admits and new recruits. We bring prospects on campus year round. One of the programs that we do in the office of admissions, if a student wants, we'll setup the student to sit in a class, the perspective student can sit in a class, of course we work with instructors who want to do this, who welcome this, and typically the students come out very impressed with oh this is great, this is great experience, but boy what a lousy classroom. My high school is a lot better than this. That hurts and if we are trying to bring in a higher quality student body, we can't do it with our existing facilities. They are shameful.

SCOTT: Just a question. Indiana University's undergraduate requirements at least in the College, they require something like the Core 40, right? Is it possible to push that sort of course, that sort of percentage of those courses in the 8:00 to 10:00am slots?

FARRIS: They are in there.

SCOTT: Are they ready to force them to go there because they need to graduate?

FARRIS: W131 is using it all the time.

COTE: You are talking about basic universal course requirements.

SCOTT: Basically, we are trying to figure out how to motivate the students to go to this course at 8:00am in the morning.

COTE: Pardon me.

SCOTT: We are trying to motivate the student to go to class at 8:00am.

COTE: In other words, math should be optimally taught since it is required for most degrees at 8:00am. English should be taught at 8:00am. I don't know. The English department is going to say that we are teaching 100 sections of this. We can't put. We can only...

FARRIS: They are there at 8:00am. They are in dorms, they're in the attic at Kirkwood.

COTE: That's right. So they only have so many people to teach.

FARRIS: Non-handicap accessible. They are everywhere, at all times, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.

PRATT: Roland since I don't see somebody asking it, I will go ahead and ask

COTE: I think I will sit down now.

PRATT: No, no, no, no. It's the Ivy Tech solution. Have we looked at renting space?

COTE: We have in the past. We did that very seriously. Most recently, well perhaps not the most recent foray into that. Several years ago when Von Lee came up for sale or when it was no longer being used and it was empty, we actually went over there and specked it out for auditorium, to see if we could put some large classes. And basically because of seating requirements, because of visibility requirements, because of lighting requirements a tremendous amount of remodeling would have had to have occurred in order for us to be able to do that. And it would still be used for film showings. The management said no we can't make all, we cant afford to make all these changes. Recently, I haven't really raised the issue. I assume that the post office is up for, the lease is not going to be renewed. Is that going to be turned into parking

space or could we lease it and turn it into classrooms? I forget how many square feet, thousands of square feet are there that could be turned into classrooms, albeit pretty poor classrooms very likely, but they could be turned into classrooms.

Yeah we have and we should look more. And we try also to engage—actually at one point, we tried to teach a class in the auditorium because we happened to have at the time an instructor who was very, very popular in history of political science. Always filled Woodburn and was willing to go to the auditorium. _____, I think it was, was willing to go teach in the auditorium but we could not without significant cost get them into the auditorium.

HANSON: Yes

PERRY: I am curious after spending the last 6 years at IUPUI, Saturday classes, the online classes, the evening classes; of course this would be inverted at IUPUI. I am wondering what about post five o'clock. Although that is strange to me that we are talking about an alternative time, I have taught evening classes here as well that we are not talking about alternative time or alternative to eight o'clock, which you can tell I wasn't around for scheduling last year because I have the eight o'clock class. [Laughter]

The other issue, going back to Professor Kolbe's comment, I am wondering how this argument will play with the legislature, I think one of the issues is what is the budgetary strategy for dealing with this. Most of the interpretation, I think by legislatures and general or average citizens, will be that yes these are the whiney professors who are seeking this, or whiney students one or the other, and why should we pay excessive amounts to sort of satisfy their needs. I did hear though some inconsistency in the presentations. One person, when I walked in a little bit late, there was a discussion about capacity utilization, which is sort of bare bones. Somebody else though later talked about teaching labs. Now in SPEA we use, we do a lot of group effort and I know they do in Business and elsewhere—we need to be talking about what are the educational needs of our students. And not necessarily making the case either based on the professors prospective or the student prospective. It seems to me that's going to be more persuasive but we also in this committee would have to have, I think, a very specific understanding of what is going to work in terms of the clinical case for expansion of buildings, procurement of better facilities. And I also assume that renting is probably not as good as procuring or buying a building.

BINGHAM: Question, there was a rank ordering of construction needs on campus and I thought that a new classroom building was on that rank ordering already. And so part, all of this is obviously great for building a case for funding that. And then we are hearing a bunch of other suggestions that are tweaks around the edges; utilization tweaks, and we can start to brainstorm a list of those, some of which it sounds like would encroach on certain expectations of certain faculty although with Jim at SPEA, we have never actually been consulted about when we teach so our expectations are very low. I've taught Friday for 3 hrs, I have taught one night a week for three hours, I am in Woodburn, whatever. So I am just wondering, if somehow we can't break this into two different—it seems to me we have two different foci. One is building the case for the new building that we already have in the waiting queue somewhere and then the other is

along the lines of a serious of resolutions or one on the best resolution about ways that faculty can help in the period of temporary need.

