

Arts and Sciences Space Planning Committee Report
Final Report
February 14, 2006

Contents

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 Committee Membership
 - 1.2 Overall Mission
 - 1.3 Planning Process
 - 1.4 Summary of the Committee's Major Conclusions
2. Planning Priorities and Principles
 - 2.1 Learning Spaces
 - 2.2 Locating Complementary Departments and Programs Close Each Other
 - 2.3 Offices for Teaching Faculty
 - 2.4 Research Space
 - 2.5 Technology
3. Bracketed Topics
4. Space Reallocation Proposals for Departments and Programs
 - 4.1 The Committee's Preferred Space Allocation Plan
 - 4.2 The Committee's Alternative Space Allocation Plan

1. Introduction

1.1 Committee Membership:

Eric Jensen, Arthur Knight, Kelly Lockeman, Teresa Longo, Heather Macdonald, Dan Maliniak, Rob Nelson, George Rublein, Gene Roche, Martha Sheets, Mariana Stempian, and Joel Schwartz (chair)

1.2 Overall Mission

The College will have a unique opportunity over the next several years to reshape its use of space in the central campus area, due largely to the relocation plans of the Schools of Education and Business. Dean Carl Strikwerda formed this committee and charged it with the mission to recommend a coherent plan that will take the greatest possible advantage of the increased space available to The Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The committee has attempted to meet specific space needs, as articulated in the individual reports that we solicited from departments and programs; however, its underlying goal has been to recommend an overall plan that will maximize the extent to which our physical space contributes to our academic aspirations.

1.3 Planning Process

The committee asked all departments and programs in Arts and Sciences to submit reports describing their current use of space and anticipated future needs. Thirty reports, many with substantial supporting documentation, were submitted. In addition to plenary committee meetings, we constituted two subcommittees that each prepared a report for the committee as a whole. The first examined the department/program submissions and prepared alternative space allocation scenarios; the second studied the College's current classroom inventory and utilization

patterns.

Finally we received input from Wayne Boy and Dave Shepard, facilities experts, who helped us evaluate the structural feasibility of the relocation scenarios that we were studying. The committee also owes special thanks to Kelly Lockeman and Martha Sheets who provided it with invaluable data and planning studies.

The Committee submitted its draft report to all Arts and Sciences faculty for comment on December 21, 2005. Its final, unanimous, report was submitted to Dean Strikwerda on January 31.

1.4 Summary of the Committee's Major Recommendations

- ⑥ We recommend that the College institutionalize its commitment to excellence in teaching by assigning *the highest priority* to the creation of quality classrooms, teaching labs, and other learning spaces. It is important to both commit appropriate resources to this task and to clarify who is responsible for accomplishing it.
- ⑥ It is also important to create flexible spaces, some of which remain controlled by the Dean of the Faculty, that will serve the anticipated growth in faculty/faculty and faculty/student research collaborations.
- ⑥ The Committee describes two feasible space allocation plans. The central elements of our preferred plan are: Economics, Government, and Public Policy will move to a renovated Tyler Hall; Anthropology will move to Morton Hall; Classical Studies will move to the first floor of Washington; and the second floor of Blow will house a coordinated set of interdisciplinary programs, including The Charles Center, American Studies, Women's Studies, Black Studies, and The Sharpe Program. The central elements of our alternative plan are: Anthropology will move to Tyler with Sociology; and Economics, Government, and Public Policy will stay in Morton. In other respects the two plans are the same.
- ⑥ The Committee has interpreted its mission to be restricted to a consideration of space needs that can be met by relocations made possible by the moves of Education and Business Needs that can be met only by new from-the-ground building projects, for instance, especially where plans for these projects are already underway, will not be addressed in this report. The fact that we are bracketing these projects does not imply that the committee regards them as having a low priority. Indeed, the Committee believes that the sequential build-out of the Integrated Science Center and the construction of the Fine and Performing Arts building are among the highest priorities for Arts and Sciences.

2. Planning Priorities and Principles

We recommend that the following priorities and principles, which emerged from this planning process, guide the allocation and use of space.

2.1 Learning Spaces

We have a significant opportunity over the next several years to advance and institutionalize William and Mary's commitment to excellence in teaching by taking advantage of opportunities that will be open to us to shape the spaces where teaching and learning take place. Our research shows that at present learning spaces are inadequate in two ways:

- ! Size. There is at present a lack of alignment between the sizes of our courses and the sizes of the classrooms in which they are taught. Our research, summarized in Appendix I, shows that approximately 70% of class sections have an enrollment of 1-30 students, but only 37% of classrooms have a capacity of 1-30. Our small and mid-sized classrooms get much more use than larger classrooms, and a large percentage of class sections meet in rooms that are larger than necessary. Since teaching practices have probably adjusted over time to fit existing architecture, the problem is likely to be even greater than the evidence indicates.
- ! Flexibility and Furnishings/Equipment. A consistent theme in the department/program reports is that in small and mid-sized classrooms faculty prefer well-equipped, flexible, learning spaces that accommodate a variety of classroom activities and approaches to teaching. For instance, we need more classrooms in which students can listen to a brief lecture and then shift their chairs and tables (and laptops) into small groups. The furnishings and technology in Tucker 131 is something of a model.

A. We recommend that the institution assign *the highest priority* to the creation of quality classrooms, teaching labs, and other learning spaces. To accomplish this, the College will have to both commit appropriate resources to this task and clarify who is responsible for accomplishing it.

B. We recommend that the College redesign existing classrooms and use some of our anticipated increase in space to create learning spaces that fit our actual practices and aspirations. A higher fraction of spaces should be smaller, well-equipped with technology, appropriately lit, and more flexible and conducive to a range of teaching strategies. We especially need more rooms that will accommodate up to 30 students and are sufficiently flexible to be suitable for both 15-student freshman seminars and 30-student lectures classes (and everything in between).

C. We recommend that departments/programs look for opportunities to create flexible classrooms that can also serve as meeting rooms, small group study/research rooms, common rooms, or libraries. Teaching and learning is not restricted to formal classes, and spaces on campus for group research, studying, informal tutoring, etc., are currently severely limited. It is clear that the lines between teaching, research, and a range of co-curricular activities will continue to become more blurred, and it will be desirable to have spaces that anticipate and support this trend.

D. We recommend that departments/programs have *small and medium-sized learning spaces* that are as proximate as possible to faculty offices in order to encourage faculty-student interaction before and after class. Many of our department/program reports argue that this

proximity is necessary if we intend to nurture a culture of intellectual interaction between faculty and students. We, for instance, found no support for a dedicated classroom building that would be shared by several departments. Faculty concur that such a building would tend to restrict faculty-student interaction to formal class meetings.

E. We recommend that *large lecture halls*, in contrast, should be shared by several units in order to maximize their efficient use. We need to maintain an adequate number of extremely well-appointed and well-equipped lecture halls.

F. Finally, we recommend that the College clarify the guidelines and principles for the assignment of learning spaces. At present we have a patchwork of common law customs that irregularly govern room “ownership” and assignment, and there is little doubt that these are responsible for some of the mal-alignment of classes and classrooms that we find in our study. In the future we will need guidelines that maximize the efficient use of learning spaces, including what we anticipate will be a modest growth in special-use spaces for linguistics, film and multi-media, GIS, etc.

2.2 Locating Complementary Departments and Programs Close to Each Other

We recommend that departments/programs that have teaching and research affinities should be housed as near to one another as possible. In addition, we encourage these related units to seek opportunities for shared uses of space, including for teaching, research, and administrative functions.

2.3 Offices for Teaching Faculty

The department/program reports indicate that several units currently have office space that inadequately supports the teaching activities of part- and full-time teaching faculty.

A. We recommend that Arts and Science departments and programs should have a sufficient number of contiguous offices so that each full-time teaching faculty member, including tenure eligible faculty, instructors, and visiting faculty, has an office. Adjuncts and other part-time faculty should also have a place to meet with students, and it is desirable, although a somewhat lower priority, for their offices to be contiguous with the offices of full-time faculty in their disciplines.

B. Departments and programs that regularly teach and conduct research with undergraduates should have space on the central campus area. Units that have little interaction with undergraduates can profit from the large amount of space available at the hospital.

2.4 Research Space

A. Departments and programs should have adequate faculty research space. It is also important that graduate students have appropriate work space.

B. When faculty research DOES NOT involve undergraduate student collaborators, space for this research may not have to be contiguous with department offices. However, most departments and programs value faculty-faculty and faculty-student research collaborations, which usually require research space that is contiguous with the unit’s offices, classrooms, and

teaching labs. Many units envision a significant increase in team research projects and will require flexible research space to accommodate this.

2.5 Technology

Many of our department and program reports highlight the growing role that technology will play in the future in both teaching and research. On the teaching side, it is important to not only continuously upgrade equipment, but also to design physical spaces, including furniture and lighting, so that we can take advantage of this equipment. For instance, in many classrooms at present the instructor is forced to cover up the chalk board when he or she pulls down the screen for a PowerPoint presentation. Also, the laptop initiative will require several changes, including moving away from folding tablet desks. High quality wireless and presentation capabilities will be increasingly necessary to both our teaching and research.