COTE: Can I address part of that? You are right there is a humanities classroom building, a humanities and classroom building that's on the priority list, it keeps falling down. I am not sure where it is right now. That building was to have I believe somewhere between 40 and 50 classrooms in it, in addition to a number of academic departments that needs to be revived. And I think that is one of the arguments that we are trying to make today. We need to bring that back to the surface. There is another point though that I'd like everybody to be aware of. We've talked today a lot about the deteriorating classroom infrastructure, the deteriorating classrooms, and the lack of modernization in classrooms. If we were today to decide to build a 50 classroom building, it would probably take, let's say three years before we final saw it, that may be optimistic.

BINGHAM: Sounds pretty good actually.

COTE: So in three years, we have 50 new classrooms. What do we do with those new classrooms? We have 50 new classrooms at our disposal, nope that wouldn't be wise. We need to take 40 out of Ballantine so that we can redo them. So oops, no net increase or a net increase of 10. And then once Ballantine is done does that mean that now we have more classrooms. No, we have to redo the School of Business. They've got 35 classrooms that need to be redone. It is called swing space. We can't repair and remodel because we have no place to put the classes. So when we are talking, when this committee gets together and starts talking about projections and needs. We need to think beyond today's needs. We need to think about the entire campus physical plant.

PRATT: Although, I think she is no longer in the back of the room, Sue Talbot one of our Trustees was here for the first hour of this meeting. And she and a number of the other Trustees are aware of this problem and interested in recommendations that are coming forward.

HANSON: It should be clear that these two things are linked. It's not that anybody wanted to cast it as sort of whiney faculty wanting various hours. It's that the faculty are in the best position to report what is and isn't working for them in the educational mission of the campus. We all know that we need more space and better space, but we also need to figure out what other things we can do as we work toward that.

JOHNSON: Have any universities used creative solutions to move faculty and students to different hours? We now know that if you want a seat near the exit on the airplane you pay more. If you want a class in prime time as a student, you pay more. If you want to do a Monday, Wednesday class, as a faculty member you lose a part of your salary. [Laughter] Some of this sounds kind of weird but it also sounded weird when they started asking you to pay for those better seats.

THOMPSON: You know. If you are interested, the University of Oregon was having a problem getting students to 8:00am classes and they began to discount tuition at a certain level if you were willing to take an 8:00am course. I heard this at a conference a couple years ago as they

were getting ready to roll it out. I have been too busy to figure out what happened when they rolled it. But may be you know Roland. I don't know.

COTE: I'm not sure that they ever did. That I could find out.

THOMPSON: Anyways there have been some of that talked about trying to change student behavior through financial incentives.

WATERMAN: How does IU compare with other universities, like other Big Ten universities? Do we have the comparative capacity numbers?

COTE: It's very difficult to get to a common ground in how you measure your classroom utilization. We are trying to come up with a pure method here. There are other things that also and Patrick can speak to this, when you are reporting utilization. You are not just reporting using a classroom at a certain time, but you are also factoring in the number of seats that are being used in that classroom during that particular time and it's hard to find the common formula among institutions. Patrick could probably speak to this a little better than I could.

MURRAY: There are a lot more. Coming up with the charts and the graphs is a lot more complicated than what we've been talking about at this broad brush level today. But we talk about it in optimal fill rate so you've got a 30 seat classroom and perhaps the optimal fill would be a percentage of that probably someplace in the neighborhood of 65%. If you achieve 65%, then you sort of make your threshold and if you get more students in that room then that's better. In terms of trying to benchmark ourselves against Penn State or Ohio State, they have different state regulatory requirements. They probably have some different formats in terms of—I think IU has probably has a lot more registrar controlled classrooms than some of the other large universities.

COTE: No not in the Big Ten.

MURRAY: Not in the Big Ten. But anyway, it's not apples to apples, we can go out and take a look and see what's out there. I don't know that it benefits us anything in terms of meeting our need. And you know, I don't know that there is much benefit going to the state legislature and saying Indiana is at the bottom of the list again. And they will say okay. The academic or the humanities classroom building is currently number 3 on the capital priorities or the planning list for new construction. This past year the state legislature funded very few new capital projects. Funding streams fluctuate according to the prosperity of the state and the economy and taxes. There is no way to predict that and sometimes we can get lucky and take advantage of it. Other times, you just lose out. So you stay on that list for year after, biennium after biennium after biennium, and this building has been on the capital priorities list for at least the past three bienniums. I went back to check this morning, maybe even longer than that. Its status has always been in the top 5. Funding never goes down that low so perhaps its time to think about-- somebody was talking about thinking, working outside of the box, maybe the funding mechanisms that we look out for building capital projects needs to be explored and expanded. That is not my area of expertise by the way.

HANSON: We are reaching the adjournment point but as Lisa mentioned that a committee will be formed and it will be playing into other elements of planning on this campus. If you have an interest in participating or what to suggest people who should be a part of that please think about getting in touch with us. But for today we are adjourned.

PRATT: Thank you.

MEETING ADJOURNED 5:22