3. Bracketed Topics

The Committee has interpreted its mission to be restricted to a consideration of *space needs that can be met by relocations made possible by the moves of Education and Business*. Needs that can be met only by new from-the-ground building projects, for instance, especially where plans for these projects are already underway, will not be addressed in this report. The fact that we are bracketing these projects does not imply that the committee regards them as having a low priority. *Indeed, the Committee believes that the sequential build-out of the Integrated Science Center and the construction of the Fine and Performing Arts building are among the highest priorities for Arts and Sciences.*

Bracketed units that are not addressed in this report include:

Physics (Small Hall is already scheduled for renovation)

Integrated Science Center units (Chemistry, Biology, and Psychology)

Fine and Performing Arts units (Music; Theatre, Speech, and Dance; Art and Art History)

Environmental Science and Studies (which, for instance, calls for the expansion of Keck and a new building in their report)

Reves Center (which, for instance, calls for expansion into the Reves dorm space, and into the Campus Center)

Kinesiology (which will have some of its needs addressed in the short term by the hospital, and others in the longer term by the Fine and Performing Arts building)

History, Religious Studies, and Philosophy (which have needs for modest alternations of their existing spaces, and may profit from flexible office space in Jones, but which do not need significant new space)

Military Science (which will need alternative space if they are required to move from Digges House)

4. Space Reallocation Proposals for Departments and Programs

After extensive study, discussion, and input from the Arts and Sciences community, the Committee has arrived at a preferred plan for space reallocation and an alternative plan. For many departments and programs there is no difference between these two plans.

We assume that:

- ! Education will vacate Jones Hall and move to the Hospital in 2007-08
- ! Admissions will vacate Blow and move to the old book store in 2007-08
- ! Business will vacate Tyler and Blow and move to the new business building in 2009-10, after which Tyler will be renovated for its new occupant..
- ! Adequate resources will be available for renovation

4.1 The Committee's Preferred Space Allocation Plan

We propose that:

Applied Sciences, which currently occupies 3,890 square feet in McLaughlin-Street Hall, will move to the Hospital.

Rationale: While it teaches some undergraduates, the bulk of its work is research and graduate teaching, so the benefits of this move will more than offset the costs.

Computer Science and Geology will make use of the bulk of the space vacated by Applied Sciences.

Rationale: The Computer Science faculty is expanding, and the department needs to recover conference and teaching space lost to a recent renovation; Geology needs additional lab and faculty office space.

When Jones is vacated, we propose that:

Mathematics will expand into the space on Jones 1 currently occupied by Education (we do not yet know if IT will vacate its space on Jones 1).

Rationale: The Mathematics report documents a variety of needs for new space, including for teaching purposes and post docs.

Jones 2 and 3 will be used as flexible research and office space, and, in the short run, as swing space. To maximize flexibility, most of this space should remain formally under the control of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Rationale: We propose that these floors be assigned on a flexible basis by the Dean of the Faculty for grant-funded research centers and other faculty/faculty and faculty/student collaborations; for visiting research faculty; and for faculty on leave who have to vacate their departmental offices. In the short term, Physics and (perhaps) some ISC faculty will use it as swing space when Small Hall is being renovated and the successive phases of the ISC are being built. English will also need significant swing space when Tucker is being renovated.

When Tyler and Blow are vacated:

Public Policy, Government, and Economics will vacate Morton and occupy Tyler and parts of Blow 3 (the Blow 3 classrooms, as well as space in Blow 3 for PLAID and other policy research centers, will be especially important for them).

Rationale: Combining these three units in Tyler would be the most coherent use of the available space in that building. Tyler currently has almost 35,000 square feet and 83 offices, many of which are small, "interior," or both. Of course, this arrangement can be changed when Tyler is renovated after Business moves (including the possibility of finishing a substantial attic space). These 3 units need about 60 offices, as well as space for about 50 MPP graduate students. They currently occupy only about 25,000 square feet, but they do not have enough offices and they do not have space for faculty/faculty

and faculty/student research groups.

This group is the *only* proposal received by the Committee that has worked out a multi-unit collaboration that will result in efficiencies (e.g., shared administrative resources) and complementarities that will enhance both teaching and research. Finally, our analysis of classroom utilization indicates that the customary class sizes of these departments presents the best fit with the existing class sizes in Tyler and Blow.

Anthropology will move to the space vacated by the Public Policy group – all of Morton B and 1, as well as additional space made possible by the moves of Classics, Black Studies, and Women’s Studies.

Rationale: Currently, Anthropology is radically short of space for teaching and research labs, and it has various centers and research enterprises spread around campus. As the department says in its report, it is “literally bursting at the seams,” and it requests that it be allocated “all of Washington Hall or a similar space....” The department would like to consolidate all of its centers and institutes (the Archaeological Research Center, the Institute for Historical Biology, and the Archaeological Conservation Center) in one location, housed with the teaching faculty. It needs additional teaching and research labs; it needs 20-24 additional offices to properly house its 24 full- and part-time faculty and staff; it needs space for a library; and it needs 6-19 additional graduate student work stations (depending on whether students double-up).

Anthropology’s current space in Washington has a total of 12,328 square feet; Morton B and 1 alone have 22,505 square feet. Sociology will retain its space on Morton 2, but Classical Studies, Black Studies, and Women’s Studies will all leave, which frees up another whole floor.

The Committee analyzed the feasibility of this move in some detail with the College’s facilities professionals. While the shape of Anthropology labs would be somewhat different in Morton, the building’s structure can easily accommodate them. While labs might be narrower in Morton than in Washington, the additional overall space in Morton would allow for some needed storage adjoining, rather than within, teaching labs. The Committee conducted a study of the classes that Anthropology taught in labs and other “special use” spaces in 2003-04 and 2004-05. The majority of the sections had an enrollment of 1-10 students, and only two had enrollments over 20. The Committee concludes that the space available in Morton for Anthropology teaching labs is more than adequate.

Classical Studies will move to some of the space on Washington 1, part of the space vacated by Anthropology.

Rationale: Classics currently occupies about 5,720 square feet in Morton. We assume that it will expand some to accommodate needs the department identifies in its report. Classics is currently intellectually isolated in Morton; this move will bring it in close proximity with complementary humanities departments, including History, Religion, English, and MLL.

Both the recommended and alternative plans will require only modest renovations in Washington, a building that was completely re-done just 15 years ago. The Committee considered, and rejected, other plans that would require substantial renovation of this building.

Modern Languages and Literatures will occupy the remaining space (i.e., not occupied by Classics) on Washington 1, and the Washington attic space vacated by Anthropology.

Rationale: MLL is currently very short of faculty office space. This additional space on Washington 1, together with space in Washington attic and in the renovated language lab, will help alleviate this shortage. The only alternative way to meet MLL needs might be to move it to Morton or Jones, but that would remove it from proximity to other humanities departments, and, in the case of Jones, it would leave us without appropriate swing space for the Small and Tucker renovations.

The Charles Center, The Sharpe Program, American Studies, Black Studies, and Women's Studies will move to Blow Hall 2.

Rationale: The goal of this plan is to create a contiguous space for complementary interdisciplinary programs on the second floor of Blow Hall, with the Charles Center and affiliated programs occupying the space that Admissions will be vacating, and American Studies occupying the other end of the hall, where the MBA program is currently housed.

This arrangement will make it possible for a large number of interdisciplinary programs that have overlapping faculties to share faculty meeting and administrative space, space for small classes, student meetings, lunch seminars, receptions for visiting speakers, etc. The large, attractive room currently used for admissions orientation meetings will be an excellent space for Monroe Scholar lunches, meetings for student groups and national scholarship committees, visiting speakers seminars, receptions, and dinners. In general, this will be a high-quality, flexible multi-purpose room that functions similar to the way the Reves Room currently functions. The programs that will benefit include Literary and Cultural Studies, Film Studies, and Medieval-Renaissance studies, in addition to Women's Studies, Black Studies, American Studies, and the Sharpe Program.

In addition, this plan will situate these programs close to the home departments of most affiliated faculty, including English, History, and Modern Languages and Literatures. For instance, this will be a major improvement for Women's Studies and Black Studies, both of which are currently in Morton but have directors who are faculty members in English.

Staying in its present location is not an option for the Charles Center. It is already slated to leave Tucker Hall to make room for the expansion of the English Department when Tucker is renovated in the next few years. The proposed location in Blow will place the Center in a better position to serve interdisciplinary programs, and permit the Charles Center and the Sharpe program to increase its interactions with, for instance, the Career Center (e.g., internships and community initiatives).

The overall plan, then, is for Blow 2 to house a variety of affiliated interdisciplinary programs anchored on the Richmond Road side with the Charles Center and on the opposite side with American Studies. Many complementarities and efficiencies will result from this arrangement.

English will take over all of Tucker Hall after the Charles Center is able to leave its current space in the basement.

Rationale: English is currently extremely cramped in Tucker, for both office and teaching space. Since it will also use the classrooms on Blow 3, the net result will be a substantial increase in space.

4.2 The Committee's Alternative Space Allocation Plan

It would also be feasible, although less desirable in the Committee's judgment, to keep Economics, Government, and Public Policy in Morton and move Anthropology and Sociology into a renovated Tyler Hall.

Rationale: The move to Tyler would provide Anthropology with adequate space for expansion. It would also keep that department close to Colonial Williamsburg, with which it has shared programs, and to History and American Studies, with which it shares faculty and programs. At present, Sociology is close to Women's Studies and Black Studies in Morton Hall. Several Sociology faculty participate in these programs. Sociology would remain close to these programs if it were to move to Tyler and they were to move to the second floor of Blow.